

WORKING PAPER SERIES 7

Tomáš Havránek and Zuzana Iršová:
Determinants of Horizontal Spillovers from FDI:
Evidence from a Large Meta-Analysis

2011

WORKING PAPER SERIES

Determinants of Horizontal Spillovers from FDI: Evidence from a Large Meta-Analysis

Tomáš Havránek
Zuzana Iršová

7/2011

CNB WORKING PAPER SERIES

The Working Paper Series of the Czech National Bank (CNB) is intended to disseminate the results of the CNB's research projects as well as the other research activities of both the staff of the CNB and collaborating outside contributor, including invited speakers. The Series aims to present original research contributions relevant to central banks. It is refereed internationally. The referee process is managed by the CNB Research Department. The working papers are circulated to stimulate discussion. The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the official views of the CNB.

Distributed by the Czech National Bank. Available at <http://www.cnb.cz>.

Reviewed by: Martin Feldkircher (Oesterreichische Nationalbank)
Maria Paula Fontoura (Technical University of Lisbon)
Petr Král (Czech National Bank)

Project Coordinator: Kamil Galuščák

© Czech National Bank, October 2011
Tomáš Havránek, Zuzana Iršová

Determinants of Horizontal Spillovers from FDI: Evidence from a Large Meta-Analysis

Tomáš Havránek and Zuzana Iršová*

Abstract

The voluminous empirical research on horizontal productivity spillovers from foreign investors to domestic firms has yielded mixed results. In this paper, we collect 1,205 estimates of horizontal spillovers from the literature and examine which factors influence spillover magnitude. To identify the most important determinants of spillovers among 43 collected variables, we employ Bayesian model averaging. Our results suggest that horizontal spillovers are on average zero, but that their sign and magnitude depend systematically on the characteristics of the domestic economy and foreign investors. The most important determinants are the technology gap between domestic and foreign firms and the ownership structure in investment projects. Foreign investors who form joint ventures with domestic firms and who come from countries with a modest technology edge create the largest benefits for the domestic economy.

JEL Codes: C83, F23, O12.

Keywords: Bayesian model averaging, determinants, foreign direct investment, meta-analysis, productivity spillovers.

* Tomáš Havránek, Czech National Bank, Economic Research Department, and Charles University, Institute of Economic Studies, Prague (tomas.havranek@cnb.cz);
Zuzana Iršová, Charles University, Institute of Economic Studies, Prague (zuzana.irsova@ies-prague.org).

We thank Martin Feldkircher, Maria Paula Fontoura, Petr Král, and Kateřina Šmídková for their helpful comments. We are grateful to Joze Damijan, Ziliang L. Deng, Adam Geršl, Galina Hale, Chidambaran Iyer, Molly Leshner, Marcella Nicolini, Pavel Vacek, and Katja Zajc-Kejzar for sending us additional data, or explaining the details of their methodology, or both. We acknowledge financial support from the Grant Agency of the Czech Republic (grant #P402/11/0948). An online appendix with data, a Stata program, and a list of excluded studies are available at meta-analysis.cz/bma. The views expressed here are ours and not necessarily those of the Czech National Bank. All remaining errors are solely our responsibility.

Nontechnical Summary

Policy makers often encourage inward FDI in expectation that domestic firms in the same sectors will benefit from the know-how brought by foreigner investors, and that this, in turn, will fuel economic convergence of the entire country. These transfers of knowledge are commonly called “horizontal spillovers” (as opposed to vertical spillovers, which denote the effect of FDI on domestic firms in supplier or customer sectors) and are usually thought to occur through three main channels.

The first channel is the competition effect (for example, Aitken and Harrison, 1999): the entry of foreign firms increases competition in the domestic market. Increased competition forces domestic firms to use their inputs more efficiently, boosting their productivity. Nonetheless, increased competition also reduces the opportunities for domestic firms to exploit returns to scale, reducing their productivity. The second channel is the demonstration effect (for example, Blomstrom and Kokko, 1998): foreign investors bring technology more advanced than that of domestic firms, especially in transition and developing countries. In this way, foreigners “demonstrate” up-to-date technology to domestic firms, which imitate and implement it. The third channel is labor turnover (for example, Görg and Greenaway, 2004b): foreign firms train local employees, who accumulate know-how and experience with modern technology. Eventually, locals may change employer or start a firm of their own, diffusing the knowledge further.

In this paper we collect 1,205 estimates of horizontal spillovers from the literature and examine what aspects of FDI source countries, host countries, foreign firms, and domestic firms influence the sign and magnitude of spillover effects. We additionally control for the aspects of data, specification, estimation, and publication of the primary studies on FDI spillovers. The method of quantitative research synthesis employed in this paper is called meta-analysis and has been commonly used in economics for two decades (see, for example, Card and Krueger, 1995; Smith and Huang, 1995; Card et al., 2010). The present paper differs from the meta-analysis of Havranek and Irsova (2011) in that it focuses on horizontal instead of vertical spillovers.¹

Our results suggest that, on average, horizontal spillovers in the Czech Republic are negative but close to zero: following a 10-percentage-point increase in foreign presence, the productivity of domestic firms decreases by 0.4%. This result contrasts sharply with the results for vertical spillovers reported by Havranek and Irsova (2011), where strong positive effects are found on the productivity of domestic firms in supplier sectors. Taken together, our evidence based on two large meta-analyses suggests that inward FDI has no important effect on the productivity of firms in the same sector, but important positive effects on the productivity of suppliers.

The origin of FDI is important: when the technology gap of domestic firms with respect to foreign investors is too large, spillovers are likely to be more positive. Moreover, horizontal spillovers are likely to be smaller with higher trade openness and better protection of intellectual property rights in the host country. On the other hand, higher levels of human capital in the host country are associated with larger spillovers. Finally, investment projects in the form of joint ventures with domestic firms bring larger positive spillovers than fully foreign-owned projects.

¹ More details on the meta-analysis of vertical spillovers are available in the working-paper version of the published paper: Havranek and Irsova (2010).

1. Introduction

With the rise in global flows of foreign direct investment (FDI) in recent decades, the policy competition for FDI among transition and developing countries has intensified. Consequently, many researchers have focused on the economic rationale of FDI incentives (Blomstrom and Kokko, 2003, provide a review). The major hypothesis examined in the literature states that domestic firms may indirectly benefit from FDI: it is assumed that knowledge “spills over” from foreign investors or their acquired firms and helps domestic firms augment their productivity. (There is now solid evidence that FDI directly increases the productivity of the acquired firms; see Arnold and Javorcik, 2009, for the case of Indonesia.) Nevertheless, the reported estimates of these “productivity spillovers” differ greatly in terms of both the statistical significance of the effect and its magnitude.

We build on the work of Crespo and Fontoura (2007), who review the literature on the determinants of FDI spillovers and thoroughly discuss the numerous factors that may cause the spillover effects to vary. Whereas the survey of Crespo and Fontoura (2007) is narrative, we examine spillover determinants using a quantitative method of literature surveys: meta-analysis. Meta-analysis was originally developed in medicine to aggregate costly clinical trials, and it has been widely used in economics to investigate the heterogeneity in reported results since the pioneering contribution of Stanley and Jarrell (1989). Recent applications of meta-analysis in economics include, among others, Card et al. (2010) on the evaluation of active labor market policies, Havranek (2010) on the trade effect of currency unions, and Babecky and Campos (2011) on the relation between structural reforms and economic growth in transition countries. In our case, meta-analysis makes use of evidence reported for many countries and different types of investment projects, enabling us to investigate hypotheses that are difficult to address in single-country case studies.

In the search for spillover determinants we focus on the characteristics of the FDI host and source countries, foreign firms, and domestic firms in the host country. Moreover, we collect an extensive set of 34 control variables that may help explain the differences in reported findings, including the aspects of data used by primary studies on FDI spillovers, their methodology, publication quality, and author characteristics. To find the most important determinants we employ Bayesian model averaging. Bayesian model averaging is suitable for meta-analysis because of the inherent model uncertainty: while there is a consensus in the literature that some factors may mediate productivity spillovers (such as the technology gap, trade openness, or financial development), it is not clear which aspects of study design are important. Nevertheless, omission of these control variables may lead to biased estimates of coefficients for the main variables of interest. Bayesian model averaging allows us to concentrate on potential spillover determinants while taking all method variables into account.

In this paper we meta-analyze horizontal spillovers from FDI; that is, the effects of foreign investment on domestic firms in the same sector (as opposed to vertical spillovers, which denote the effect of FDI on domestic firms in supplier or customer sectors). To our knowledge, there have been two meta-analyses of horizontal spillovers: Görg and Strobl (2001) and Meyer and Sinani (2009). The meta-analysis by Görg and Strobl (2001) concentrates on the effect of study design on reported spillover coefficients and additionally tests for publication bias. Meyer and Sinani (2009) examine country heterogeneity in the estimates of spillovers. Compared with the earlier meta-analyses, we gather a more homogeneous sample of estimates so that we are able to examine the economic effect of spillovers. Moreover, we collect ten times more estimates of spillovers and investigate three times more factors that may explain spillover heterogeneity

than Meyer and Sinani (2009), the larger of the earlier meta-analyses.

The paper is structured as follows. Section 2 describes the properties of the data set of spillover estimates. Section 3 introduces the potential spillover determinants and the methodology of Bayesian model averaging. Section 4 presents estimation results. In Section 5 we test for publication bias in the literature. Section 6 provides a summary and policy implications.

2. Data Set

Our data set comprises evidence on FDI spillovers from 45 countries reported in 52 distinct empirical studies; the list of the studies used in the meta-analysis is available in the Data Appendix (Table A1). To increase the comparability of the estimates in our sample, we only include modern empirical studies that examine horizontal spillovers together with vertical spillovers in the same specification. The first empirical studies on vertical spillovers appeared in the early 2000s, and thus we do not use any studies published before 2000—in contrast with the earlier meta-analyses on horizontal spillovers (Görg and Strobl, 2001; Meyer and Sinani, 2009), in which the pre-2000 studies account for most of the data. The pre-2000 studies were so heterogeneous in terms of methodology that it was not possible to compare directly the economic effects reported in the studies; instead, the earlier meta-analyses used measures of statistical significance, especially t-statistics. In the modern literature on FDI spillovers, most of the researchers examine how changes in the ratio of foreign presence affect the productivity of domestic firms, and estimate a variant of the following general model:

$$\ln Productivity_{ij} = e_0 \cdot Horizontal_j + e_0^b \cdot Backward_j + e_0^f \cdot Forward_j + \alpha \cdot Controls_{ij} + u_{ij}, \quad (1)$$

where $Productivity_{ij}$ is a measure of the productivity of domestic firm i in sector j , $Horizontal_j$ is the ratio of foreign presence in sector j (the ratio ranges from 0 to 1), $Backward_j$ is the ratio of foreign presence in sectors that buy intermediate products from firms in sector j , and $Forward_j$ is the ratio of foreign presence in sectors that sell intermediate products to firms in sector j . Together, backward and forward spillovers form vertical spillovers. $Controls_{ij}$ denotes control variables included in the regression—for example, the degree of competition in sector j .

The regression coefficients from equation (1) represent the economic effect of FDI on the productivity of domestic firms. For instance, the coefficient for horizontal spillovers (e_0) expresses the percentage change in domestic productivity associated with an increase in foreign presence in the same sector of one percentage point, or, in other words, the semi-elasticity of domestic productivity with respect to foreign presence.

It is worth noting that the term “spillover” has become overused in the literature; the semi-elasticities in equation (1) may also capture effects other than knowledge externalities. As for horizontal effects, the entry of foreign companies can lead to greater competition in the sector. Greater competition can either increase (through reducing inefficiencies) or decrease (through reducing market shares) the productivity of domestic firms. Neither case represents a knowledge transfer, and the coefficient e_0 thus captures the net effect of knowledge spillovers and competition on productivity. For the sake of simplicity, we follow the convention of calling productivity semi-elasticities “spillovers.” The takeaway from this discussion is that even positive and economically significant estimates of semi-elasticities do not necessarily call for governments to subsidize FDI.

We searched for empirical studies on FDI spillovers in the EconLit, Scopus, and Google Scholar databases; and extracted results from all studies, published and unpublished, that report an estimate of e_0 with a measure of precision (standard error or t-statistic) and that control for vertical spillovers in the regression. In some cases we had to re-compute the estimates of spillovers so that they represented semi-elasticities—for example, if the regression was not estimated in the log-level form. For the computation we required sample means of the spillover variables, but this information is usually not reported in the studies. Therefore, we had to write to the authors of primary studies and ask for additional data or clarifications; the sample of the estimates available for meta-analysis would be much smaller without the help from the authors. The data, a Stata program, and a list of excluded studies with reasons for exclusion are available in the online appendix at meta-analysis.cz/bma.

Most studies report various estimates of spillovers: estimates for different countries, different types of investment projects, or estimates computed using a different methodology. To avoid arbitrary decisions on what the “best” estimate of each study could be, we extract all reported estimates.² In sum, our data set contains 1,205 estimates of horizontal spillovers. We also codify 43 variables that may explain the differences among spillover estimates. For comparison, Nelson and Kennedy (2009) survey 140 meta-analyses conducted in economics since 1989; they find that an average meta-analysis uses 92 estimates and 12 explanatory variables. Therefore, our data set is large compared with that of conventional economics meta-analyses. (The largest meta-analysis in the sample of Nelson and Kennedy, 2009, includes 1,592 estimates and employs 41 variables to explain heterogeneity.)

Our database includes evidence on FDI spillovers estimated for 45 countries around the world; together, these countries accounted for about 60% of the flow of inward FDI in 1999-2000 (the median year of the data used by the primary studies in our sample). Almost all European countries are covered (28), as well as all major Asian emerging economies (9), a few African countries (3), and some Latin American economies (5).

How big must the semi-elasticity be for spillovers to gain practical importance? Suppose, for instance, that e (an estimate of e_0) equals 0.1. Then, a ten-percentage-point increase in foreign presence is associated with an increase in domestic productivity in the same sector of 1%. This is not a great effect; nevertheless, Blalock and Gertler (2008) find similar magnitudes of spillover coefficients for Indonesia and note that such spillovers may be relatively important if there are large changes in foreign presence (large inflows of FDI). For the sake of simplicity, in this paper we consider all spillover effects economically unimportant if they are lower than 0.1, irrespective of their statistical significance. On the other hand, all estimates that are statistically significant and larger than 0.1 we consider economically important.

Out of the 1,205 estimates that we collected, six are larger than 10 in absolute value. These observations are also more than three standard deviations away from the mean of all estimates. When we exclude these outliers, the mean hardly changes, but the standard deviation drops by two thirds. We thus continue in the analysis with a narrower set consisting of 1,199 estimates of horizontal spillovers, without the outliers. The simple mean of the remaining estimates is -0.002 , not significantly different from zero at any conventional level. In meta-analysis it

² There is no clear consensus on what the best practice methodology in the spillover literature is. For this reason, we collect all estimates (including results from simple OLS regressions) and control for the method choices that the authors made. If a particular misspecification was associated with a systematic bias in the estimated spillover coefficients, this effect would be captured in the meta-regression. More details on the control variables used are available in the Data Appendix.

is common to weight the estimates by their precision (the inverse of the standard error); the procedure is commonly called fixed-effects meta-analysis (see, for example, Borenstein et al., 2009).³ In our case the fixed-effects meta-analysis provides a result broadly similar to the simple arithmetic average: 0.017, which is far from values at which the spillover effect could be considered important.

The fixed-effects meta-analysis assumes that there is no heterogeneity in the spillover effects across countries and estimation methods. In practice, however, heterogeneity is likely to be substantial. This is confirmed formally in our case by the Q test of heterogeneity, which is significant at any conventional level. An alternative method for estimating the average effect from the literature is called random-effects meta-analysis. Random-effects meta-analysis assumes that the true estimated effect is randomly distributed in the literature and, thus, can vary across countries and methods. Even for this method the estimate of the average effect is close to zero and equals -0.011 . These results, based on a broad sample of modern literature with a study of median age published only in 2008, corroborate the common impression that the evidence on horizontal spillovers is mixed (Görg and Greenaway, 2004a; Crespo and Fontoura, 2007; Smeets, 2008). In contrast, a recent meta-analysis of vertical spillovers shows that they are on average important, in both statistical and economic terms (Havranek and Irsova, 2011).

Horizontal spillovers are zero on average, but this does not have to mean that they are negligible in general. Perhaps host countries differ in their ability to benefit from FDI, as Lipsey and Sjöholm (2005) suggest; for some countries the effect may well be positive, whereas for others the negative effects of foreign competition on domestic firms (crowding out of the domestic market or draining of skilled labor force) may prevail. Since in the sample we have estimates of horizontal spillovers for almost all European countries, we illustrate in Figure 1 how spillovers differ from one European country to another. The values for individual countries are computed using random-effects meta-analysis and range from negative and economically important ($e < -0.1$) to positive and economically important ($e > 0.1$): horizontal spillovers are highly heterogeneous across countries. From the figure it is difficult to infer any clear relationship between the degree of economic development and the magnitude of spillovers. Clearly, the host-country characteristics are important for the benefits from FDI, but the relationship seems to have more than one dimension.

The estimated average spillovers for Western-European countries are mostly negative, with the exception of Portugal, Ireland, and the United Kingdom. On the other hand, the average spillovers for Central-Eastern European countries are predominantly positive, with the exception of Hungary and the Czech Republic. Nevertheless, the estimated averages for Hungary and the Czech Republic only amount to -0.02 and -0.04 , respectively, a value far from any economic importance. In the Czech Republic, for example, the estimated value would be consistent with a 0.4% decrease in the productivity of domestic firms following a 10-percentage-point increase in foreign presence in the corresponding sector. This result concerning average horizontal spillovers contrasts sharply with the results for vertical spillovers reported by Havranek and Irsova (2011), where strong positive effects are found on the productivity of domestic firms in supplier sectors. Taken together, our evidence based on two large meta-analyses suggests that inward FDI has no important effect on the productivity of firms in the same sector, but important posi-

³ The terminology concerning “fixed” and “random” effects in meta-analysis is derived from multilevel data analysis, and differs from panel data econometrics. In this case, a “fixed-effect” estimator is analogous to simple OLS weighted by the precision (the inverse of the standard error for each estimate); that is, the specification only contains a deterministic coefficient and an error term. In a “random-effect” specification, on the other hand, the parameter is allowed to vary randomly between studies. More details can be found in Havranek and Irsova (2010).

Figure 1: Country Heterogeneity in the Estimates of Horizontal Spillovers for Europe





Figure 2: Method Heterogeneity in the Estimates of Horizontal Spillovers for China



tive effects on the productivity of suppliers. The effect on suppliers appears to be strong enough to have significant effects on speeding up economic convergence in the future if the inflow of FDI rebounds after the drop experienced during the recent crisis.

Another factor that may influence the reported spillover coefficients is the methodology used in the estimation. Though most researchers nowadays follow the general approach introduced earlier [equation (1)], they still have to make many method choices concerning data, specification, and estimation. Figure 2 shows how the results vary across studies with different methodologies for the country that is most frequently examined in the FDI spillover literature, China. The results are all over the place: from negative to positive, from negligible to economically significant. Therefore, if we want to discover what makes countries benefit from FDI, it is also important to control for the method choices employed in the studies.

3. Why Do Spillover Estimates Differ?

Building on the narrative surveys of the FDI spillover literature (Crespo and Fontoura, 2007; Smeets, 2008) and on the recent research concerning the factors that may determine the magnitude of horizontal spillovers, we compile a list of the potential spillover determinants that can be examined in a meta-analysis framework. Because spillovers are usually estimated for individual countries, and our database contains estimates of spillovers for 45 countries, it is convenient to express most of the determinants at the country level (Meyer and Sinani, 2009, choose a similar approach).⁴ As documented by Crespo and Fontoura (2007), the theory as well as empirical evidence gives mixed results on what the exact influence of the individual mediating factors on spillovers should be. Since the empirical results often vary from country to country, a meta-analysis for 45 countries could give us a more general picture. Here we provide a brief intuition for the inclusion of each of the nine potential determinants of horizontal spillovers:

Technology gap If the difference in the level of technology between domestic firms and foreign investors is too large, domestic firms are less likely to be able to imitate technology and adopt know-how brought by foreign investors. On the other hand, a small technology gap may mean that there is too little to learn from foreign investors (for more discussion on the role of the technology gap in mediating spillovers, see, for example, Blalock and Gertler, 2009; Sawada, 2010).

Similarity When the source country of FDI is closer to the host country in terms of culture, domestic firms are likely to adopt foreign technology more easily (as noted by Crespo and Fontoura, 2007, p. 414). A common language or a similar legal system may represent an important mediating factor of horizontal spillovers. Moreover, a common language and historical colonial links are associated with migration patterns, and Javorcik et al. (2011) find that migration networks significantly affect FDI flows.

Trade openness In countries open to international trade, domestic firms are likely to have more experience with foreign firms and, hence, also with foreign technology. This may increase

⁴ Some potential sources of differences in spillover estimates evident in Figure 1 are not possible to investigate within the meta-analysis framework, and could only be examined within primary studies using micro-level data. These include, for example, the effect of geographical distance between host-country firms and the affiliates of foreign firms in the host country. Another important factor may be the different sectoral composition of FDI flowing to different countries, as documented by Babecky et al. (2011): if, for example, the largest portion of FDI in the Czech Republic flows into the auto industry, while in the Baltic states it flows into the housing sector, this could have important implications for FDI spillovers. Nevertheless, the sectoral decomposition of FDI is not available for all countries in our data set.

the domestic firms' absorptive capacity for spillovers (Leshner and Miroudot, 2008), but it may also mean that there is less potential to learn because the firms are already exposed to foreign technology.

Financial development To benefit from the exposure to foreign technology, domestic firms should have access to financing so that they are able to implement the new technology in their production processes. In consequence, countries with a less developed financial system are likely to enjoy smaller horizontal spillovers (Alfaro et al., 2004).

Patent rights If the protection of intellectual property rights in the country is poor, the country is likely to attract relatively less sophisticated foreign investors (with only a modest technology edge over domestic firms). In addition, better protection of intellectual property rights makes it more difficult for domestic firms to copy technology from foreigners, and may lead to less positive horizontal spillovers (Smeets, 2011).

Human capital With a more skilled labor force, domestic firms are likely to exhibit a greater capacity to absorb spillovers from foreign firms in the same sectors (Narula and Marin, 2003).

FDI penetration If the country is already saturated with inward FDI, new foreign investment may have quite a small impact on domestic firms. In other words, the spillover semi-elasticity could be larger for an increase in foreign presence in the industry from 0 to 10% than, for example, from 50 to 60% (Gersl, 2008).

Fully owned The degree of foreign ownership of investment projects is likely to matter for spillovers. Domestic firms can be expected to have harder access to the technology of fully foreign-owned affiliates than to the technology of joint ventures of foreign firms and other domestic firms (Abraham et al., 2010; Javorcik and Spatareanu, 2008).

Service sectors Domestic firms in the service and manufacturing sectors may differ in their ability to benefit from foreign presence (Leshner and Miroudot, 2008). For example, firms in service sectors are usually less export-intensive, and hence are likely to have less ex-ante experience with foreign firms. Less experience with foreign technology may lead to either a lower absorptive capacity or a higher potential to learn from FDI because of a larger technology gap.

The first seven potential spillover determinants are computed at the country level. Out of these seven variables, *Technology gap* and *Similarity* show average bilateral values with respect to the source countries of FDI. The remaining two variables, *Fully owned* and *Service sectors*, are dummy variables, and their values are determined by the manner of estimation of spillovers in the primary studies (researchers often estimate separately the effects of fully foreign-owned investment projects and joint ventures and also examine separately the effects on domestic firms in manufacturing and in service sectors). Details on the construction of all variables and their summary statistics are provided in Table A2 in the Data Appendix. The table also lists all 34 control variables that we use in our estimation: the characteristics of the data, specification, estimation, and publication of the primary studies on horizontal spillovers from FDI.

Our intention is to examine how the nine potential determinants influence the reported estimates of horizontal spillovers. As documented by the intuition outlined on the previous pages, all of the potential determinants may play a role in explaining spillover heterogeneity. On the other hand, it is far from clear which control variables from our extensive set should be included in the regression, or what signs their regression coefficients should have. A regression with all

43 explanatory variables would certainly contain many redundant control variables and would unnecessarily inflate the standard errors. The general model, a so-called “meta-regression,” can be described in the following way:⁵

$$e_k = a + \beta \cdot \text{Determinants}_k + \gamma \cdot \text{Controls}_k + \epsilon_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, 1199, \quad (2)$$

where e is an estimate of horizontal spillovers, *Determinants* denotes the nine potential spillover determinants, which should be included in the regression, and *Controls* denotes control variables, some of which may be included in the regression.⁶ This is a typical example of model uncertainty that can be addressed by a method called Bayesian model averaging (BMA; for example, Fernandez et al., 2001a; Sala-i-Martin et al., 2004; Ciccone and Jarocinski, 2010). BMA has been applied in meta-analysis, for instance, by Moeltner and Woodward (2009).

BMA estimates many models comprising the possible subsets of explanatory variables and constructs a weighted average over these models. In a way, BMA can be thought of as a meta-analysis of meta-analyses, because it aggregates many possible meta-regression models. The weights in this methodology are the so-called *posterior model probabilities*. Simply put, posterior model probability can be thought of as a measure of the fit of the model, analogous to information criteria or adjusted R-squared: the models that fit the data best get the highest posterior model probability, and vice versa. Next, for each explanatory variable we can compute the *posterior inclusion probability*, which represents the sum of the posterior model probabilities of all models that contain this particular variable. In other words, the posterior inclusion probability expresses how likely it is that the variable should be included in the “true” regression. Finally, for each explanatory variable we are able to extract the *posterior coefficient distribution* across all the regressions. From the posterior coefficient distribution we can infer the posterior mean (analogous to the estimate of the regression coefficient in a standard regression) and the posterior standard deviation (analogous to the standard error of the regression coefficient in a standard regression).

Because we have to consider 43 explanatory variables, it is not technically feasible to enumerate all 2^{43} of their possible combinations; on a standard personal computer this would take several years. In such cases, Markov chain Monte Carlo methods are used to go through the most important models (those with high posterior model probabilities). For the computation we use the `bms` package in R (Feldkircher and Zeugner, 2009), which employs the Metropolis-Hastings algorithm. Following Fernandez et al. (2001b), we run the estimation with 200 million iterations, which ensures a good degree of convergence. We apply conservative priors on both the regression coefficients and the model size to let the data speak. More details on the BMA procedure employed in this paper are available in Appendix B; more details on BMA in general can be found, for example, in Feldkircher and Zeugner (2009).

⁵ Ideally, nonlinear functions and interactions of the variables should be included as well. Nevertheless, with so many potential explanatory variables this would greatly increase the complexity of the model and introduce problems with multicollinearity.

⁶ These control variables are different from the control variables included in (1) estimated by primary studies. In the primary studies, authors often control, for example, for the concentration in the domestic firm’s sector and other sector- or firm-level characteristics; while in (2) we control for country-level characteristics and method choices made by the authors of primary studies.

4. Meta-Regression Results

A graphical representation of the results of the BMA estimation is depicted in Figure 3. Columns denote individual models; these models include the explanatory variables for which the corresponding cells are not blank. Blue color (darker in grayscale) of the cell means that the variable is included in the model and that the estimated sign of the regression coefficient is positive. Red color (lighter in grayscale) means that the variable is included and that the estimated sign is negative. On the horizontal axis the figure depicts the posterior model probabilities: the wider the column, the better the fit of the model. For example, the best model, the first one from the left, includes only two control variables—*Forward* (a dummy variable that equals one if the primary study controls for both backward and forward vertical spillovers when estimating horizontal spillovers) and *Author citations* (the number of citations of the most frequently cited co-author of the primary study). The posterior probability of the best model, however, is only 18%, and we have to take a look at the rest of the model mass as well.


The posterior inclusion probability, computed as the sum of the posterior model probabilities for the models that include the corresponding variable, also exceeds 50% for variable *Aggregated* (a dummy variable that equals one if the data in the primary study are aggregated at the sector level; that is, if firm-level data are not available). A few other control variables seem to be important in many models, but especially in the worse ones to the right. From Figure 3 we can infer how stable the regression coefficients are for potential spillover determinants. The sign of the coefficient is consistently negative for *Technology gap*, *Trade openness*, *Patent rights*, and *Fully owned*. On the other hand, the figure shows mixed results for *Similarity*, *Financial development*, and *FDI penetration*: the coefficients for these variables are unstable and depend on which control variables are included in the regression. Finally, the sign seems to be clearly positive for variables *Human capital* and *Service sectors*.

Table 1 reports numerical details on the results of the BMA estimation. Because for one country a few variables are not available, we can only use 1,195 out of all 1,199 spillover estimates in the BMA. Most control variables have a posterior inclusion probability lower than 0.1; therefore they do not seem to be important. A few control variables have a posterior inclusion probability between 0.1 and 0.5, which suggests that they may play a role in influencing the magnitude of the reported spillover coefficients. The variables with such a moderate posterior inclusion probability are the following: *Cross-sectional* (a dummy variable that equals one if cross-sectional data instead of panel data are used in the primary study), *Employment* (a dummy variable that equals one if the share of foreign firms in the sector's employment is used as the proxy for foreign presence), *Regional* (a dummy variable that equals one if vertical spillovers in the regression are measured using the ratio of foreign firms in the region), and *Study citations* (the number of citations of the study divided by the age of the study).⁷

As a “frequentist” check of the BMA estimation, we run a simple OLS regression with all potential spillover determinants and the control variables with posterior inclusion probabilities higher than 0.1 (that is, the control variables that the BMA estimation finds to be relatively important). In other words, using OLS we run one of the many models shown in Figure 3. Because we are interested in the potential spillover determinants, most of them being defined at the country level, we use country-level clustered standard errors in the regression (the potential spillover determinants would be a bit more significant if study-level clustering was used instead). The

⁷ The results concerning control variables remain similar even if the potential spillover determinants are not fixed in the BMA estimation; see Appendix C.

Figure 3: Bayesian Model Averaging, Model Inclusion



Notes: Columns denote individual models; variables are sorted by posterior inclusion probability in descending order. Blue color (darker in grayscale) = the variable is included and the estimated sign is positive. Red color (lighter in grayscale) = the variable is included and the estimated sign is negative. No color = the variable is not included in the model. The horizontal axis measures the cumulative posterior model probabilities.

Table 1: Explaining the Differences in the Estimates of Horizontal Spillovers

Response variable: Estimate of spillovers	Bayesian model averaging			Frequentist check (OLS)		
	Post. mean	Post. std. dev.	PIP	Coef.	Std. er.	p-value
<i>Potential spillover determinants</i>						
Technology gap	-0.294	0.088	1.000	-0.260	0.145	0.080
Similarity	-0.006	0.097	1.000	-0.086	0.108	0.430
Trade openness	-0.246	0.138	1.000	-0.367	0.176	0.044
Financial dev.	-0.083	0.162	1.000	0.020	0.178	0.909
Patent rights	-0.144	0.076	1.000	-0.183	0.119	0.131
Human capital	0.437	0.316	1.000	0.710	0.499	0.162
FDI penetration	0.085	0.232	1.000	0.218	0.276	0.435
Fully owned	-0.144	0.103	1.000	-0.104	0.057	0.077
Service sectors	0.092	0.118	1.000	0.150	0.144	0.303
<i>Data characteristics</i>						
Cross-sectional	-0.043	0.123	0.124	-0.290	0.091	0.003
Aggregated	0.352	0.378	0.524	0.965	0.210	3.E-07
Time span	-0.003	0.010	0.093			
No. of firms	-1.E-04	0.003	0.007			
Average year	9.E-06	0.001	0.003			
Amadeus	0.005	0.034	0.026			
<i>Specification characteristics</i>						
Forward	0.313	0.068	0.997	0.281	0.074	0.001
Employment	-0.036	0.093	0.146	-0.178	0.104	0.094
Equity	8.E-05	0.007	0.003			
All firms	7.E-05	0.004	0.003			
Absorption cap.	0.005	0.041	0.022			
Competition	-4.E-04	0.008	0.005			
Regional	-0.065	0.194	0.115	-0.309	0.278	0.274
Lagged	0.008	0.050	0.029			
More estimates	-0.001	0.009	0.008			
Combination	0.002	0.024	0.012			
<i>Estimation characteristics</i>						
One step	-0.017	0.058	0.095			
Olley-Pakes	0.012	0.049	0.068			
OLS	-9.E-05	0.007	0.003			
GMM	3.E-06	0.009	0.003			
Random eff.	-1.E-04	0.008	0.003			
Pooled OLS	-0.014	0.057	0.062			
Year fixed	0.008	0.041	0.040			
Sector fixed	-0.001	0.010	0.007			
Differences	2.E-04	0.005	0.004			
Translog	-4.E-04	0.011	0.004			
Log-log	-0.001	0.031	0.006			
<i>Publication characteristics</i>						
Published	3.E-07	0.008	0.005			
Impact	4.E-06	0.004	0.003			
Study citations	-0.012	0.033	0.127	-0.093	0.075	0.222
Native co-author	-5.E-05	0.005	0.003			
Author citations	0.042	0.029	0.745	0.088	0.037	0.024
US-based	8.E-05	0.007	0.004			
Publication date	4.E-04	0.005	0.010			
Observations	1,195			1,195		

Notes: For variables in bold the BMA estimates that the posterior means of the regression coefficients are larger than the corresponding posterior standard deviations. PIP = posterior inclusion probability. Potential spillover determinants are always included. In the frequentist check we only include control variables with PIP > 0.1. Standard errors in the frequentist check are clustered at the country level.

results are reported in the last three columns of Table 1 and are broadly in line with the BMA estimation in terms of the predicted coefficient values and their standard errors. The potential spillover determinants that seem to be important based on the BMA estimation are typeset in bold; we highlight variables for which the posterior mean of the regression coefficient exceeds the posterior standard deviation. Apart from variables with clearly unstable signs as was seen from Figure 3, additionally the variable *Service sectors* does not seem to be important; its regression coefficient is also highly insignificant in the frequentist check.

Table 1 only shows the summary statistics of the posterior distribution of the regression coefficients; for a closer look at the posterior distributions for potential spillover determinants, we need to advance to Figure 4. The solid line in the graphs denotes the posterior mean of the regression coefficients, which was already reported in Table 1. The dotted lines denote coefficient values that are two posterior standard deviations away from the posterior mean; if zero lies outside these intervals, the interpretation of the result is broadly similar to statistical significance at the 5% level in the frequentist case.


Figure 4 suggests that the coefficient for *Technology gap* is negative with a high probability. Therefore, our results suggest that a high technology gap between domestic firms and foreign investors results in smaller horizontal spillovers. In contrast, the coefficient for *Similarity* is almost precisely zero: it seems that neither a common language nor a historical colonial link between the host and source country from FDI helps increase the benefits of FDI. (The results would hold even if we considered only a common language or only a colonial link in the definition of *Similarity*.) Next, the coefficient for *Trade openness* is robustly negative, which is consistent with the hypothesis that companies with ex-ante experience from international trade have little to learn from foreign investors coming to their country. The degree of *Financial development* does not seem to be important for horizontal spillovers. In contrast, the degree of protection of intellectual property rights matters: the coefficient for *Patent rights* is robustly negative. With stronger protection of intellectual property, the host country can expect less horizontal spillovers from incoming FDI since it becomes more difficult for domestic firms to copy technology from foreign firms.

The estimated coefficient corresponding to *Human development* is positive, which suggests that to benefit from FDI, host countries need a skilled labor force; skilled employees increase the absorptive capacity of domestic firms. *FDI penetration* does not seem to matter for the size of horizontal spillovers. This result is consistent with the implicit hypothesis behind most regressions in primary studies: the researchers usually assume that the effect of FDI on domestic firms is linear, or, in other words, that the spillover semi-elasticity is constant for different values of foreign presence. The coefficient for *Fully owned* is negative, which means that joint ventures are more likely to bring positive spillovers for domestic firms than fully foreign-owned investment projects. Finally, the mean of the coefficient for *Service sectors* is positive, but for many models negative coefficients are reported.⁸

The results discussed on the previous pages give us some idea about the direction with which the various mediating factors influence horizontal spillovers from FDI. For practical purposes, however, we need to determine the economic importance of the individual spillover determinants.

⁸ We also tried to include non-linear segments (powers) of some of the potential spillover determinants (namely, *Technology gap*, *Trade openness*, and *FDI penetration*) in the frequentist check of the meta-regression; these results are not reported, but are available on request. The non-linear segment was not significant for *Trade openness* and *FDI penetration*, but it was significant at the 10% level for *Technology gap*. The effect of a technology gap on spillovers seems to be quadratic—the benefits of FDI are the largest with a modest technology gap.

Figure 4: Posterior Coefficient Distributions for Potential Spillover Determinants



Notes: The figure depicts the densities of the regression parameters for the corresponding spillover determinant encountered in different regressions (with subsets of all control variables on the right-hand side). For example, the regression coefficient for *Technology gap* is negative in almost all models, irrespective of the control variables included. The most common value of the coefficient is approximately -0.3 . On the other hand, the coefficient for *Similarity* is negative in one half of the models and positive in the other half, depending on which control variables are included. The most common value is 0.

In Table 2 we consider two measures of economic importance. First, we examine how the BMA estimation would predict the horizontal spillovers to change if the value of the spillover determinants increased from the minimum value in our sample to the maximum value. The results suggest that *Technology gap* is by far the most important determinant: extreme changes in the difference between the technological level of domestic firms and foreign investors can increase or decrease the spillover coefficient by 1.321. If we consider values above 0.1 to be economically important, as discussed in Section 2, a value of 1.321 represents a huge difference.

Table 2: The Economic Significance of Potential Spillover Determinants

Variable	Maximum effect	Std. dev. effect
Technology gap	-1.321	-0.158
Similarity	-0.012	-0.004
Trade openness	-0.341	-0.079
Financial dev.	-0.097	-0.036
Patent rights	-0.478	-0.115
Human capital	0.282	0.081
FDI penetration	0.102	0.016
Fully owned	-0.144	-0.039
Service sectors	0.092	0.022

Notes: The table depicts the predicted effects of increases in the variables on the spillover estimates based on BMA. Maximum effect = an increase from sample minimum to sample maximum. Std. dev. effect = a one-standard-deviation increase.


Nevertheless, such large changes in spillover determinants are not realistic, and in the next column of Table 2 we thus report the changes in spillovers associated with a one-standard-deviation increase in the spillover determinants. Even according to this measure the most important determinant is *Technology gap*, but the predicted effect on the spillover coefficient is much lower than in the previous case: 0.158. Other important determinants are *Patent rights* (the one-standard-deviation effect equals 0.115), *Human capital* (0.081), and *Trade openness* (0.079). Note that a one-standard-deviation effect is not suitable for dummy variables such as *Fully owned*, because the value of *Fully owned* is either 0 or 1. The spillover effect of fully foreign-owned investment projects is 0.144 smaller compared with the case when all investments are considered. Therefore, if the host country encourages foreign investment projects involving joint ventures with a somewhat smaller technology advantage with respect to domestic firms, it may increase the average spillovers by $0.144 + 0.158 = 0.302$, an economically significant value.

5. Publication Bias

An important concern in meta-analysis is publication selection bias (Stanley, 2001, 2005): some estimates of spillovers may be more likely to be selected for publication than others. The presence of publication selection would probably not affect the analysis of spillover determinants in the previous two sections, but it could seriously bias our estimate of the average spillover reported in Section 2. Publication selection in the spillover literature has two potential sources. First, researchers may treat statistically significant results more favorably, as seems to be the case in many areas of empirical economics (see, for example, the surveys of DeLong and Lang, 1992; Card and Krueger, 1995). Second, researchers may prefer a particular direction of the

estimate of spillovers. Some researchers may be tempted to report “good news” (positive estimates) for developing countries in contrast to skeptical results. Moreover, until the 1990s there was a relatively strong consensus in the literature that horizontal spillovers were truly positive, so researchers could use this intuition as a specification check. Indeed, publication selection bias was found in the first meta-analysis of horizontal spillovers by Görg and Strobl (2001).

Figure 5: Funnel Plot



The presence of publication bias is usually tested both graphically and formally. The graphical test uses the so-called funnel plot (Egger et al., 1997; Stanley and Doucouliagos, 2010), a scatter plot of the estimates of spillovers (on the horizontal axis) against their precision (the inverse of the standard error; on the vertical axis). In the absence of publication bias the funnel plot is symmetrical: the most precise estimates are close to the true spillover, while the imprecise estimates are dispersed widely. In consequence, the scatter plot should resemble an inverted funnel. On the other hand, if some estimates of spillovers are discarded because of their unintuitive sign, the funnel will become asymmetrical. If insignificant estimates are not reported, the funnel will become hollow (results yielding small coefficients with large standard errors will be discarded).

The funnel plot for our sample of horizontal spillovers is reported in Figure 5. The funnel seems to be full and symmetrical, although the left portion of the funnel might be a little heavier than the right one. In any case, most funnels reported in economics meta-analyses show much stronger asymmetry than what we see in Figure 5 (Stanley, 2008; Stanley and Doucouliagos, 2010). Because the interpretation of the funnel plot is rather subjective, more formal methods are needed to assess the presence of publication bias in the spillover literature.

The most commonly employed test for publication bias reformulates the funnel plot as a regression relationship: the funnel asymmetry test. If we switch the axes in the funnel plot and invert the values on the new horizontal axis, we get a relation between the estimate of spillovers and its standard error. In the absence of publication bias, the estimated size of the coefficient should not be correlated with its standard error (Card and Krueger, 1995; Egger et al., 1997). If,

however, some estimates are selected for publication because of their significance or an intuitive sign, the relation will be significant. The following regression formalizes the idea:

$$e_k = e_0 + \beta_0 \cdot Se(e_k) + u_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, 1199, \quad (3)$$

where e denotes the estimate of spillovers, e_0 is the average underlying spillover, $Se(e)$ is the standard error of e , and β_0 measures the magnitude of publication bias. Because specification (3) is likely heteroscedastic (the explanatory variable is a sample estimate of the standard deviation of the response variable), in practice it is usually estimated by weighted least squares to ensure efficiency (Stanley, 2005, 2008). Since we have many estimates from different studies, we add study fixed effects and cluster the standard errors at the study level (country-level clustering would yield similar results).

Table 3: Test of Publication Bias

Response variable: e	Study fixed effects			Study and country fixed effects		
	Coef.	Std. er.	p-value	Coef.	Std. er.	p-value
Constant	0.021	0.015	0.150	0.021	0.015	0.183
Se (publication bias)	-0.325	0.262	0.220	-0.284	0.305	0.357
Observations	1,199			1,199		

Notes: Standard errors are clustered at the study level. Estimated by weighted least squares with the precision (the inverse of standard error) taken as the weight.

The results reported in Table 3 confirm the intuition based on the funnel plot: the coefficients for publication bias are small and insignificant. In a quantitative survey of economics meta-analyses, Doucouliagos and Stanley (2008) state that values of the coefficient for publication bias in the funnel asymmetry test are important if they are statistically significant and larger than one in absolute value; therefore, we can conclude that publication selection in the spillover literature is negligible. The result contrasts with the findings of Görg and Strobl (2001). Nevertheless, in this meta-analysis we use the estimates of horizontal spillovers published after 2000, and in the following decade the focus of many studies shifted to vertical spillovers, so that the selection pressure could have moved to those estimates. Indeed, Havranek and Irsova (2011) show that publication bias in the literature on vertical spillovers is strong.

6. Summary and Implications

In a large meta-analysis of horizontal spillovers from FDI estimated for 45 countries, we examine which factors determine the magnitude of spillovers. On average, horizontal spillovers are negligible, but the estimates are distributed unevenly across countries and estimation methods. Building on the previous literature we investigate nine potential spillover determinants, which capture the characteristics of the FDI source countries, host countries, domestic firms, and investment projects. Additionally we assemble a list of 34 aspects of methodology that may affect the estimates of spillovers. Using Bayesian model averaging we investigate the importance of individual spillover determinants and control for the aspects of methodology. We also test for possible publication selection bias.

Our results suggest that the origin of FDI is important: when the technology gap of domestic firms with respect to foreign investors is too large, horizontal spillovers are small. Moreover,

spillovers are likely to be smaller with higher trade openness and better protection of intellectual property rights in the host country. On the other hand, higher levels of human capital in the host country are associated with larger spillovers. Finally, investment projects in the form of joint ventures with domestic firms bring more positive spillovers than fully foreign-owned projects. We found no evidence of publication bias in the literature on horizontal spillovers.

Productivity spillovers from FDI are often cited as the most important reason for promoting inward FDI (Blomstrom and Kokko, 2003). Therefore, if horizontal spillovers were the only effect of inward FDI on the domestic economy, our meta-analysis would suggest that promotion of FDI brings no benefits on average; therefore, this paper provides no support for FDI subsidies in general. The question remains: what can countries do in practice to increase their benefits from FDI? We found that changes in particular characteristics have positive effects on FDI spillovers, but some of these changes are also likely to have serious detrimental side effects. For example, changing the degree of protection of intellectual property or the degree of trade openness, difficult as it is, would certainly affect many other aspects of the economy, the volume of FDI attracted among them, and is thus not suitable for policy purposes.

Nevertheless, there are tools that may be used to increase the benefits from FDI without obvious side effects. If the country already promotes inward FDI, our results indicate that the country could benefit from focusing on investors from countries with a modest technology edge and encouraging joint ventures with domestic firms. Such investment projects would help foster not only horizontal, but also vertical spillovers, as documented by the meta-analysis of Havranek and Irsova (2011), and speed up the process of economic convergence and increase the flexibility of domestic producers.

References

- ABRAHAM, F., KONINGS, J., AND SLOOTMAEKERS, V. (2010): “FDI spillovers in the Chinese manufacturing sector.” *The Economics of Transition*, 18(1):143–182.
- AITKEN, B. J. AND HARRISON, A. E. (1999): “Do Domestic Firms Benefit from Direct Foreign Investment? Evidence from Venezuela.” *American Economic Review*, 89(3): 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(1):89–112.
- ARNOLD, M. J. AND JAVORCIK, B. S. (2009): “Gifted kids or pushy parents? Foreign direct investment and plant productivity in Indonesia.” *Journal of International Economics*, 79(1):42–53.
- ATALLAH MURRA, S. (2006): “Revaluando la transmisión de spillovers de la IED: Un estudio de productividad para Colombia.” *Revista Desarrollo y Sociedad*, 57(1):163–213.
- BABECKY, J. AND CAMPOS, N. F. (2011): “Does reform work? An econometric survey of the reform–growth puzzle.” *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 39(2):140–158.
- BABECKY, J., BULIR, A., AND SMIDKOVA, K. (2011): “Sustainable Real Exchange Rates in the New EU Member States: What Did the Great Recession Change?” Working Papers 2011/01, Czech National Bank, Research Department
- BARRIOS, S., GÖRG, H., AND STROBL, E. (2009): “Spillovers Through Backward Linkages from Multinationals: Measurement Matters!” IZA Discussion Papers 4477, Institute for the Study of Labor
- BÉKÉS, G., KLEINERT, J., AND TOUBAL, F. (2009): “Spillovers from Multinationals to Heterogeneous Domestic Firms: Evidence from Hungary.” *The World Economy*, 32 (10):1408–1433.
- BLAKE, A., DENG, Z., AND FALVEY, R. (2009): “How does the productivity of foreign direct investment spill over to local firms in Chinese manufacturing?.” *Journal of Chinese Economic and Business Studies*, 7(2):183–197.
- BLALOCK, G. AND GERTLER, P. J. (2008): “Welfare gains from Foreign Direct Investment through technology transfer to local suppliers.” *Journal of International Economics*, 74 (2):402–421.
- BLALOCK, G. AND GERTLER, P. J. (2009): “How firm capabilities affect who benefits from foreign technology.” *Journal of Development Economics*, 90(2):192–199.
- BLALOCK, G. AND SIMON, D. H. (2009): “Do all firms benefit equally from downstream FDI? The moderating effect of local suppliers’ capabilities on productivity gains.” *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(7):1095–1112.
- BLOMSTROM, M. AND KOKKO, A. (1998): “Multinational Corporations and Spillovers.” *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 12(3):247–77.
- BLOMSTROM, M. AND KOKKO, A. (2003): “The Economics of Foreign Direct Investment Incentives.” NBER Working Papers 9489, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc
- BLYDE, J., KUGLER, M., AND STEIN, E. (2004): “Exporting vs. Outsourcing by MNC Subsidiaries: Which Determines FDI Spillovers?.” Discussion Paper Series In Economics And Econometrics 0411, Economics Division, School of Social Sciences, University of Southampton

- BORENSTEIN, M., ROTHSTEIN, H. R., HEDGES, L. V., AND HIGGINS, J. P. (2009): *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*. Wiley, London.
- BWALYA, S. M. (2006): “Foreign direct investment and technology spillovers: Evidence from panel data analysis of manufacturing firms in Zambia.” *Journal of Development Economics*, 81(2):514–526.
- CARD, D. AND KRUEGER, A. B. (1995): “Time-Series Minimum-Wage Studies: A Meta-analysis.” *American Economic Review*, 85(2):238–43.
- CARD, D., KLUVE, J., AND WEBER, A. (2010): “Active Labour Market Policy Evaluations: A Meta-Analysis.” *Economic Journal*, 120(548):F452–F477.
- CHANG, S. J., CHUNG, J., AND XU, D. (2007): “FDI and Technology Spillovers in China.” CEI Working Paper Series 2007-7, Center for Economic Institutions, Institute of Economic Research, Hitotsubashi University
- CICCONE, A. AND JAROCINSKI, M. (2010): “Determinants of Economic Growth: Will Data Tell?” *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*, 2(4):222–46.
- CRESPO, N. AND FONTOURA, M. P. (2007): “Determinant Factors of FDI Spillovers—What Do We Really Know?” *World Development*, 35(3):410–425.
- CRESPO, N., FONTOURA, M. P., AND PROENÇA, I. (2009): “FDI spillovers at regional level: Evidence from Portugal.” *Papers in Regional Science*, 88(3):591–607.
- DAMIJAN, J. P., KNELL, M., MAJCEN, B., AND ROJEC, M. (2003): “Technology Transfer through FDI in Top-10 Transition Countries: How Important are Direct Effects, Horizontal and Vertical Spillovers?” William Davidson Institute Working Papers Series 549, William Davidson Institute at the University of Michigan, Stephen M. Ross Business School
- DAMIJAN, J. P., ROJEC, M., MAJCEN, B., AND KNELL, M. (2008): “Impact of Firm Heterogeneity on Direct and Spillover Effects of FDI: Micro Evidence from Ten Transition Countries.” LICOS Discussion Papers 21808, LICOS—Centre for Institutions and Economic Performance, K. U. Leuven
- DELONG, J. B. AND LANG, K. (1992): “Are All Economic Hypotheses False?” *Journal of Political Economy*, 100(6):1257–72.
- DOUCOULIAGOS, H. AND STANLEY, T. (2008): “Theory Competition and Selectivity: Are All Economic Facts Greatly Exaggerated?” Economics Series Working Paper 06, Deakin University
- EGGER, M., SMITH, G. D., SCHEIDER, M., AND MINDER, C. (1997): “Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test.” *British Medical Journal*, 316:320–246.
- FELDKIRCHER, M. AND ZEUGNER, S. (2009): “Benchmark Priors Revisited: On Adaptive Shrinkage and the Supermodel Effect in Bayesian Model Averaging.” IMF Working Papers 09/202, International Monetary Fund
- FERNANDEZ, C., LEY, E., AND STEEL, M. F. J. (2001): “Benchmark priors for Bayesian model averaging.” *Journal of Econometrics*, 100(2):381–427.
- FERNANDEZ, C., LEY, E., AND STEEL, M. F. J. (2001): “Model uncertainty in cross-country growth regressions.” *Journal of Applied Econometrics*, 16(5):563–576.
- GERSL, A. (2008): “Productivity, Export Performance, and Financing of the Czech Corporate Sector: The Effects of Foreign Direct Investment.” *Czech Journal of Economics and Finance*, 58(05-06):232–247.
- GERSL, A., RUBENE, I., AND ZUMER, T. (2007): “Foreign Direct Investment and Pro-

- ductivity Spillovers: Updated Evidence from Central and Eastern Europe.” Working Paper 2007/08, Czech National Bank
- GIRMA, S. AND GONG, Y. (2008): “FDI, Linkages and the Efficiency of State-Owned Enterprises in China.” *Journal of Development Studies*, 44(5):728–749.
- GIRMA, S. AND WAKELIN, K. (2007): “Local productivity spillovers from foreign direct investment in the U.K. electronics industry.” *Regional Science and Urban Economics*, 37(3):399–412.
- GIRMA, S., GÖRG, H., AND PISU, M. (2008): “Exporting, linkages and productivity spillovers from foreign direct investment.” *Canadian Journal of Economics*, 41(1):320–340.
- GORODNICHENKO, Y., SVEJNAR, J., AND TERRELL, K. (2007): “When Does FDI Have Positive Spillovers? Evidence from 17 Emerging Market Economies.” CEPR Discussion Papers 6546, Centre for Economic Policy Research
- GÖRG, H. AND GREENAWAY, D. (2004): “Much Ado about Nothing? Do Domestic Firms Really Benefit from Foreign Direct Investment?.” *World Bank Research Observer*, 19(2):171–197.
- GÖRG, H. AND GREENAWAY, D. (2004): “Much Ado about Nothing? Do Domestic Firms Really Benefit from Foreign Direct Investment?.” *World Bank Research Observer*, 19(2):171–197.
- GÖRG, H. AND STROBL, E. (2001): “Multinational Companies and Productivity Spillovers: A Meta-analysis.” *The Economic Journal*, 111(475):F723–39.
- HAGEMEJER, J. AND KOLASA, M. (2008): “Internationalization and economic performance of enterprises: Evidence from firm-level data.” National Bank of Poland Working Papers 51, National Bank of Poland
- HALPERN, L. AND MURAKÖZY, B. (2007): “Does distance matter in spillover?.” *Economics of Transition*, 15:781–805.
- HAVRANEK, T. (2010): “Rose Effect and the Euro: Is the Magic Gone?.” *Review of World Economics*, 146(2):241–261.
- HAVRANEK, T. AND IRSOVA, Z. (2010): “Which Foreigners Are Worth Wooing? A Meta-Analysis of Vertical Spillovers from FDI.” Working Papers 2010/03, Czech National Bank, Research Department
- HAVRANEK, T. AND IRSOVA, Z. (2011): “Estimating Vertical Spillovers from FDI: Why Results Vary and What the True Effect Is.” *Journal of International Economics*, (forthcoming. DOI: 10.1016/j.jinteco.2011.07.004
- JABBOUR, L. AND MUCCHIELLI, J. L. (2007): “Technology transfer through vertical linkages: The case of the Spanish manufacturing industry.” *Journal of Applied Economics*, 10(1):115–136.
- JAVORCIK, B. S. (2004): “Does Foreign Direct Investment Increase the Productivity of Domestic Firms? In Search of Spillovers Through Backward Linkages.” *American Economic Review*, 94(3):605–627.
- JAVORCIK, B. S. AND SPATAREANU, M. (2008): “To share or not to share: Does local participation matter for spillovers from foreign direct investment?.” *Journal of Development Economics*, 85(1-2):194–217.
- JAVORCIK, B. S. AND SPATAREANU, M. (2011): “Does it matter where you come from? Vertical spillovers from foreign direct investment and the origin of investors.” *Journal of Development Economics*, 96(1):126–138.

- JAVORCIK, B. S., ÖZDEN, A., SPATAREANU, M., AND NEAGU, C. (2011): “Migrant networks and foreign direct investment.” *Journal of Development Economics*, 94(2):231–241.
- JORDAAN, J. A. (2008): “Regional foreign participation and externalities: New empirical evidence from Mexican regions.” *Environment and Planning A*, 40(12):2948–2969.
- KOLASA, M. (2008): “How does FDI inflow affect productivity of domestic firms? The role of horizontal and vertical spillovers, absorptive capacity and competition.” *Journal of International Trade & Economic Development*, 17(1):155–173.
- LE, Q. H. AND POMFRET, R. (2008): “Technology Spillovers from Foreign Direct Investment in Vietnam: Horizontal or Vertical Spillovers?.” Working Paper 85, Vietnam Development Forum
- LESHER, M. AND MIROUDOT, S. (2008): “FDI Spillovers and their Interrelationships with Trade.” OECD Trade Policy Working Papers 80, OECD, Trade Directorate
- LIANG, F. H. (2008): “Does Foreign Direct Investment Improve the Productivity of Domestic Firms? Technology Spillovers, Industry Linkages, and Firm Capabilities.” Working Paper, Haas School of Business, University of California, Berkeley
- LILEEVA, A. (2006): “Global Links: The Benefits to Domestically-controlled Plants from Inward Direct Investment—The Role of Vertical Linkages.” The Canadian Economy in Transition Research Paper 010, Statistics Canada, Economic Analysis Division
- LIN, P., LIU, Z., AND ZHANG, Y. (2009): “Do Chinese domestic firms benefit from FDI inflow? Evidence of horizontal and vertical spillovers.” *China Economic Review*, 20(4): 677–691.
- LIPSEY, R. E. AND SJÖHOLM, F. (2005): *The Impact of Inward FDI on Host Countries: Why Such Different Answers?*. In Moran, T. H., Graham, E., and Blomström, M., editors, *Does Foreign Direct Investment Promote Development?*, pages 23–43. Institute for International Economics and Center for Global Development.
- LIU, X., WANG, C., AND WEI, Y. (2009): “Do local manufacturing firms benefit from transactional linkages with multinational enterprises in China?.” *Journal of International Business Studies*, 40(7):1113–1130.
- LIU, Z. (2008): “Foreign direct investment and technology spillovers: Theory and evidence.” *Journal of Development Economics*, 85(1-2):176–193.
- MANAGI, S. AND BWALYA, S. M. (2010): “Foreign direct investment and technology spillovers in sub-Saharan Africa.” *Applied Economics Letters*, 17(6):605–608.
- MERLEVEDE, B. AND SCHOORS, K. (2005): “Conditional Spillovers from FDI Within and Between Sectors: Evidence from Romania.” Working Papers, Örebro University, Sweden
- MERLEVEDE, B. AND SCHOORS, K. (2007): “FDI and the Consequences: Towards more complete capture of spillover effects.” William Davidson Institute Working Papers Series 886, William Davidson Institute at the University of Michigan, Stephen M. Ross Business School
- MERLEVEDE, B. AND SCHOORS, K. (2009): “Openness, competition, technology and FDI spillovers: Evidence from Romania.” Working Paper 42, Forum for Research in Empirical International Trade
- MEYER, K. E. AND SINANI, E. (2009): “When and where does foreign direct investment generate positive spillovers? A meta-analysis.” *Journal of International Business Studies*,

- 40(7):1075–1094.
- MOELTNER, K. AND WOODWARD, R. (2009): “Meta-Functional Benefit Transfer for Wetland Valuation: Making the Most of Small Samples.” *Environmental & Resource Economics*, 42(1):89–108.
- NARULA, R. AND MARIN, A. (2003): “FDI spillovers, absorptive capacities and human capital development: Evidence from Argentina.” Research Memoranda 018, Maastricht: MERIT, Maastricht Economic Research Institute on Innovation and Technology
- NELSON, J. AND KENNEDY, P. (2009): “The Use (and Abuse) of Meta-Analysis in Environmental and Natural Resource Economics: An Assessment.” *Environmental & Resource Economics*, 42(3):345–377.
- NGUYEN, A. N., THANG, N., TRUNG, L. D., PHAM, N. Q., NGUYEN, C. D., AND NGUYEN, N. D. (2008): “Foreign Direct Investment in Vietnam: Is There Any Evidence Of Technological Spillover Effects.” Working Papers 18, Development and Policies Research Center, Vietnam
- NGUYEN, C. D., SIMPSON, G., SAAL, D., NGUYEN, A. N., AND PHAM, N. Q. (2008): “FDI Horizontal and Vertical Effects on Local Firm Technical Efficiency.” Working Papers 17, Development and Policies Research Center, Vietnam
- QIU, B., YANG, S., XIN, P., AND KIRKULAK, B. (2009): “FDI technology spillover and the productivity growth of China’s manufacturing sector.” *Frontiers of Economics in China*, 4(2):209–227.
- REGANATI, F. AND SICA, E. (2007): “Horizontal and Vertical Spillovers from FDI: Evidence from Panel Data for the Italian Manufacturing Sector.” *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 8(4):259–266.
- SALA-I-MARTIN, X., DOPPELHOFER, G., AND MILLER, R. (2004): “Determinants of Long-Term Growth: A Bayesian Averaging of Classical Estimates (BACE) Approach.” *American Economic Review*, 94(4):813–835.
- SASIDHARAN, S. AND RAMANATHAN, A. (2007): “Foreign Direct Investment and Spillovers: Evidence from Indian Manufacturing.” *International Journal of Trade and Global Markets*, 1(1):5–22.
- SAWADA, N. (2010): “Technology Gap Matters on Spillover.” *Review of Development Economics*, 14(1):103–120.
- SCHOORS, K. AND VAN DER TOL, B. (2002): “Foreign direct investment spillovers within and between sectors: Evidence from Hungarian data.” Working Papers 02/157, Ghent University, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Belgium
- SMEETS, R. (2008): “Collecting the Pieces of the FDI Knowledge Spillovers Puzzle.” *World Bank Research Observer*, 23(2):107–138.
- SMEETS, R. (2011): “Knowledge diffusion from FDI and Intellectual Property Rights.” CPB Discussion Paper 168, CPB Netherlands Bureau for Economic Policy Analysis
- SMITH, V. K. AND HUANG, J.-C. (1995): “Can Markets Value Air Quality? A Meta-analysis of Hedonic Property Value Models.” *Journal of Political Economy*, 103(1):209–27.
- STANCIK, J. (2007): “Horizontal and Vertical FDI Spillovers: Recent Evidence from the Czech Republic.” CERGE-EI Working Papers 340, CERGE-EI, Prague
- STANCIK, J. (2009): “FDI Spillovers in the Czech Republic: Takeovers vs. Greenfields.” Economic Papers 369, The European Commission
- STANLEY, T. AND DOUCOULIAGOS, H. (2010): “Picture This: A Simple Graph That Reveals

- Much Ado About Research.” *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 24(1):170–191.
- STANLEY, T. D. (2001): “Wheat from Chaff: Meta-analysis as Quantitative Literature Review.” *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15(3):131–150.
- STANLEY, T. D. (2005): “Beyond Publication Bias.” *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 19(3): 309–345.
- STANLEY, T. D. (2008): “Meta-Regression Methods for Detecting and Estimating Empirical Effects in the Presence of Publication Selection.” *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, 70(1):103–127.
- STANLEY, T. D. AND JARRELL, S. B. (1989): “Meta-Regression Analysis: A Quantitative Method of Literature Surveys.” *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 3(2):161–70.
- TANG, H. (2008): “Essays on international trade and investment.” PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- TAYMAZ, E. AND YELMAZ, K. (2008): “Foreign Direct Investment and Productivity Spillovers: Identifying Linkages Through Product-Based Measures.” Working Papers, Koc University
- TONG, S. Y. AND HU, Y. (2007): *Productivity Spillovers from FDI: Detrimental or Beneficial? A Study of Chinese Manufacturing*. In Fleisher, B. M., Li, H., and Song, S., editors, *Market Development In China: Spillovers, Growth and Inequality*, pages 190–208. Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, England.
- VACEK, P. (2007): *Productivity Spillovers from Foreign Direct Investment: Industry-level Analysis*. In *Essays on International Productivity Spillovers*. Ph.D. thesis, Cornell University.
- WANG, C. AND ZHAO, Z. (2008): “Horizontal and vertical spillover effects of foreign direct investment in Chinese manufacturing.” *Journal of Chinese Economic and Foreign Trade Studies*, 1(1):8–20.
- YUDAIEVA, K., KONSTANTIN, K., MELENTIEVA, N., AND PONOMAREVA, N. (2003): “Does Foreign Ownership Matter? Russian Experience.” *Economics of Transition*, 11(3):383–409.
- ZAJC KEJZAR, K. AND KUMAR, A. (2006): “Inward Foreign Direct Investment and Industrial Restructuring: Micro Evidence—The Slovenian Firms’ Growth Model.” *Proceedings of Rijeka School of Economics: Journal of Economics and Business*, 24(2):185–210.

A. Data Appendix

Table A1: List of Studies Included in the Meta-Analysis

Atallah Murra (2006)	Hagemejer and Kolasa (2008)	Merlevede and Schoors (2007)
Barrios et al. (2009)	Halpern and Muraközy (2007)	Merlevede and Schoors (2009)
Békés et al. (2009)	Jabbour and Mucchielli (2007)	Nguyen et al. (2008a)
Blake et al. (2009)	Javorcik (2004)	Nguyen et al. (2008b)
Blalock and Gertler (2008)	Javorcik and Spatareanu (2011)	Qiu et al. (2009)
Blalock and Simon (2009)	Javorcik and Spatareanu (2008)	Reganati and Sica (2007)
Blyde et al. (2004)	Jordaan (2008)	Sasidharan and Ramanathan (2007)
Bwalya (2006)	Kolasa (2008)	Schoors and van der Tol (2002)
Chang et al. (2007)	Le and Pomfret (2008)	Stancik (2007)
Crespo et al. (2009)	Leshner and Miroudot (2008)	Stancik (2009)
Damijan et al. (2003)	Liang (2008)	Tang (2008)
Damijan et al. (2008)	Lileeva (2006)	Taymaz and Yılmaz (2008)
Gersl (2008)	Lin et al. (2009)	Tong and Hu (2007)
Gersl et al. (2007)	Liu (2008)	Vacek (2007)
Girma and Gong (2008)	Liu et al. (2009)	Wang and Zhao (2008)
Girma et al. (2008)	Managi and Bwalya (2010)	Yudaeva et al. (2003)
Girma and Wakelin (2007)	Merlevede and Schoors (2005)	Zajc Kejzar and Kumar (2006)
Gorodnichenko et al. (2007)		

Notes: Both published and unpublished studies are included if they control for vertical spillovers. We use all comparable estimates reported in the studies. The search for primary studies was terminated on March 31, 2010. A list of excluded studies, with reasons for exclusion, is available in the online appendix.

Our database includes evidence on FDI spillovers estimated for 45 countries around the world; together, these countries accounted for about 60% of the flow of inward FDI in 1999-2000 (the median year of the data used by the primary studies in our sample). Almost all European countries are covered (28), as well as all major Asian emerging economies (9), a few African countries (3), and some Latin American economies (5).

Approximately 90% of all studies use firm-level panel data to estimate equation (1). Still, a few cross-sectional sector-level studies have been published after the year 2000, even though Görg and Strobl (2001) showed that cross-sectional studies systematically overstate horizontal spillovers. Most authors use the share of sector output as a measure of foreign presence, but some use the shares of sector employment or equity. The most common control variables include sector competition, demand in downstream sectors, and a measure of absorption capacity (such as the technology gap between domestic and foreign firms or domestic firms' expenditures on research and development).

The majority of authors employ total factor productivity (TFP) as the measure of productivity, while others use output, value added, or labor productivity for the response variable. When computing TFP, most authors take into account the endogeneity of input demand and use the Levinson-Petrin or Olley-Pakes method, but 9% of all estimates are computed using ordinary least squares. Approximately a half of all studies estimate equation (1) in differences. A general-method-of-moments estimator is employed by 3% of the studies, and the translog production function instead of the usual Cobb-Douglas function is employed by 5% of them. For the definition of domestic firms (used on the left-hand side of the regression), most studies employ the threshold of a 10% foreign share, consistent with the most common definition of for-

eign direct investment. Some studies retain the same threshold for the identification of foreign firms used to compute foreign presence (on the right-hand side of the regression), while others use the exact fraction of foreign ownership for the foreign presence computation (more details on the use of different methodologies in the spillover literature are available in Table A2).

Table A2: Description and Summary Statistics of Regression Variables

Variable	Description	Mean	Std. dev.
<i>e</i>	The estimate of the semi-elasticity for horizontal spillovers	-0.002	0.905
Potential spillover determinants			
Technology gap	The logarithm of the country's FDI-stock-weighted gap in GDP per capita with respect to its source countries of FDI (USD, constant prices of 2000).	9.771	0.538
Similarity	The country's FDI-stock-weighted proxy for cultural and language similarity with respect to the source countries of FDI (=1 if countries share either a common language or a colonial link, =2 if both, =0 if neither).	0.628	0.616
Trade openness	The trade openness of the country: (exports + imports)/GDP.	0.709	0.323
Financial dev.	The development of the financial system of the country: (domestic credit to private sector)/GDP.	0.600	0.432
Patent rights	The Ginarte-Park index of patent rights of the country.	3.052	0.793
Human capital	The tertiary school enrollment rate in the country.	0.269	0.186
FDI penetration	The ratio of inward FDI stock to GDP in the country.	0.267	0.186
Fully owned	=1 if only fully foreign-owned investments are considered for linkages (baseline: all firms with foreign ownership are considered).	0.078	0.269
Service sectors	=1 if only firms from service sectors are included in the regression (baseline: manufacturing firms are included).	0.062	0.241
Control Variables			
<i>Data characteristics</i>			
Cross-sectional	=1 if cross-sectional data are used (baseline: panel data).	0.088	0.284
Aggregated	=1 if sector-level data for productivity are used (baseline: firm-level data).	0.034	0.182
Time span	The number of years of the data used.	7.080	3.832
No. of firms	The logarithm of [(the number of observations used)/(time span)].	7.884	2.003
Average year	The average year of the data used (2000 as a base).	-1.120	3.953
Amadeus	=1 if the Amadeus database by Bureau van Dijk Electronic Publishing is used (baseline: Amadeus is not used).	0.215	0.411
<i>Specification characteristics</i>			
Forward	=1 if forward vertical spillovers are included in the regression (baseline: only backward spillovers are controlled for).	0.704	0.457
Employment	=1 if employment is the proxy for foreign presence (baseline: output is the proxy).	0.139	0.346
Equity	=1 if equity is the proxy for foreign presence (baseline: output is the proxy).	0.066	0.248
All firms	=1 if both domestic and foreign firms are included in the regression (baseline: only domestic firms are used).	0.280	0.449
Absorption cap.	=1 if the specification controls for firms' absorption capacity using the technology gap or R&D spending (baseline: no control).	0.057	0.231
Competition	=1 if the specification controls for sector competition (baseline: no control).	0.297	0.457
Regional	=1 if vertical spillovers are measured using the ratio of foreign firms in the region as a proxy for foreign presence (baseline: standard definition).	0.048	0.213
Lagged	=1 if the coefficient represents lagged foreign presence (baseline: contemporaneous coefficient).	0.075	0.264
More estimates	=1 if the coefficient is not the only estimate of horizontal spillovers in the regression (baseline: only one estimate from the regression).	0.488	0.500
Combination	=1 if the coefficient is a marginal effect computed using a combination of reported estimates (baseline: no computation necessary).	0.068	0.253

Continued on next page

Table A2: Description and Summary Statistics of Regression Variables (continued)

Variable	Description	Mean	Std. dev.
<i>Estimation characteristics</i>			
One step	=1 if spillovers are estimated in one step using output, value added, or labor productivity as the response variable (baseline: estimated in two steps).	0.461	0.499
Olley-Pakes	=1 if the Olley-Pakes method is used for the estimation of total factor productivity (baseline: Levinson-Petrin method).	0.224	0.417
OLS	=1 if ordinary least squares (OLS) are used for the estimation of total factor productivity (baseline: Levinson-Petrin method).	0.092	0.289
GMM	=1 if the system general-method-of-moments estimator is used for the estimation of spillovers (baseline: Levinson-Petrin method).	0.028	0.164
Random eff.	=1 if the random-effects estimator is used for the estimation of spillovers (baseline: fixed effects).	0.035	0.184
Pooled OLS	=1 if pooled OLS is used for the estimation of spillovers (baseline: fixed effects).	0.162	0.368
Year fixed	=1 if year fixed effects are included (baseline: not included).	0.837	0.369
Sector fixed	=1 if sector fixed effects are included (baseline: not included).	0.566	0.496
Differences	=1 if the regression is estimated in differences (baseline: estimated in levels).	0.517	0.500
Translog	=1 if the translog production function is used (baseline: Cobb-Douglas function).	0.048	0.213
Log-log	=1 if the coefficient is taken from a specification different from log-level (baseline: log-level).	0.018	0.134
<i>Publication characteristics</i>			
Published	=1 if the study was published in a peer-reviewed journal (baseline: unpublished).	0.289	0.454
Impact	The recursive RePEc impact factor of the outlet. Collected in April 2010.	0.222	0.455
Study citations	The logarithm of [(Google Scholar citations of the study)/(age of the study) + 1]. Collected in April 2010.	1.180	1.026
Native co-author	=1 if at least one co-author is native to the investigated country (baseline: all co-authors non-native).	0.714	0.452
Author citations	The logarithm of (the number of RePEc citations of the most-cited co-author + 1). Collected in April 2010.	2.956	2.508
US-based	=1 if at least one co-author is affiliated with a US-based institution (usually highly ranked institutions in our sample).	0.292	0.455
Publication date	The year and month of publication (January 2000 as a base).	7.827	1.418


Source of the data: UNCTAD, World Development Indicators, www.cepii.org, OECD, and Walter Park's website. For country-level variables we use values for 1999, the median year of the data used in the primary studies.

B. BMA Diagnostics

Table B1: Summary of BMA Estimation


<i>Mean no. regressors</i> 12.359	<i>Draws</i> $2 \cdot 10^8$	<i>Burn-ins</i> $1 \cdot 10^8$	<i>Time</i> 13.679 hours
<i>No. models visited</i> 23,619,112	<i>Modelspace</i> $8.8 \cdot 10^{12}$	<i>Visited</i> 0.00027%	<i>Topmodels</i> 99%
<i>Corr PMP</i> 1.0000	<i>No. Obs.</i> 1195	<i>Model Prior</i> random	<i>g-Prior</i> BRIC
<i>Shrinkage-Stats</i> Av= 0.9995			

Figure B1: Model Size and Convergence



C. BMA Estimation with No Fixed Variables

Figure B2: Bayesian Model Averaging, Model Inclusion



Notes: Columns denote individual models; variables are sorted by posterior inclusion probability in descending order. Blue color (darker in grayscale) = the variable is included and the estimated sign is positive. Red color (lighter in grayscale) = the variable is included and the estimated sign is negative. No color = the variable is not included in the model. The horizontal axis measures the cumulative posterior model probabilities.

CNB WORKING PAPER SERIES

7/2011	Tomáš Havránek Zuzana Iršová	<i>Determinants of horizontal spillovers from FDI: Evidence from a large meta-analysis</i>
6/2011	Roman Horváth Jakub Matějů	<i>How are inflation targets set?</i>
5/2011	Bořek Vašíček	<i>Is monetary policy in the new EU member states asymmetric?</i>
4/2011	Alexis Derviz	<i>Financial frictions, bubbles, and macroprudential policies</i>
3/2011	Jaromír Baxa Roman Horváth Bořek Vašíček	<i>Time-varying monetary-policy rules and financial stress: Does financial instability matter for monetary policy?</i>
2/2011	Marek Rusnák Tomáš Havránek Roman Horváth	<i>How to solve the price puzzle? A meta-analysis</i>
1/2011	Jan Babecký Aleš Bulíř Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Sustainable real exchange rates in the new EU member states: What did the Great Recession change?</i>
15/2010	Ke Pang Pierre L. Siklos	<i>Financial frictions and credit spreads</i>
14/2010	Filip Novotný Marie Raková	<i>Assessment of consensus forecasts accuracy: The Czech National Bank perspective</i>
13/2010	Jan Filáček Branislav Saxa	<i>Central bank forecasts as a coordination device</i>
12/2010	Kateřina Arnoštová David Havrlant Luboš Růžička Peter Tóth	<i>Short-term forecasting of Czech quarterly GDP using monthly indicators</i>
11/2010	Roman Horváth Kateřina Šmídková Jan Zápál	<i>Central banks' voting records and future policy</i>
10/2010	Alena Bičáková Zuzana Prelcová Renata Pašaličová	<i>Who borrows and who may not repay?</i>
9/2010	Luboš Komárek Jan Babecký Zlataše Komárková	<i>Financial integration at times of financial instability</i>
8/2010	Kamil Dybczak Peter Tóth David Voňka	<i>Effects of price shocks to consumer demand. Estimating the QUAIDS demand system on Czech Household Budget Survey data</i>
7/2010	Jan Babecký Philip Du Caju Theodora Kosma Martina Lawless Julián Messina Tairi Rõõm	<i>The margins of labour cost adjustment: Survey evidence from European Firms</i>
6/2010	Tomáš Havránek Roman Horváth Jakub Matějů	<i>Do financial variables help predict macroeconomic environment? The case of the Czech Republic</i>
5/2010	Roman Horváth	<i>Does money help predict inflation? An empirical assessment for</i>

	Luboš Komárek Filip Rozsypal	<i>Central Europe</i>
4/2010	Oxana Babecká Kucharčuková Jan Babecký Martin Raiser	<i>A Gravity approach to modelling international trade in South-Eastern Europe and the Commonwealth of Independent States: The role of geography, policy and institutions</i>
3/2010	Tomáš Havránek Zuzana Iršová	<i>Which foreigners are worth wooing? A Meta-analysis of vertical spillovers from FDI</i>
2/2010	Jaromír Baxa Roman Horváth Bořek Vašíček	<i>How does monetary policy change? Evidence on inflation targeting countries</i>
1/2010	Adam Geršl Petr Jakubík	<i>Relationship lending in the Czech Republic</i>
15/2009	David N. DeJong Roman Liesenfeld Guilherme V. Moura Jean-Francois Richard Hariharan Dharmarajan	<i>Efficient likelihood evaluation of state-space representations</i>
14/2009	Charles W. Calomiris	<i>Banking crises and the rules of the game</i>
13/2009	Jakub Seidler Petr Jakubík	<i>The Merton approach to estimating loss given default: Application to the Czech Republic</i>
12/2009	Michal Hlaváček Luboš Komárek	<i>Housing price bubbles and their determinants in the Czech Republic and its regions</i>
11/2009	Kamil Dybczak Kamil Galuščák	<i>Changes in the Czech wage structure: Does immigration matter?</i>
10/2009	Jiří Böhm Petr Král Branislav Saxa	<i>Perception is always right: The CNB's monetary policy in the media</i>
9/2009	Alexis Derviz Marie Raková	<i>Funding costs and loan pricing by multinational bank affiliates</i>
8/2009	Roman Horváth Anca Maria Podpiera	<i>Heterogeneity in bank pricing policies: The Czech evidence</i>
7/2009	David Kocourek Filip Pertold	<i>The impact of early retirement incentives on labour market participation: Evidence from a parametric change in the Czech Republic</i>
6/2009	Nauro F. Campos Roman Horváth	<i>Reform redux: Measurement, determinants and reversals</i>
5/2009	Kamil Galuščák Mary Keeney Daphne Nicolitsas Frank Smets Pawel Strzelecki Matija Vodopivec	<i>The determination of wages of newly hired employees: Survey evidence on internal versus external factors</i>
4/2009	Jan Babecký Philip Du Caju Theodora Kosma Martina Lawless Julián Messina Tairi Rõõm	<i>Downward nominal and real wage rigidity: Survey evidence from European firms</i>

3/2009	Jiri Podpiera Laurent Weill	<i>Measuring excessive risk-taking in banking</i>
2/2009	Michal Andrlé Tibor Hlédik Ondra Kameník Jan Vlček	<i>Implementing the new structural model of the Czech National Bank</i>
1/2009	Kamil Dybczak Jan Babecký	<i>The impact of population ageing on the Czech economy</i>
14/2008	Gabriel Fagan Vitor Gaspar	<i>Macroeconomic adjustment to monetary union</i>
13/2008	Giuseppe Bertola Anna Lo Prete	<i>Openness, financial markets, and policies: Cross-country and dynamic patterns</i>
12/2008	Jan Babecký Kamil Dybczak Kamil Galuščák	<i>Survey on wage and price formation of Czech firms</i>
11/2008	Dana Hájková	<i>The measurement of capital services in the Czech Republic</i>
10/2008	Michal Franta	<i>Time aggregation bias in discrete time models of aggregate duration data</i>
9/2008	Petr Jakubík Christian Schmieder	<i>Stress testing credit risk: Is the Czech Republic different from Germany?</i>
8/2008	Sofia Bauducco Aleš Bulíř Martin Čihák	<i>Monetary policy rules with financial instability</i>
7/2008	Jan Brůha Jiří Podpiera	<i>The origins of global imbalances</i>
6/2008	Jiří Podpiera Marie Raková	<i>The price effects of an emerging retail market</i>
5/2008	Kamil Dybczak David Voňka Nico van der Windt	<i>The effect of oil price shocks on the Czech economy</i>
4/2008	Magdalena M. Borys Roman Horváth	<i>The effects of monetary policy in the Czech Republic: An empirical study</i>
3/2008	Martin Cincibuch Tomáš Holub Jaromír Hurník	<i>Central bank losses and economic convergence</i>
2/2008	Jiří Podpiera	<i>Policy rate decisions and unbiased parameter estimation in conventionally estimated monetary policy rules</i>
1/2008	Balázs Égert Dobravko Mihaljek	<i>Determinants of house prices in Central and Eastern Europe</i>
17/2007	Pedro Portugal	<i>U.S. unemployment duration: Has long become longer or short become shorter?</i>
16/2007	Yuliya Rychalovská	<i>Welfare-based optimal monetary policy in a two-sector small open economy</i>
15/2007	Juraj Antal František Brázdk	<i>The effects of anticipated future change in the monetary policy regime</i>
14/2007	Aleš Bulíř Kateřina Šmídková Viktor Kotlán David Navrátil	<i>Inflation targeting and communication: Should the public read inflation reports or tea leaves?</i>

13/2007	Martin Cinnibuch Martina Horníková	<i>Measuring the financial markets' perception of EMU enlargement: The role of ambiguity aversion</i>
12/2007	Oxana Babetskaia- Kukharchuk	<i>Transmission of exchange rate shocks into domestic inflation: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
11/2007	Jan Filáček	<i>Why and how to assess inflation target fulfilment</i>
10/2007	Michal Franta Branislav Saxa Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Inflation persistence in new EU member states: Is it different than in the Euro area members?</i>
9/2007	Kamil Galuščák Jan Pavel	<i>Unemployment and inactivity traps in the Czech Republic: Incentive effects of policies</i>
8/2007	Adam Geršl Ieva Rubene Tina Zumer	<i>Foreign direct investment and productivity spillovers: Updated evidence from Central and Eastern Europe</i>
7/2007	Ian Babetskii Luboš Komárek Zlataše Komárková	<i>Financial integration of stock markets among new EU member states and the euro area</i>
6/2007	Anca Pruteanu-Podpiera Laurent Weill Franziska Schobert	<i>Market power and efficiency in the Czech banking sector</i>
5/2007	Jiří Podpiera Laurent Weill	<i>Bad luck or bad management? Emerging banking market experience</i>
4/2007	Roman Horváth	<i>The time-varying policy neutral rate in real time: A predictor for future inflation?</i>
3/2007	Jan Brůha Jiří Podpiera Stanislav Polák	<i>The convergence of a transition economy: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
2/2007	Ian Babetskii Nauro F. Campos	<i>Does reform work? An econometric examination of the reform-growth puzzle</i>
1/2007	Ian Babetskii Fabrizio Coricelli Roman Horváth	<i>Measuring and explaining inflation persistence: Disaggregate evidence on the Czech Republic</i>
13/2006	Frederic S. Mishkin Klaus Schmidt- Hebbel	<i>Does inflation targeting make a difference?</i>
12/2006	Richard Disney Sarah Bridges John Gathergood	<i>Housing wealth and household indebtedness: Is there a household 'financial accelerator'?</i>
11/2006	Michel Juillard Ondřej Kameník Michael Kumhof Douglas Laxton	<i>Measures of potential output from an estimated DSGE model of the United States</i>
10/2006	Jiří Podpiera Marie Raková	<i>Degree of competition and export-production relative prices when the exchange rate changes: Evidence from a panel of Czech exporting companies</i>
9/2006	Alexis Derviz Jiří Podpiera	<i>Cross-border lending contagion in multinational banks</i>
8/2006	Aleš Bulíř Jaromír Hurník	<i>The Maastricht inflation criterion: "Saints" and "Sinners"</i>

7/2006	Alena Bičáková Jiří Slačálek Michal Slavík	<i>Fiscal implications of personal tax adjustments in the Czech Republic</i>
6/2006	Martin Fukač Adrian Pagan	<i>Issues in adopting DSGE models for use in the policy process</i>
5/2006	Martin Fukač	<i>New Keynesian model dynamics under heterogeneous expectations and adaptive learning</i>
4/2006	Kamil Dybczak Vladislav Flek Dana Hájková Jaromír Hurník	<i>Supply-side performance and structure in the Czech Republic (1995–2005)</i>
3/2006	Aleš Krejdl	<i>Fiscal sustainability – definition, indicators and assessment of Czech public finance sustainability</i>
2/2006	Kamil Dybczak	<i>Generational accounts in the Czech Republic</i>
1/2006	Ian Babetskii	<i>Aggregate wage flexibility in selected new EU member states</i>
<hr/>		
14/2005	Stephen G. Cecchetti	<i>The brave new world of central banking: The policy challenges posed by asset price booms and busts</i>
13/2005	Robert F. Engle Jose Gonzalo Rangel	<i>The spline GARCH model for unconditional volatility and its global macroeconomic causes</i>
12/2005	Jaromír Beneš Tibor Hlédik Michael Kumhof David Vávra	<i>An economy in transition and DSGE: What the Czech national bank's new projection model needs</i>
11/2005	Marek Hlaváček Michael Koňák Josef Čada	<i>The application of structured feedforward neural networks to the modelling of daily series of currency in circulation</i>
10/2005	Ondřej Kameník	<i>Solving SDGE models: A new algorithm for the sylvester equation</i>
9/2005	Roman Šustek	<i>Plant-level nonconvexities and the monetary transmission mechanism</i>
8/2005	Roman Horváth	<i>Exchange rate variability, pressures and optimum currency area criteria: Implications for the central and eastern european countries</i>
7/2005	Balázs Égert Luboš Komárek	<i>Foreign exchange interventions and interest rate policy in the Czech Republic: Hand in glove?</i>
6/2005	Anca Podpiera Jiří Podpiera	<i>Deteriorating cost efficiency in commercial banks signals an increasing risk of failure</i>
5/2005	Luboš Komárek Martin Melecký	<i>The behavioural equilibrium exchange rate of the Czech koruna</i>
4/2005	Kateřina Arnoštová Jaromír Hurník	<i>The monetary transmission mechanism in the Czech Republic (evidence from VAR analysis)</i>
3/2005	Vladimír Benáček Jiří Podpiera Ladislav Prokop	<i>Determining factors of Czech foreign trade: A cross-section time series perspective</i>
2/2005	Kamil Galuščák Daniel Münich	<i>Structural and cyclical unemployment: What can we derive from the matching function?</i>
1/2005	Ivan Babouček Martin Jančar	<i>Effects of macroeconomic shocks to the quality of the aggregate loan portfolio</i>

10/2004	Aleš Bulíř Kateřina Šmídková	<i>Exchange rates in the new EU accession countries: What have we learned from the forerunners</i>
9/2004	Martin Cincibuch Jiří Podpiera	<i>Beyond Balassa-Samuelson: Real appreciation in tradables in transition countries</i>
8/2004	Jaromír Beneš David Vávra	<i>Eigenvalue decomposition of time series with application to the Czech business cycle</i>
7/2004	Vladislav Flek, ed.	<i>Anatomy of the Czech labour market: From over-employment to under-employment in ten years?</i>
6/2004	Narcisa Kadlčáková Joerg Keplinger	<i>Credit risk and bank lending in the Czech Republic</i>
5/2004	Petr Král	<i>Identification and measurement of relationships concerning inflow of FDI: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
4/2004	Jiří Podpiera	<i>Consumers, consumer prices and the Czech business cycle identification</i>
3/2004	Anca Pruteanu	<i>The role of banks in the Czech monetary policy transmission mechanism</i>
2/2004	Ian Babetskii	<i>EU enlargement and endogeneity of some OCA criteria: Evidence from the CEECs</i>
1/2004	Alexis Derviz Jiří Podpiera	<i>Predicting bank CAMELS and S&P ratings: The case of the Czech Republic</i>

CNB RESEARCH AND POLICY NOTES

1/2011	Jiří Böhm Jan Filáček Ivana Kubicová Romana Zamazalová	<i>Price-level targeting – A real alternative to inflation targeting?</i>
1/2008	Nicos Christodoulakis	<i>Ten years of EMU: Convergence, divergence and new policy priorities</i>
2/2007	Carl E. Walsh	<i>Inflation targeting and the role of real objectives</i>
1/2007	Vojtěch Benda Luboš Růžička	<i>Short-term forecasting methods based on the LEI approach: The case of the Czech Republic</i>
2/2006	Garry J. Schinasi	<i>Private finance and public policy</i>
1/2006	Ondřej Schneider	<i>The EU budget dispute – A blessing in disguise?</i>
5/2005	Jan Stráský	<i>Optimal forward-looking policy rules in the quarterly projection model of the Czech National Bank</i>
4/2005	Vít Bárta	<i>Fulfilment of the Maastricht inflation criterion by the Czech Republic: Potential costs and policy options</i>
3/2005	Helena Šůvová Eva Kozelková David Zeman Jaroslava Bauerová	<i>Eligibility of external credit assessment institutions</i>
2/2005	Martin Čihák Jaroslav Heřmánek	<i>Stress testing the Czech banking system: Where are we? Where are we going?</i>
1/2005	David Navrátil	<i>The CNB's policy decisions – Are they priced in by the markets?</i>

Viktor Kotlán

4/2004	Aleš Bulíř	<i>External and fiscal sustainability of the Czech economy: A quick look through the IMF's night-vision goggles</i>
3/2004	Martin Čihák	<i>Designing stress tests for the Czech banking system</i>
2/2004	Martin Čihák	<i>Stress testing: A review of key concepts</i>
1/2004	Tomáš Holub	<i>Foreign exchange interventions under inflation targeting: The Czech experience</i>

CNB ECONOMIC RESEARCH BULLETIN

April 2011	<i>Monetary policy analysis in a central bank</i>
November 2010	<i>Wage adjustment in Europe</i>
May 2010	<i>Ten years of economic research in the CNB</i>
November 2009	<i>Financial and global stability issues</i>
May 2009	<i>Evaluation of the fulfilment of the CNB's inflation targets 1998–2007</i>
December 2008	<i>Inflation targeting and DSGE models</i>
April 2008	<i>Ten years of inflation targeting</i>
December 2007	<i>Fiscal policy and its sustainability</i>
August 2007	<i>Financial stability in a transforming economy</i>
November 2006	<i>ERM II and euro adoption</i>
August 2006	<i>Research priorities and central banks</i>
November 2005	<i>Financial stability</i>
May 2005	<i>Potential output</i>
October 2004	<i>Fiscal issues</i>
May 2004	<i>Inflation targeting</i>
December 2003	<i>Equilibrium exchange rate</i>

Czech National Bank
Economic Research Department
Na Příkopě 28, 115 03 Praha 1
Czech Republic

phone: +420 2 244 12 321

fax: +420 2 244 14 278

<http://www.cnb.cz>

e-mail: research@cnb.cz

ISSN 1803-7070