

Foreign direct investment and regional growth: an analysis of the Spanish case

Bajo-Rubio, Oscar; Diaz-Mora, Carmen; Diaz-Roldan, Carmen

Postprint / Postprint

Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Zur Verfügung gestellt in Kooperation mit / provided in cooperation with:

www.peerproject.eu

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Bajo-Rubio, O., Diaz-Mora, C., & Diaz-Roldan, C. (2010). Foreign direct investment and regional growth: an analysis of the Spanish case. *Regional Studies*, 44(3), 373-382. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343400802508844>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter dem "PEER Licence Agreement zur Verfügung" gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zum PEER-Projekt finden Sie hier: <http://www.peerproject.eu> Gewährt wird ein nicht exklusives, nicht übertragbares, persönliches und beschränktes Recht auf Nutzung dieses Dokuments. Dieses Dokument ist ausschließlich für den persönlichen, nicht-kommerziellen Gebrauch bestimmt. Auf sämtlichen Kopien dieses Dokuments müssen alle Urheberrechtshinweise und sonstigen Hinweise auf gesetzlichen Schutz beibehalten werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht in irgendeiner Weise abändern, noch dürfen Sie dieses Dokument für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

gesis
Leibniz-Institut
für Sozialwissenschaften

Terms of use:

This document is made available under the "PEER Licence Agreement". For more information regarding the PEER-project see: <http://www.peerproject.eu> This document is solely intended for your personal, non-commercial use. All of the copies of this documents must retain all copyright information and other information regarding legal protection. You are not allowed to alter this document in any way, to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.

Mitglied der

Leibniz-Gemeinschaft



Foreign direct investment and regional growth: an analysis of the Spanish case

Journal:	<i>Regional Studies</i>
Manuscript ID:	CRES-2007-0290.R1
Manuscript Type:	Main Section
JEL codes:	F21 - International Investment Long-Term Capital Movements < F2 - International Factor Movements and International Business < F - International Economics, O40 - General < O4 - Economic Growth and Aggregate Productivity < O - Economic Development, Technological Change, and Growth, R58 - Regional Development Policy < R5 - Regional Government Analysis < R - Urban, Rural, and Regional Economics
Keywords:	Economic growth , Foreign direct investment, Regions



FOREIGN DIRECT INVESTMENT AND REGIONAL GROWTH: AN ANALYSIS OF THE SPANISH CASE

Oscar Bajo-Rubio
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha
Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales
Department of Economics
Ronda de Toledo, s/n
13071 Ciudad Real (Spain)
E-mail: oscar.bajo@uclm.es

Carmen Díaz-Mora
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha
Facultad de Ciencias Jurídicas y Sociales
Department of Economics
Cobertizo de San Pedro Mártir, s/n
45071 Toledo (Spain)
E-mail: carmen.diazmora@uclm.es

Carmen Díaz-Roldán
Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha
Facultad de Derecho y Ciencias Sociales
Department of Economics
Ronda de Toledo, s/n
13071 Ciudad Real (Spain)
E-mail: carmen.diazroldan@uclm.es

First received: September 2007

Accepted: April 2008

Abstract

The massive increase in foreign direct investment (FDI) inflows following the Spanish integration with the now European Union (EU) in 1986, has been one of the most important features shaping the behaviour of the Spanish economy in the last twenty years. In this paper we will try to assess the impact of FDI on regional economic growth following Spain's entry into the EU, using data for the 17 Spanish regions. The results support the important role played by FDI in promoting productivity growth over the period analyzed, which proves to be robust to several alternative specifications.

Key words: Economic growth, Foreign direct investment, Regions

JEL Classification: F21, O40, R58

Ausländische Direktinvestitionen und regionales Wachstum: eine Analyse des Falls von Spanien

Oscar Bajo-Rubio, Carmen Díaz-Mora and Carmen Díaz-Roldán

Abstract

Der massive Anstieg ausländischer Direktinvestitionen in Spanien nach der Integration des Landes in die heutige Europäische Union im Jahr 1986 war eines der wichtigsten Merkmale, die das Verhalten der spanischen Wirtschaft in den letzten zwanzig Jahren prägten. In diesem Beitrag versuchen wir, die Auswirkung der ausländischen Direktinvestitionen auf das regionale Wirtschaftswachstum nach dem EU-Beitritt Spaniens anhand von Daten für die 17 spanischen Regionen zu bewerten. Die Ergebnisse bekräftigen die wichtige Rolle der ausländischen Direktinvestitionen bei der Förderung des Produktivitätswachstums über den analysierten Zeitraum – ein Ergebnis, das sich auch in Verbindung mit mehreren alternativen Spezifikationen als robust erweist.

Key words:

Wirtschaftswachstum

Ausländische Direktinvestitionen

Regionen

JEL Classification: F21, O40, R58

1
2
3 Inversión extranjera directa y crecimiento regional: un análisis del caso
4 español

5
6 Resumen

7 El masivo incremento de las entradas de inversión extranjera directa (IED)
8 tras la integración española en la actual Unión Europea (UE) en 1986, ha
9 sido uno de los rasgos más importantes que configuran la evolución de la
10 economía española en los últimos veinte años. En este artículo trataremos
11 de evaluar el impacto de la IED sobre el crecimiento económico regional
12 tras la entrada de España en la UE, utilizando datos para las 17 regiones
13 españolas. Los resultados confirman el importante papel desempeñado por la
14 IED a la hora de favorecer el crecimiento de la productividad a lo largo
15 del periodo analizado, siendo estos resultados robustos a diversas
16 especificaciones alternativas.

17
18 Crecimiento económico, Inversión extranjera directa, Regiones

19
20 Investissement étranger direct et croissance régionale: une analyse du cas
21 espagnol Résumé Le massif accroissement des entrées d'investissement
22 étranger direct (IED) après l'intégration espagnole dans l'actuelle Union
23 Européenne (UE) en 1986, a été l'un des principaux traits configurant
24 l'évolution de l'économie espagnole des vingt dernières années. Dans cet
25 article, nous essayerons d'évaluer l'impact de l'IED sur la croissance
26 économique régionale après l'entrée de l'Espagne dans l'UE, en utilisant
27 des données des 17 régions espagnoles. Les résultats confirment l'important
28 rôle joué par l'IED en favorisant la croissance de la productivité tout au
29 long de la période analysée, ces résultats étant robustes à diverses
30 spécifications alternatives.

31
32
33 Croissance économique, Investissement étranger direct, Régions

34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 1. Introduction

42
43 As is well known, foreign direct investment (FDI henceforth) has played over the last fifty
44 years an increasing role as a way of internationalization of the economic activity. In fact, FDI
45 is one of the most relevant aspects of the recent wave of globalization, registering higher
46 growth rates than both world trade and output.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 On the other hand, FDI has been a crucial factor in the process of intense growth
56 enjoyed by the Spanish economy since the beginning of the 1960s. Even more, the massive
57 increase in FDI inflows following the Spanish integration with the now European Union (EU)
58
59
60

1
2
3 in 1986, coupled with the prospects about the completion of the Single European Market by
4
5 1992, has been one of the most important features shaping the behaviour of the Spanish
6
7 economy in the last twenty years. An overview of FDI trends during this period can be found
8
9 in BAJO-RUBIO and TORRES, 2001.
10
11

12
13
14
15 There are several studies available that investigate the main features of the FDI arrived
16
17 to the Spanish economy, together with their economic implications. From a long-term
18
19 perspective, the macroeconomic factors behind the FDI inflows received between 1964 and
20
21 1989 were analyzed in BAJO-RUBIO and SOSVILLA-RIVERO, 1994; also, the role of FDI
22
23 in fostering the favourable effects of the European Single Market was stressed in SOSVILLA-
24
25 RIVERO and HERCE, 1998. In turn, the sectoral allocation of FDI in manufacturing between
26
27 1986 and 1992 (i.e., the period where the affluence of FDI was more intense) has been
28
29 examined in BAJO-RUBIO and LÓPEZ-PUEYO, 2002. A general survey on the more recent
30
31 role of FDI in the Spanish economy can be found in FERNÁNDEZ-OTHEO, 2003. However,
32
33 despite the importance of FDI in the Spanish economy, their regional aspects have been
34
35 hardly explored. Some exceptions are EGEA-ROMÁN and LÓPEZ-PUEYO, 1991,
36
37 FERNÁNDEZ-OTHEO, 2000, and PELEGRÍN-SOLÉ, 2002, where the focus is on the
38
39 description of regional FDI trends in Spain and their explanatory factors, but without
40
41 analyzing growth effects.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 On the other hand, the role of FDI on economic growth has been extensively analyzed
51
52 in recent years, by means of multivariate regressions of the rates of growth of (mostly)
53
54 developing countries, over long-time spans, on a series of macroeconomic variables including
55
56 the ratio FDI-GDP. In general, FDI shows a positive and significant influence on growth,
57
58 although this effect would be stronger if host countries possess an adequate absorptive
59
60

1
2
3 capacity to channel FDI flows toward real output expansion; a non-exhaustive listing of
4
5 papers would include, among others, BLOMSTRÖM et al., 1994, BALASUBRAMANYAM
6
7 et al., 1996, BORENSZTEIN et al., 1998, DE MELLO, 1999, CAMPOS and KINOSHITA,
8
9 2002, DURHAM, 2004, or ALFARO et al., 2004. These results, however, have been
10
11 criticized by CARKOVIC and LEVINE, 2005, on the grounds that they can be biased on not
12
13 fully controlling for endogeneity, country-specific effects, and the routine use of lagged
14
15 dependent variables. These authors propose instead the use of the Generalized Method of
16
17 Moments (GMM) estimator, and find no robust, independent influence of FDI on growth for a
18
19 sample of 72 countries, both industrial and developing; similar results were found by
20
21 LAURETI and POSTIGLIONE, 2005, in this case for 11 developing Mediterranean countries.
22
23 However, and as far as we know, the relationship between FDI and growth on a regional basis
24
25 has been hardly explored. We just can quote LEDYAEVA and LINDEN, 2006, or YAO and
26
27 WEI, 2007 (both of them using also the GMM estimator), who analyze the effects of FDI on
28
29 growth for the regions of Russia and China, respectively, and find the opposite results about
30
31 the effects of FDI on growth: non significant for the Russian regions, and positive and
32
33 significant for the Chinese regions.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44 In this paper we will try to assess the impact of FDI on regional economic growth in
45
46 the Spanish case, by estimating an aggregate production function augmented with FDI
47
48 inflows for the 17 Spanish regions, following the country's entry into the EU. This paper
49
50 intends to contribute to the available literature on FDI and growth by emphasizing the
51
52 regional dimension in the context of a developed country. In particular, we present some
53
54 evidence for a group of relatively homogeneous economies, the Spanish regions, belonging to
55
56 a developed country that has become integrated with other richer nations. In addition, we
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 make use of an econometric methodology especially well suited for empirical growth work,
4
5 namely, the system GMM estimator.
6
7
8
9

10 On the other hand, choosing the Spanish case might also prove to be a relevant case
11 study. Unlike the cases of Russia and China mentioned above (i.e., two very large and weakly
12 developed countries), Spain would be a medium-size industrialized economy, given the size
13 of her main macroeconomic variables, which has experienced a process of rapid growth in the
14 last forty years, starting from a relatively weak position as compared to the rest of Western
15 European countries. This has been particularly true after her accession to the EU in 1986,
16 allowing her an even deeper integration with other more advanced economies, so Spain has
17 been able to join the Economic and Monetary Union from its start. Summarizing, the Spanish
18 experience could be of interest for other medium-size economies following a process of
19 integration with other relatively more advanced countries, as can be the case of the Central
20 and Eastern European countries that have recently joined the EU.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 The rest of the paper is organized as follows: the theoretical framework is presented in
40 Section 2, and the main empirical results are shown in Section 3; finally, the main conclusions
41 are summarized in Section 4.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 2. Theoretical framework

49
50 Our starting point will be a simple production function that includes human capital (as in
51 MANKIW, ROMER and WEIL, 1992), written for simplicity in a Cobb-Douglas form:
52
53
54

$$55 Y_t = A_t K_t^\alpha H_t^\beta L_t^\gamma \quad (1)$$

56
57
58
59
60

where Y , K , H , and L denote, respectively, output, physical capital, human capital, and labour; and A is an index of the level of technology. Dividing by L and taking logs, the above function would become:

$$\log\left(\frac{Y}{L}\right)_t = \log A_t + (\alpha + \beta + \gamma - 1)\log L_t + \alpha \log\left(\frac{K}{L}\right)_t + \beta \log\left(\frac{H}{L}\right)_t \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha + \beta + \gamma$ indicates the degree of returns to scale for all production factors. Now, the question would be: how does FDI enter the above equation? The main arguments below are taken from BAJO-RUBIO and DÍAZ-ROLDÁN, 2002, who present a survey on the relationship between FDI, productivity growth, and technological innovation, by the multinational enterprise (MNE).

In the standard neoclassical growth model, FDI would be considered as an addition to the capital stock of the host economy (see, e.g., BREMS, 1970), so that the effect of foreign capital would be indistinguishable from that of domestic capital. Notice that, in this case, the assumption of diminishing returns to capital would imply that FDI would affect growth only in the short run, i.e., during the transition to the steady-state growth path. Such a characterization, however, is unsatisfactory given the recent trends in FDI. In fact, the main role of FDI would seem to be that of transferring assets from less efficient to more efficient owners, so that in practice FDI would consist of offsetting two-way flows that would be hardly related to productive investment (LIPSEY, 2001). In other words, FDI would be less and less “greenfield”, i.e., that FDI devoted to enlarge the production capacity of the host economy.

Endogenous growth models allow for a greater impact of FDI on growth. On the one hand, FDI could lead to externalities on the domestic production factors; the effect on growth,

1
2
3 however, would be permanent only if the resulting returns to scale over all factors (i.e.,
4 including the externality) turn to be increasing. More importantly, the endogenous growth
5 literature has tried to formalize technological innovation, which would emerge as a response
6 to economic incentives, that is, profit opportunities detected by firms that would be influenced
7 by the institutional, legal, and economic environment in which they act (GROSSMAN and
8 HELPMAN, 1994). And, in turn, this would lead to stress the role of FDI and, in general, the
9 degree of economic integration, on influencing technological progress and consequently
10 growth rates.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23
24 In this way, higher integration would mean an increase in market size, which would
25 lead to greater incentives to R&D and hence higher growth; and this would facilitate the
26 diffusion of knowledge across countries and avoid duplication of the research activity
27 (ROMER, 1990; GROSSMAN and HELPMAN, 1991). In particular, integration among
28 relatively similar economies would lead to a higher growth rate in the long run, since it would
29 allow the exploitation at the world level of the increasing returns that would exist in the R&D
30 sector (RIVERA-BATIZ and ROMER, 1991). Even more, both FDI and growth could be the
31 simultaneous result of an increased economic integration, on changing the relative strength of
32 centrifugal and centripetal forces behind manufacturing agglomeration, in a model that
33 combines endogenous growth with elements of economic geography (GAO, 2005).
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50
51 On the other hand, as mentioned before, FDI has acquired in last years an increasing
52 importance as a way of internationalization of the economic activity in the industrialized
53 countries, enjoying growth rates remarkably above those of world trade. Indeed, the
54 importance of FDI would not be limited to its spectacular growth in merely quantitative
55 grounds, since it would have performed a crucial role in the diffusion of ideas and innovations
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 across borders (ROMER, 1993). In fact, the possibility of gaining access to modern
4
5 technologies is probably the main reason behind the interest on the side of the less
6
7 technologically advanced countries to attract FDI. The reason is that MNEs conduct a great
8
9 part of world R&D, as well as generating and controlling much of the most advanced
10
11 production techniques. Still, the host countries should possess a minimum social capability in
12
13 the form of an educated labour force and adequate organizational structures, i.e., the
14
15 absorptive capacity to get a fully satisfactory transmission of such advanced technologies, in
16
17 order to reach a higher output growth.
18
19
20
21

22
23
24 The literature has also analyzed extensively the possible presence of spillovers of the
25
26 MNEs activities, when establishing a subsidiary leads to productivity or efficiency benefits
27
28 for the host country's local firms, and the MNEs are not able to internalize the full value of
29
30 these benefits (BLOMSTRÖM and KOKKO, 1998). That is, the more evolved production
31
32 methods, organizational and managerial techniques, marketing activities, and the like, of the
33
34 MNEs, can be spread over the host country's local firms through several channels such as
35
36 imitation, the higher competition associated with the presence of the subsidiary, or the
37
38 mobility of the labour force previously trained and familiar with the more advanced
39
40 techniques developed by the MNEs (GÖRG and GREENAWAY, 2004).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Notice that the empirical evidence on these spillover effects is far from being
49
50 unambiguous. In fact, the positive spillover effects would shift downwards the average costs
51
52 curve of domestic firms; but the increased competition would lead these firms to cut their
53
54 output and so moving upwards along the new average costs curve, so the net effect on average
55
56 costs would be ambiguous (AITKEN and HARRISON, 1999). As stressed by GÖRG and
57
58 GREENAWAY, 2004, not all domestic firms would benefit equally from the spillover effects,
59
60

1
2
3 but rather those enjoying a higher absorptive capacity of the new technologies, or those
4
5 located geographically closer to the subsidiary of the MNE. Also, in terms of the development
6
7 of local industry, the positive spillovers related with FDI would dominate when inflows are
8
9 large, outweighing the negative competition effects associated with FDI (BARRIOS et al.,
10
11 2005). Finally, backward regions would be more likely to benefit from spillovers from FDI,
12
13 since the potential productivity gains by domestic firms would be greater due to the scope for
14
15 technological catch-up (PERI and URBAN, 2006).
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 In general, a greater opening to FDI coming from the most advanced countries would
23
24 lead to an increase in the rate of technological progress in the host country, and hence its rate
25
26 of growth (WANG, 1990). Indeed, the incentive of a MNE to transfer technology would be
27
28 inversely related to its perceived operation risks in the host country, which would explain that
29
30 the average age of technologies transferred to their subsidiaries in developed countries is
31
32 considerably lower than those transferred to developing countries; and technological transfer
33
34 via FDI would be positively related to the investment in learning made by the host country's
35
36 firms (WANG and BLOMSTRÖM, 1992).
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 According to the above theoretical arguments, we will assume that the level of
44
45 technology A depends on its initial value, A_0 , and the externalities from accumulated FDI
46
47 inflows, in relative terms per employee:
48
49

$$A_t = A_0 \left(\frac{FDI}{L} \right)_t^\theta \quad (3)$$

50
51
52
53
54
55 where FDI denotes the accumulated sum of FDI inflows, which acts as a proxy of the foreign
56
57 capital stock.
58
59
60

Finally, replacing (3) in (2):

$$\log\left(\frac{Y}{L}\right)_t = \log A_0 + (\alpha + \beta + \gamma - 1) \log L_t + \alpha \log\left(\frac{K}{L}\right)_t + \beta \log\left(\frac{H}{L}\right)_t + \theta \log\left(\frac{FDI}{L}\right)_t \quad (4)$$

or, denoting by y , k , h , and fdi the logs of Y/L , K/L , H/L , and FDI/L , respectively, we get

$$y_t = \log A_0 + (\alpha + \beta + \gamma - 1) \log L_t + \alpha k_t + \beta h_t + \theta fdi_t \quad (5)$$

This will be the equation to be estimated in the next section.

3. Empirical results

Equation (5) has been estimated for the 17 regions (“comunidades autónomas”) established after the approval of the current Spanish Constitution in 1978, with the sample period running from 1987 to 2000. The starting and final year of that period is dictated by data availability. So, the regional data on FDI are only available from 1987 on; in turn, the private and public stocks of capital, which are used later in the estimations, are not available after 2000. In addition, a certain change in the traditional location advantages of the Spanish economy seems to have occurred in the last years of the past century, leading to a slowing down of FDI inflows to Spain (FERNÁNDEZ-OTHEO, 2003), so that enlarging the period of analysis much beyond 2000 (even if all data were available) might bias the results. All the variables in real terms are valued at 1986 prices. The data sources and definitions are as follows:

- Gross Domestic Product, from the *Spanish Regional Accounts*, elaborated at the National Institute of Statistics within the framework of the *Spanish National Accounts*.
- Physical capital stock (total, private, and public), from MAS et al., 2005a, which is the result of a joint project between the Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Económicas and the Fundación BBVA. The series are elaborated using the method of the permanent inventory, from the accumulation of the series on gross fixed capital formation, following OECD recommendations. Note that the data on public capital we use below,

1
2
3 incorporate only the directly productive items included into the whole government
4 capital stock (i.e., roads, water infrastructures, urban structures, ports, railroads, and
5 airports), hence excluding the non-directly productive items (i.e., education and health);
6
7
8 see MAS et al., 2005a, for details.
9
10

- 11
12
13 • Employment and human capital, from MAS et al., 2005b, which is the result of a joint
14 project between the Instituto Valenciano de Investigaciones Económicas and the
15 Fundación Bancaja. This dataset contains a wide range of information on how levels of
16 education in the Spanish population have evolved, separated into several categories (i.e.,
17 illiterate, no formal education or primary education, compulsory secondary education,
18 pre-university education, higher education, and total), and its basic source is the
19 *Economically Active Population Survey*, elaborated at the National Institute of Statistics.
20 The particular proxy for human capital we use below is the share of the employed
21 population with two levels of higher education (i.e., pre-university education, and higher
22 education).
23
24
25 • Gross FDI inflows, from the *Foreign Investment Registry*, kept at the Ministry of
26 Industry, Tourism and Trade for statistical purposes. Notice that a stock, rather than a
27 flow, measure of FDI should be used in the estimations, in order to pick the permanent
28 character of FDI, rather than the fluctuations associated to flows. In absence of such a
29 variable, we chose to proxy the foreign capital stock for each year with the accumulated
30 sum of gross FDI inflows from 1987 on to that particular year, as in BAJO-RUBIO and
31 SOSVILLA-RIVERO, 1994.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 Table 1 presents summary statistics of the data. As can be seen, the highest variability
56 corresponds to the FDI variable. Some additional information for this last variable appears in
57 Table 2. Nearly one half (46 per cent) of the accumulated FDI inflows over the period 1987-
58
59
60

2000 came to the Madrid region, and 30 per cent to Catalonia; that is, these two regions account for more than 75 per cent of total in that period. Of the remaining regions, Andalusia attracted 6 per cent, and the Valencian Community and Basque Country around 3 per cent each; which, added up to the figures for Madrid and Catalonia would mean almost 90 per cent of total. In terms of GDP, the relative importance of Madrid and Catalonia is also substantial, since the accumulated FDI inflows amounted to 49 and 26 per cent of GDP, respectively, on average over the whole period. Leaving aside some small regions like Navarre, Rioja, and the Balearic Islands, for the rest of regions accumulated FDI did not exceed 10 per cent of GDP.

[Table 1 here]

[Table 2 here]

In the empirical application, we use a dynamic panel approach where the lagged dependent variable is also included to allow for a dynamic structure of the model. The regression equation would be the following:

$$y_{i,t} = \rho y_{i,t-1} + (\alpha + \beta + \gamma - 1) \log L_{i,t} + \alpha k_{i,t} + \beta h_{i,t} + \theta fdi_{i,t} + \eta_i + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (6)$$

where η_i and $\varepsilon_{i,t} \sim N(0, \sigma^2)$ denote, respectively, the unobservable individual specific effects, and a random disturbance.

Equation (6) makes up a dynamic panel data model, where the dependent variable is partly explained by its past value. This model involves two econometric problems. The first one results from the dynamic nature of the data, which can introduce some correlation between the error term and the explanatory variables. So, the application of static panel data estimation methods would lead to biased estimates with dynamic panel data models. The

1
2
3 second issue results from the potential endogeneity of the explanatory variables, which can be
4 the case of FDI. We expect that FDI influences GDP growth, but faster GDP growth may lead
5 to more FDI as well; as usual, the other explanatory variables are also treated as endogenous.
6
7 Therefore, an instrumental variable estimation has to be used to avoid any potential biases
8 induced by simultaneity.
9
10
11
12
13
14

15
16
17 The econometric technique that allows accounting for the problem of error correlation
18 and endogeneity of variables is GMM. An appropriate instrumentation technique for dynamic
19 panel data has been developed by ARELLANO and BOND, 1991, and ARELLANO and
20 BOVER, 1995, which provides unbiased and efficient estimates. These authors suggest first-
21 differencing the model to get rid of the individual specific effects and then using valid
22 instruments (lagged values of the instrumented variables) to deal with the problem of the new
23 error term being correlated with the lagged dependent variable. The use of instruments is also
24 required in order to control for the potential endogeneity of the other explanatory variables.
25 We assume that the right-hand side variables are predetermined (i.e., they are assumed to be
26 correlated with past values of the error term, but uncorrelated with current and future values
27 of the error term). So, at least two lagged values of the dependent variable (i.e., $y_{i,t-2}$ and any
28 further lag $y_{i,t-3}$, $y_{i,t-4}$, etc.) are used as instruments for the equations in first differences. Since
29 it makes use of all the available moment restrictions, the difference GMM estimator suggested
30 by ARELLANO and BOND, 1991, improves significantly estimation efficiency.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 A drawback of the difference GMM estimator of ARELLANO and BOND, 1991, is
54 that, when first differences are taken, time invariant variables are wiped out. So, the estimator
55 does not use the cross-sectional information reflected in the differences between regions.
56
57
58
59
60 Another disadvantage is that lagged levels are often poor instruments for the equation in

1
2
3 differences, especially in the case of panels with a small number of time periods with highly
4 persistent data, which can lead to large finite-sample biases and poor precision in the
5 estimators. To reduce this problem associated with the difference GMM estimator, we use a
6 new estimator, namely, the system GMM, developed by ARELLANO and BOVER, 1995,
7 and BLUNDELL and BOND, 1998. This estimator is based on an augmented system that
8 includes the regression in differences in addition to the regression in levels with lagged
9 differences as instruments. The second part of the system requires the additional assumption
10 of no correlation between the variables in differences and the unobserved industry effects,
11 although there may be correlation between the levels of the explanatory variables and the
12 fixed effects. Interestingly, BOND et al., 2001, recommend using the system GMM estimator
13 in empirical growth work. We make use of the one-step robust estimator of the system GMM
14 since simulation studies have suggested very modest efficiency gains from using the two-step
15 estimator, even in the presence of considerable heteroscedasticity (BOND, 2002).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 On the other hand, the consistency of the GMM estimator depends on the validity of
37 the instruments, which is examined by means of two specifications tests. First, the Sargan and
38 Hansen test statistics of over-identifying restrictions (the latter, robust to the presence of
39 heteroscedasticity), which test the hypothesis that the instruments are not correlated with the
40 residuals. The validity of the instruments also requires the lack of second-order serial
41 correlation in the first-differenced error term whereas, by construction, first-order correlation
42 is expected even with an uncorrelated original error term. So, an additional test is included to
43 examine the null hypothesis of no second-order correlation in the residuals.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57

58 The results of the econometric estimation of equation (6) are shown in Table 3. The
59 two specification tests suggested by ARELLANO and BOND, 1991, to test for the validity of
60

1
2
3 the assumed moment restrictions are also included in Table 3. In all cases, the null hypothesis
4 of no second-order serial correlation cannot be rejected; also, the validity of the instruments
5 used in the estimation is not rejected by Sargan and Hansen's tests. All the estimated
6 equations include time dummies.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13
14
15 [Table 3 here]
16
17
18
19

20 As can be seen in column (1), the coefficient on employment would be negative and
21 significantly different from zero, so that the hypothesis of decreasing returns to scale over all
22 inputs would not be rejected. Both the physical capital stock and the human capital variable
23 show a positive and significant effect on the evolution of output per employee. Finally, FDI
24 appears with a positive coefficient, significantly different from zero at the 1 per cent level.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 Next, in column (2) we include as an additional variable the product between human
35 capital and FDI, as in BORENSZTEIN et al., 1998. This variable would indicate the existence
36 of complementarities between human capital and FDI, so that the favourable effect of FDI on
37 productivity would depend on the availability of some minimal endowments of human
38 capital, which would proxy in turn the capability of the host country to absorb the new
39 technologies. The coefficient on this variable, however, is negative but not significant, and
40 human capital and FDI lose their significance. In turn, when human capital is dropped in
41 column (3), the multiplicative variable becomes positive and significant at the 10 per cent
42 level, but FDI is not significant; and when FDI is dropped in column (4), the interactive term
43 is positive and significant at the 5 per cent level, but now human capital is not significant.
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finally, the physical capital stock has been split into its two components, private and
4 public, which allows us to assess the separate effect of government capital. The important role
5 played by government capital on regional growth in the Spanish case has been shown
6 elsewhere; see, e.g., BAJO-RUBIO and DÍAZ-ROLDÁN, 2005. As can be seen in columns
7 (5) through (8), the previous results are roughly unchanged. In particular, the coefficient on
8 FDI is positive and significant at the 1 per cent level in column (5); and the interactive term
9 between human capital and FDI is not significant in column (6), unless either human capital
10 or FDI are dropped from the estimated equation in columns (7) and (8), although these
11 variables become then non significant.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 We proceed now to assess the robustness of the basic results shown in columns (1) and
28 (5) of Table 3; these new results are presented in Table 4. First, we have included the second
29 lag of the dependent variable in columns (1) and (2), but it did not prove to be significant; the
30 results for the FDI variable are basically unchanged, and human capital loses its significance.
31 On the other hand, note that increasing the number of instruments may weaken the Hansen
32 test to the point that the p-values for this test might become implausibly high (i.e., equal or
33 very close to one). A possible solution would be reducing the number of instruments, even
34 though there is no clear guidance on what is an adequate number of instruments
35 (ROODMAN, 2007). Accordingly, we have experimented using a variety of number of lags
36 as instruments. In columns (3) and (4) we report the estimation results using as instruments
37 lags two to five of all the explanatory variables, but the p-value of the Hansen test does not
38 fall; however, the instruments would be still valid according to the Sargan test, which does
39 not suffer this weakness. The coefficients on the FDI variable, though, are quite the same, and
40 still significant at the 1 per cent level; human capital, in turn, is only significant (at the 10 per
41 cent level) in column (3), but not in column (4).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

[Table 4 here]

Still, since the absorptive capacity required to attract FDI inflows is expected to be more prevalent in “richer” countries, we have re-estimated the specifications in columns (1) and (5) of Table 3 allowing for a different coefficient on the FDI variable for those regions with a GDP per employee above and below the Spanish average level over the whole period of analysis; these separate coefficients are denoted by the subscripts ‘high’ and ‘low’ in columns (5) and (6) of Table 4. As can be seen, the estimated coefficients on the FDI variable are very similar for both the ‘richer’ or ‘more productive’ regions (Rioja, Baleares, Madrid, País Vasco, Navarra, Cataluña, Aragón, Cantabria), and the ‘poorer’ or ‘less productive’ regions (Asturias, Comunidad Valenciana, Canarias, Castilla y León, Murcia, Andalucía, Castilla-La Mancha, Extremadura, Galicia). Finally, since most of the FDI received by the Spanish economy is concentrated in Madrid and Catalonia (according to the figures in Table 2, 46 and 30 per cent, respectively, of the accumulated FDI over the whole period of analysis), the specifications in columns (1) and (5) of Table 3 have been re-estimated allowing for a different coefficient on the FDI variable for Madrid, Catalonia, and the rest of regions. Again, the estimated coefficients, denoted by the subscripts ‘Madrid’, ‘Catalonia’ and ‘rest’, and shown in columns (7) and (8) of Table 4, are very similar for these two regions and the rest, and analogous to those found in the basic specification.

4. Conclusions

In this paper we have tried to assess the impact of FDI on regional economic growth in the Spanish case. To that end, an aggregate production function augmented with FDI inflows was estimated, using data for the 17 Spanish regions over the period 1987-2000, i.e., following

1
2
3 entry into the EU. Along the paper we have emphasized the regional dimension, for a group
4
5 of developed and relatively homogeneous economies, the Spanish regions, becoming
6
7 integrated with other richer countries. Finally, we have used an econometric methodology
8
9 especially well suited for empirical growth work, namely, the system GMM estimator.
10
11

12
13
14
15 Overall, our results support the outstanding role played by FDI as a vehicle for
16
17 technology transfer, and its relationship with productivity growth. More specifically,
18
19 accumulated FDI inflows would have played a positive and significant role in the evolution of
20
21 GDP per employee in the case of the Spanish regions. Even if we have been unable to identify
22
23 a joint effect of FDI and human capital accumulation, aside the separate impact of both
24
25 variables simultaneously, the main result has proved to be robust to a number of alternative
26
27 specifications of the basic equation. In particular, very similar results were found when
28
29 allowing for a different coefficient on the FDI variable for those regions with a GDP per
30
31 employee above and below the Spanish average level, or for the regions receiving more than
32
33 75 per cent of the accumulated FDI over the period, i.e., Madrid and Catalonia, and the rest.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Summarizing, the results of this paper would confirm (unlike CARKOVIC and
42
43 LEVINE, 2005) the positive influence of FDI on the evolution of GDP per employee and,
44
45 eventually, on growth, when using a proper econometric method. In achieving these results it
46
47 would be crucial that the host economies have an appropriate level of development, and hence
48
49 the necessary absorptive capacity; and even if the amount of FDI received was deemed in
50
51 principle as not too high. This in turn would contrast with the conclusions of other papers
52
53 quoted in the Introduction, which analyze the cases of weakly developed economies; see, e.g.,
54
55 LAURETI and POSTIGLIONE, 2005, or LEDYAEVA and LINDEN, 2006.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 On the other hand, recall that policies aimed to increasing R&D expenditures and
4 innovation have been widely used in order to promote regional economic growth in the EU,
5 especially in the peripheral regions (BILBAO-OSORIO and RODRÍGUEZ-POSE, 2004). In
6 this sense, a policy addressed to support FDI could be thought as an indirect way of
7 promoting R&D, given the prominent role of FDI in transferring the most advanced
8 technologies available; and provided that a minimum level of social capability exists in the
9 host regions.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 To conclude, it should be stressed that these favourable effects of FDI on growth
23 found for the Spanish regions would be greatly dependent upon their stability and permanent
24 nature. While the huge affluence of FDI to the Spanish economy following her accession to
25 the EU in 1986, would have led to a positive outcome in terms of the evolution of GDP per
26 employee, the picture might be changing since the end of the 1990s (i.e., coinciding with the
27 end of our sample period). In fact, last years have witnessed a process of foreign capital
28 divestment, following recent changes in the strategies of MNEs, which has reached significant
29 levels in the Spanish case (FERNÁNDEZ-OTHEO and MYRO, 2004). Accordingly, it would
30 not be unlikely that the results found in this paper should be qualified in the next future. Also,
31 this fact should be borne in mind by those regions seeking to attract FDI as an engine of
32 technology transfer in order to fostering economic growth.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Acknowledgements
4

5 The authors thank Carlos M. Fernández-Otheo for providing the data on foreign direct
6 investment, and for his continuous advice; as well as an anonymous referee and the
7
8 participants at the X Conference on International Economics (Madrid, June 2007) and the
9
10 47th Congress of the European Regional Science Association (Paris, August 2007), for helpful
11
12 comments on previous versions. Financial support from the Spanish Ministry of Education
13
14 and Science, through the project SEJ2005-08738-C02-01 (O. Bajo-Rubio and C. Díaz-
15
16 Roldán), and from the Department of Education and Science of the regional government of
17
18 Castilla-La Mancha, through the projects PAI07-0021-5148 (O. Bajo-Rubio and C. Díaz-
19
20 Roldán) and PBI-05-021 (C. Díaz-Mora), is also gratefully acknowledged.
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

AITKEN B. J. and HARRISON A. E. (1999) Do domestic firms benefit from direct foreign investment? Evidence from Venezuela, *American Economic Review* **89**, 605-618.

ALFARO L., CHANDA A., KALEMLI-OZCAN S. and SAYEK S. (2004) FDI and economic growth: The role of local financial markets, *Journal of International Economics* **64**, 89-112.

ARELLANO M. and BOND S. (1991) Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations, *Review of Economic Studies* **58**, 277-297.

ARELLANO M. and BOVER O. (1995) Another look at the instrumental variable estimation of error-components models, *Journal of Econometrics* **68**, 29-51.

BAJO-RUBIO O. and DÍAZ-ROLDÁN C. (2002) Inversión extranjera directa, innovación tecnológica y productividad. Una aplicación a la industria española, *Economía Industrial* **347**, 111-124.

BAJO-RUBIO O. and DÍAZ-ROLDÁN C. (2005) Optimal endowments of public capital: An empirical analysis for the Spanish regions, *Regional Studies* **39**, 297-304.

BAJO-RUBIO O. and LÓPEZ-PUEYO C. (2002) Foreign direct investment in a process of economic integration: The case of Spanish manufacturing, 1986-1992, *Journal of Economic Integration* **17**, 85-103.

1
2
3 BAJO-RUBIO O. and SOSVILLA-RIVERO S. (1994) An econometric analysis of foreign
4 direct investment in Spain, 1964-89, *Southern Economic Journal* **61**, 104-120.
5
6
7

8
9
10 BAJO-RUBIO O. and TORRES A. (2001) *The impact of Spain's integration with the EC on*
11 *trade and foreign investment*. Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej im. Oskara Langego we
12 Wrocławiu, Wrocław.
13
14
15

16
17
18 BALASUBRAMANYAM V. N., SALISU M. and SAPSFORD D. (1996) Foreign direct
19 investment and growth in EP and IS countries, *Economic Journal* **106**, 92-105.
20
21
22
23

24
25
26 BARRIOS S., GÖRG H. and STROBL E. (2005) Foreign direct investment, competition and
27 industrial development in the host country, *European Economic Review* **49**, 1761-1784.
28
29
30
31

32
33
34 BILBAO-OSORIO B. and RODRÍGUEZ-POSE A. (2004) From R&D to innovation and
35 economic growth in the EU, *Growth and Change* **35**, 434-455.
36
37
38

39
40
41 BLOMSTRÖM M. and KOKKO A. (1998) Multinational corporations and spillovers,
42 *Journal of Economic Surveys* **12**, 247-277.
43
44
45

46
47
48 BLOMSTRÖM M., LIPSEY R. E. and ZEJAN M. (1994) What explains the growth of
49 developing countries?, in BAUMOL W. J., NELSON R. R. and WOLFF E. N. (Eds)
50 *Convergence of productivity: Cross-national studies and historical evidence*, pp. 243-259.
51 Oxford University Press, Oxford.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 BLUNDELL R. and BOND S. (1998) Initial conditions and moment restrictions in dynamic
4 panel data models, *Journal of Econometrics* **87**, 115-143.
5
6
7

8
9
10 BOND S. (2002) Dynamic panel data models: A guide to micro data methods and practice,
11 *Portuguese Economic Journal* **1**, 141-162.
12
13
14

15
16
17 BOND S., HOEFFLER A. and TEMPLE J. (2001) GMM estimation of empirical growth
18 models, Discussion Paper No. 3048, Centre for Economic Policy Research.
19
20
21

22
23
24 BORENSZTEIN E., DE GREGORIO J. and LEE J.-W. (1998) How does foreign direct
25 investment affect economic growth?, *Journal of International Economics* **45**, 115-135.
26
27
28

29
30
31 BREMS H. (1970) A growth model of international direct investment, *American Economic*
32 *Review* **60**, 320-331.
33
34
35

36
37
38 CAMPOS N. F. and KINOSHITA Y. (2002) Foreign direct investment as technology
39 transferred: Some panel evidence from the transition economies, *The Manchester School* **70**,
40 398-419.
41
42
43
44

45
46
47
48 CARKOVIC M. and LEVINE R. (2005) Does foreign direct investment accelerate economic
49 growth?, in MORAN T. H., GRAHAM E. M. and BLOMSTRÖM M. (Eds) *Does foreign*
50 *direct investment promote development?*, pp. 195-220. Institute for International Economics,
51 Washington, DC.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 DE MELLO L. R. (1999) Foreign direct investment-led growth: Evidence from time series
4 and panel data, *Oxford Economic Papers* **51**, 133-151.
5
6
7

8
9
10 DURHAM J. B. (2004) Absorptive capacity and the effects of foreign direct investment and
11 equity foreign portfolio investment on economic growth, *European Economic Review* **48**,
12 285-306.
13
14
15

16
17
18 EGEA-ROMÁN P. and LÓPEZ-PUEYO C. (1991) Un estudio sobre la distribución
19 geográfica de la inversión extranjera directa en España, *Información Comercial Española*
20 **696-697**, 105-118.
21
22
23
24

25
26
27 FERNÁNDEZ-OTHEO C. M. (2000) Concentración y especialización regional de la
28 inversión directa extranjera en España, *Economía Industrial* **335/336**, 67-82.
29
30
31
32

33
34
35 FERNÁNDEZ-OTHEO C. M. (2003) *Inversión directa extranjera de España en la década*
36 *final del siglo XX: Nuevas perspectivas*. Fundación José Ortega y Gasset, Madrid.
37
38
39
40

41
42
43 FERNÁNDEZ-OTHEO C. M. and MYRO R. (2004) Is the foreign capital leaving
44 industrialized countries? The case of Spain, Working Paper on International Economics and
45 Finance No. 04-03, AEEFI-FEDEA.
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 GAO T. (2005) Foreign direct investment and growth under economic integration, *Journal of*
53 *International Economics* **67**, 157-174.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 GÖRG H. and GREENAWAY D. (2004) Much ado about nothing? Do domestic firms really
4 benefit from foreign direct investment?, *World Bank Research Observer* **19**, 171-197.
5
6
7

8
9
10 GROSSMAN G. M. and HELPMAN E. (1991) *Innovation and growth in the global economy*.
11 The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.
12
13

14
15
16
17 GROSSMAN G. M. and HELPMAN E. (1994) Endogenous innovation in the theory of
18 growth, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* **8**, 23-44.
19
20
21

22
23
24 LAURETI L. and POSTIGLIONE P. (2005) The effects of capital inflows on the economic
25 growth in the Med Area, *Journal of Policy Modeling* **27**, 839-851.
26
27
28

29
30
31 LEDYAEVA S. and LINDEN M. (2006) Foreign direct investment and economic growth:
32 Empirical evidence from Russian regions, BOFIT Discussion Paper No. 17, Bank of Finland,
33 Institute for Economies in Transition.
34
35
36
37

38
39
40
41 LIPSEY R. E. (2001) Interpreting developed countries' foreign direct investment, in
42 DEUTSCHE BUNDESBANK: *Investing today for the world of tomorrow*, pp. 285-325.
43
44 Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
45
46
47

48
49
50 MANKIW N. G., ROMER D. and WEIL D. N. (1992) A contribution to the empirics of
51 economic growth, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **107**, 407-437.
52
53
54

55
56
57 MAS M., PÉREZ F. and URIEL E. (2005a) *El stock de capital en España y su distribución*
58 *territorial (1964-2002)*. Fundación BBVA, Bilbao.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 MAS M., PÉREZ F., URIEL E., SERRANO L. and SOLER A. (2005b) *Capital humano en*
7
8 *España y su distribución provincial*, electronic edition. Fundación Bancaja, Valencia.
9

10
11
12 PELEGRÍN-SOLÉ A. (2002) Inversión extranjera directa: Factores determinantes de la
13
14 localización regional, *Papeles de Economía Española* **93**, 122-134.
15

16
17
18 PERI G. and URBAN D. (2006) Catching-up to foreign technology? Evidence on the
19
20 “Veblen-Gerschenkron” effect of foreign investments, *Regional Science and Urban*
21
22 *Economics* **36**, 72-98.
23
24
25

26
27
28 RIVERA-BATIZ L. A. and ROMER P. M. (1991) Economic integration and endogenous
29
30 growth, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* **106**, 531-555.
31
32

33
34
35 ROMER P. M. (1990) Endogenous technological change, *Journal of Political Economy* **98**,
36
37 S71-S102.
38
39

40
41
42 ROMER P. M. (1993) Idea gaps and object gaps in economic development, *Journal of*
43
44 *Monetary Economics* **32**, 543-573.
45
46
47

48
49
50 ROODMAN D. (2007) A short note on the theme of too many instruments, Working Paper
51
52 No. 125, Center for Global Development.
53
54

55
56
57 SOSVILLA-RIVERO S. and HERCE J. A. (1998) Efectos macroeconómicos del Mercado
58
59 Único Europeo, *Economía Industrial* **322**, 11-21.
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 WANG J.-Y. (1990) Growth, technology transfer, and the long-run theory of international
7 capital movements, *Journal of International Economics* **29**, 255-271.
8
9

10
11
12 WANG J.-Y. and BLOMSTRÖM M. (1992) Foreign investment and technology transfer. A
13 simple model, *European Economic Review* **36**, 137-155.
14
15

16
17
18 YAO S. and WEI K. (2007) Economic growth in the presence of FDI: The perspective of
19 newly industrialising economies, *Journal of Comparative Economics* **35**, 211-234.
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1: Summary statistics

	Mean	Standard deviation	Minimum value	Maximum value
y	4.2958	0.0662	4.0582	4.4365
k	4.7208	0.0660	4.4629	4.8860
kpr	4.6603	0.0707	4.4152	4.8603
kpu	3.8133	0.1374	3.4800	4.0408
h	1.1255	0.1190	0.8035	1.4519
fdi	3.0074	0.5807	0.8894	4.2724

Source: Own elaboration from National Institute of Statistics; MAS et al., 2005a, 2005b; and Ministry of Industry, Tourism and Trade.

Table 2: Accumulated FDI inflows received by the Spanish regions, 1987-2000
(million euros and percentages)

	Accumulated FDI inflows	% on total	% on GDP
Andalucía	34964.14	6.10	7.40
Aragón	9715.37	1.69	8.15
Asturias	4141.43	0.72	4.61
Baleares	8906.63	1.55	10.36
Canarias	8743.68	1.52	6.83
Cantabria	2012.31	0.35	4.35
Castilla y León	5592.81	0.98	2.66
Castilla-La Mancha	2468.58	0.43	1.93
Cataluña	172149.61	30.01	25.96
Comunidad Valenciana	19750.14	3.44	5.71
Extremadura	1618.41	0.28	2.43
Galicia	6280.56	1.09	3.27
Madrid	263516.51	45.94	49.29
Murcia	3154.63	0.55	3.66
Navarra	9632.27	1.68	16.81
País Vasco	17658.54	3.08	7.98
Rioja	3312.03	0.58	11.08
Total	573617.66	100.00	16.50

Source: Own elaboration from *Foreign Investment Registry*, Ministry of Industry, Tourism and Trade; and *Spanish Regional Accounts*, National Institute of Statistics.

Table 3: Estimation of a production function for the Spanish regions, 1987-2000 (I)
(GMM-system regressions results. Dependent variable: y)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
y ₋₁	0.7703*** (0.0485)	0.7672*** (0.0501)	0.7799*** (0.0468)	0.7822*** (0.0453)	0.7664*** (0.0504)	0.7668*** (0.0523)	0.7715*** (0.0492)	0.7790*** (0.0458)
log L	-0.0067** (0.0036)	-0.0094** (0.0035)	-0.0094** (0.0037)	-0.0092** (0.0038)	-0.0078** (0.0031)	-0.0078** (0.0030)	-0.0076** (0.0032)	-0.0074** (0.0032)
k	0.1337*** (0.0369)	0.1338*** (0.0312)	0.1310*** (0.0288)	0.1317*** (0.0292)	-	-	-	-
kpr	-	-	-	-	0.1225*** (0.0304)	0.1225*** (0.0305)	0.1216*** (0.0293)	0.1208*** (0.0291)
kpu	-	-	-	-	0.0303*** (0.0080)	0.0304*** (0.0084)	0.0316*** (0.0081)	0.0316*** (0.0087)
h	0.0284** (0.0369)	0.0437 (0.0357)	-	0.0001 (0.0167)	0.0193* (0.0099)	0.0171 (0.0392)	-	-0.0188 (0.0169)
fdi	0.0113*** (0.0016)	0.0168 (0.0118)	0.0027 (0.0063)	-	0.0140*** (0.0043)	0.0133 (0.0128)	0.0081 (0.0056)	-
h*fdi	-	-0.0046 (0.0104)	0.0074* (0.0042)	0.0087** (0.0034)	-	0.0006 (0.0110)	0.0052* (0.0029)	0.0113*** (0.0037)
Observations	221	221	221	221	221	221	221	221
Test p-values:								
AR(1)	0.009	0.010	0.007	0.007	0.009	0.010	0.008	0.007
AR(2)	0.914	0.926	0.894	0.897	0.911	0.911	0.897	0.885
Sargan	0.279	0.528	0.323	0.354	0.509	0.742	0.560	0.559
Hansen	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Notes:

- (i) Robust standard errors in parentheses; *, **, and *** denote statistical significance at the 10%, 5%, and 1% levels, respectively.
- (ii) AR(1) and AR(2) are tests of first- and second-order serial correlation.
- (iii) The instruments are lags two to the earlier available of all the explanatory variables. Sargan and Hansen are tests of the over-identifying restrictions; p-values below 0.05 suggest a rejection of the validity of the instruments at the 5% critical level.

Table 4: Estimation of a production function for the Spanish regions, 1987-2000 (II)
(GMM-system regressions results. Dependent variable: y)

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
y_{-1}	0.7952*** (0.0491)	0.7774*** (0.0589)	0.8027*** (0.0397)	0.7965*** (0.0472)	0.7658*** (0.0459)	0.7614*** (0.0475)	0.7559*** (0.0539)	0.7597*** (0.0550)
y_{-2}	-0.0019 (0.0499)	0.0087 (0.0545)	-	-	-	-	-	-
$\log L$	-0.0094** (0.0046)	-0.0073* (0.0038)	-0.0085** (0.0033)	-0.0068** (0.0028)	-0.0083** (0.0038)	-0.0062* (0.0032)	-0.0098** (0.0040)	-0.0088** (0.0034)
k	0.1168*** (0.0273)	-	0.1125*** (0.2608)	-	0.1313*** (0.0283)	-	0.1391*** (0.0343)	-
kpr	-	0.1075*** (0.0293)	-	0.1050*** (0.0288)	-	0.1198*** (0.0284)	-	0.1239*** (0.0322)
kpu	-	0.0327*** (0.0107)	-	0.0279*** (0.0076)	-	0.0313*** (0.0071)	-	0.0274*** (0.0083)
h	0.0194 (0.0134)	0.0073 (0.0126)	0.0224* (0.0117)	0.0141 (0.0099)	0.0274** (0.0127)	0.0173* (0.0094)	0.0382*** (0.0140)	0.0268* (0.0149)
fdi	0.0117** (0.0046)	0.0157*** (0.0059)	0.0101*** (0.0035)	0.0127*** (0.0040)	-	-	-	-
fdi_{high}	-	-	-	-	0.0095** (0.0039)	0.0121*** (0.0043)	-	-
fdi_{low}	-	-	-	-	0.0084** (0.0043)	0.0108** (0.0046)	-	-
fdi_{Madrid}	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0109** (0.0042)	0.0129*** (0.0044)
$fdi_{Catalonia}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0131*** (0.0045)	0.0144*** (0.0047)
fdi_{rest}	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.0123** (0.0050)	0.0135*** (0.0052)
Observations	204	204	221	221	221	221	221	221
Test p-values:								
AR(1)	0.008	0.007	0.008	0.009	0.009	0.009	0.010	0.010
AR(2)	0.519	0.529	0.931	0.928	0.910	0.906	0.917	0.916
Sargan	0.853	0.955	0.808	0.924	0.588	0.770	0.660	0.660
Hansen	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000

Notes: See Table 3. The instruments in columns (3) and (4) are lags two to five of all the explanatory variables.