



THE FOURTEENTH YOUNG ECONOMISTS' SEMINAR

TO THE TWENTY-FIFTH DUBROVNIK ECONOMIC CONFERENCE

Organized by the Croatian National Bank

Matej Bule and Andrijana Ćudina

Foreign Direct Equity Investments and Foreign Ownership Premium: The Case of Croatia

Hotel "Grand Villa Argentina"

Dubrovnik

June 17, 2019

Draft version

Please do not quote



CROATIAN NATIONAL BANK

FOREIGN DIRECT EQUITY INVESTMENTS AND FOREIGN OWNERSHIP PREMIUM: THE CASE OF CROATIA

Matej Bule*, Andrijana Ćudina**

Summary

This paper analyzes the structure of foreign direct equity investments in Croatia and econometrically tests the existence of foreign ownership premium among Croatian non-financial companies. Using a novel dataset generated by the merger of two firm-level databases, it is found that in the 2002-2017 period foreign equity investments in non-financial companies were relatively modest and that the bulk of investments was motivated by the expansion on the local market (market seeking FDI), and only partly by increasing the efficiency of the investor's business group. As for the mode of entry, most investments were greenfield projects, although brownfield investments were also significant, reflecting the large scale privatization of state-owned companies. However, it is found that the industry structure of investments was unfavorable as only a smaller part went into tradeable sectors and high-tech industries. Compared to domestically owned companies, regression analysis has firmly established the existence of organizational, technological and financial premium of foreign ownership among Croatian non-financial companies, which differs depending on the size of the company, industrial and regional affiliations, business orientation on local or foreign markets, type of foreign ownership, mode of entry, as well as the origin of the foreign investor. Actually, the foreign ownership premium is higher in small and medium companies and those that are oriented towards the local market, and when the concentration of foreign ownership is higher. Also, the premium is higher when the foreign investor originates from a more developed country.

Key words: *foreign direct investment, foreign ownership premium*

JEL classification: F21, F23, L20, C21

* Croatian National Bank, matej.bule@hnb.hr

** Croatian National Bank, andrijana.cudina@hnb.hr

1. Introduction

During the last almost three decades, many of the less developed European countries have been trying to attract foreign investment recognizing its potential in accelerating economic growth and smoothing the transition from planned to market economy. Indeed, foreign investment brings numerous benefits to the host economy, both at a macroeconomic and microeconomic level. Apart from being a relatively stable form of capital inflow, which is particularly important for countries with inadequate domestic savings and accumulated macroeconomic imbalances, foreign direct investment brings abundant macroeconomic benefits, most important being the job creation, increasing tax revenues, widening export base and increasing the competitiveness of the economy. At the microeconomic level, foreign ownership surges the transfer of superior knowledge and technology, creates opportunities for faster involvement in global value chains, and often provides access to more stable and affordable sources of funding.

Although the policy makers often take the benefits of foreign direct investments for granted, the empirical findings on their true impact are not that straightforward. Specifically, empirical studies are often based on aggregate macroeconomic data on inflows or stocks of foreign investments, almost completely neglecting the fact that behind the aggregate variables there are numerous investment projects, heterogeneous in nature, that can ultimately affect the recipient country in different ways, depending on the motives behind each investment as well as the mode of entry of foreign investors on the local market. In that context, with the increased availability of micro data, the newer literature increasingly places companies at the very center of their research of the effects of foreign investment. The basic assumption of this type of research is that foreign investors invest in other countries in order to materialize the advantages of having the resources that are not necessarily available to local entrepreneurs (Dunning, 1993).

Following the same assumption, this research seeks to examine the benefits of foreign ownership on the example of Croatian companies over the 2002-2017 period through the estimation of foreign ownership premium reflected in different organizational, technological or financial aspects of non-financial companies. Premiums are estimated for different types of foreign investments, depending on the motivation of investors (expansion on the local market or increasing efficiency of the investors' business group), mode of entry (independent venture, joint venture, privatization or takeover), size of the company, industry field, country of foreign investor, etc.

The paper is structured as follows. After the introduction, the second chapter provides a brief overview of empirical literature, with an emphasis on the contribution from this particular research. Then, in the third chapter, the data sources used in the descriptive and empirical part of the research are described. The fourth chapter presents a detailed descriptive analysis of foreign direct investment in Croatia based on data collected by the Croatian National Bank and the Financial Agency directly from companies, which, according to the authors' best knowledge, have not been used so far in such structural analysis of the foreign investment. Based on the same data, the fifth chapter econometrically evaluates foreign ownership premium with regard to different criteria (industry and region in which the company operates, its business orientation, relation with the foreign investors, as well as the mode in which the investment was carried out).

2. Literature overview and research contribution

Empirical literature dealing with the effects of foreign direct equity investments on the recipient country is quite rich. However, most of the literature are multi-country macroeconomic studies that only partly take into account the specifics of each national economy, and thus cannot be widely applied. By contrast, microeconomic studies that rely on firm-level data and thus take into account the heterogeneity of individual investment projects (Wang et al., 2012), allow for a more precise measurement of the effects of foreign investment on the business performance of individual companies, as well as the measurement of spillover effects on other companies and consequently on the overall macroeconomic activity. Thanks to the increasing availability and quality of the data, the number of micro-based studies is on the rise at the global level.

Methodologically speaking, in microeconomic studies, the effects of foreign investment are most often measured by the direct comparison of foreign and domestically owned companies through the calculation of the so-called foreign ownership premium using various firm characteristics and performance indicators. Expectedly, most such studies confirm the generally accepted assumption that foreign-owned companies have better characteristics and performance than domestically owned companies (this was confirmed by Doms and Jensen in 1995 on the example of US companies; Goethals and Ooghe in 1997 for Belgian companies; Conyon et al. in 2002 for British companies; Aydin et al. in 2007 for Turkish companies; and Gelübcke in 2012 for German companies). Most mentioned authors point to higher productivity and wages in foreign-owned companies, their greater capital and technological intensity as well as their better financial performance, primarily the higher profitability and lower financing costs. They attribute these findings to the fact that foreign-owned companies possess specific advantages that enable them to use scarce resources more efficiently than the domestically owned companies, primarily in terms of more advanced technology, better financial conditions and higher-quality human capital (Caves, 2007; Shiu, 2009). The explanation may also be in the positive selection by foreign investors when choosing domestic companies in which to invest, i.e. in their tendency to invest in companies with above-average performance (Bentivogli and Mirenda, 2016).

However, there are exceptions. For example, Konings (2001) did not find any positive effects of foreign ownership in the sample of Bulgarian and Romanian companies, as did not Khawar (2003) on the example of Mexican companies. Likewise, Barbosa and Louri (2005) found almost no difference between foreign and domestically owned companies in Portugal and Greece. According to these studies, better knowledge of local markets and established distribution channels are some of the advantages that can be better capitalized by domestic owners rather than foreigners. Whereas most of the mentioned studies did not distinguish between different levels of foreign ownership, Azzam et al. (2013) have shown that foreign ownership may have non-linear effects, i.e. that its positive effects decrease after a certain level of foreign ownership. Similarly, Hintošova and Kubikova (2016), on the example of Slovak companies, confirmed that the company's performance improves with higher level of foreign ownership, but only up to the level of about 60%, after which it deteriorates compared to peer companies.

In most studies examining the case of Croatia, the effects of foreign direct equity investments are analyzed from a macroeconomic perspective (Vukšić, 2005; Derado et al., 2011; Derado, 2013; Kersan-Škrabić, 2014). Only a few studies have been carried out at the microeconomic level, and

these are relatively outdated studies focusing on the manufacturing sector. Škudar (2004) confirmed positive effects of direct equity investments, both greenfield and brownfield, on the example of Croatian manufacturing companies in the period from 1998 to 2002. These positive effects are reflected in faster income and capital as well as productivity growth of foreign-owned companies. The same author emphasized that positive effects of direct investment on the firm-level did not translate into macroeconomic benefits, at least not as much as in other transition European countries, due to the relatively small volume of foreign investments in the Croatian case. Another significant research, Marić (2008), on the sample of about 2,400 companies in the period from 1999 to 2005 also confirmed positive effects of foreign ownership on the productivity of companies that are subject of foreign investment as well as spillover effects on the productivity of other companies in the manufacturing industry.

Research questions raised by these authors are still very important for Croatia, especially in the context of low potential growth of the domestic economy and the possible positive impact of equity investments in that regard. This research complements the existing empirical knowledge on the link between foreign ownership and business performance at the micro level, which is the basis for understanding the impact of FDI at the macroeconomic level. Actually, the contribution of this research is significant in many ways. Foremost, using a newly created data set, the paper disaggregates the foreign direct equity investments in Croatia by new criteria, with perhaps the most interesting being the motives of foreign investors and the mode of their entry on the local market, thus shedding a new light on aggregate FDI developments in Croatia. At the microeconomic level, the main contribution of this research is in the estimation of foreign ownership premium using a considerably broader set of structural and performance indicators that have not been used previously, while using a larger sample of companies over a longer period of time (2002 - 2017). Namely, for the first time, according to the authors' best knowledge, the regression model is used to estimate the foreign ownership premium in various organizational, technological and financial aspects of business performance of Croatian non-financial companies. The model takes into account the heterogeneity among companies in terms of their size, industry field and regional affiliation, business orientation, modality of foreign ownership, etc. The differentiation of the foreign ownership premium with respect to all of these aspects significantly contributes to better understanding of the behavior of foreign investors and can be used by policy makers in creating measures to stimulate foreign investment with a view of improving the country's macroeconomic outlook.

3. Data sources

For the purposes of this study, data from two firm-level databases was used. The first one is the Croatian National Bank's (CNB) database containing detailed information on foreign direct equity investments¹ from 1990 to 2018. Namely, legal entities in Croatia are obliged to report to the CNB the prescribed data on foreign direct investments for the purpose of monitoring external sector developments, i.e. the compilation of the balance of payments. The advantage of the CNB database is that it is the only source that includes specific information related to each investment,

¹ In this paper the definition of foreign direct equity investments refers to those investments where a foreign owner acquires at least 10% of the share in the company's share capital.

like the type of investment, method of payment, country of investor, acquired share in the company, etc. This database is then merged with the annual financial statements of non-financial companies reported to the Financial Agency (FINA) during 2002-2017 period. Companies operating in Croatia are obliged to submit their financial statements to FINA for statistical and other purposes, which are then aggregated and made available to other institutions and users. The FINA database contains several hundred information from companies' balance sheets and the profit and loss accounts. By merging these two databases, a unique data set is created, enabling a much more detailed desegregation of total foreign direct investment as well as a deeper insight into the microeconomic aspects of foreign investment.

Based on this newly created data set, in Chapter 4 total foreign direct investment in non-financial companies during 2002-2017 period is desegregated. The desegregation analysis encompasses 9,717 non-financial companies subject to foreign investment at different years during the observed period. These are companies for which complete data are available, i.e. those that have properly reported the data on foreign investments to the CNB and have also submitted annual financial statements to FINA. The analysis does not include 456 companies that did not submit annual financial statements to FINA, but their importance in the total value of foreign direct investment is not significant, as those are mostly inactive companies².

The calculation of the foreign ownership premium in Chapter 5 is based on a sample of 35,324 companies, out of which 2,185 are foreign-owned and 33,139 are domestically owned. The sample was created by "cleaning" the total population of non-financial companies that properly report to FINA, using several criteria. Namely, in the period from 2002 to 2017, more than 100 thousand companies operated in Croatia, in which the previously mentioned 9,717 were foreign-owned. Out of the total population, first were excluded the companies operating in those activities where no foreign investments were recorded in the observed period (at the fifth level of the NACE Classification). Then, companies having less than 10 employees on average during the observed period were excluded. The detailed overview of the sample structure according to different criteria is given in Table 1 in the Appendix of the Paper.

4. The structure of foreign direct equity investments

Looking at aggregate indicators of foreign direct investments, like the stock of FDI in percent of GDP, Croatia stands out as one of the best performers among new EU member states, which is somewhat surprising given that Croatia lags behind peer countries when it comes to the overall macroeconomic performance. Firm-level data used in the analysis below, shows somewhat different picture of the seemingly favorable performance of the Croatian economy when it comes to attracting FDI, as it allows for detailed insight into the composition of realized inflows of foreign investments.


First of all, total inflow of foreign direct investment in Croatia is to a large extent related to equity investments in the financial sector, which is expected in view of the bank-centric financial system

² Because of the adjustments made by authors for analytical purposes and other methodological differences, aggregate data on foreign direct equity investments may differ from official CNB data.

and the high share of foreign ownership in the domestic banking sector³. As indicated in Figure 1 (left), during the period of excessive credit activity before the global financial crisis, there was a noticeable inflow of direct equity investments associated with banks and insurance companies, while after the crisis and the collapse of credit activity these inflows almost completely dried up. Secondly, there are also significant foreign investments that have been realized by converting the debt to affiliated companies into equity (debt-to-equity swaps). Such transactions intensified with the outbreak of the crisis, creating an appearance of higher level of foreign equity investments, while in fact, these foreign-owned companies came into difficulties and their debt to their parents was converted into equity as part of their restructuring program. Furthermore, in Croatia there are so-called round-tripping transactions that increase the level of direct equity investments on both assets and liabilities side of the FDI account (such investments have been realized in larger amount by several companies in 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2014).

When these three categories mentioned above are excluded, the remaining foreign direct equity investments in non-financial companies (excluding debt-to-equity swaps) in Croatia are significantly smaller than the aggregate numbers. The average value of foreign equity investment over the 2002-2017 period halves from 3.1% of GDP to 1.5% of GDP. Nevertheless, although relatively modest, the inflow of investments into non-financial companies was stable throughout the observed period (ranging from 1 to 2% of GDP), which supports the theoretical assumptions that foreign direct investments are relatively stable form of capital flows (Loungani and Razin, 2001; Lipsey, 2001; Sula and Willet, 2006). The only exceptions were in 2006 and 2008, when somewhat larger investments were recorded, almost exclusively reflecting one-off effects associated with large scale privatizations of two state-owned enterprises in the manufacture of chemicals and oil industry.

Figure 1. Foreign direct equity investment in Croatia (left) and the structure of foreign direct equity investments in non-financial companies by activities (right)



Note: The left panel excludes round-tripping transactions, the right panel excludes also debt-to-equity swaps and equity investments associated with banks and insurance companies.

Sources: Authors' calculation based on FINA and CNB data

³ According to CNB data, the share of foreign-owned banks' assets in total banks assets at end 2018 stood at 90.1%, similarly as during the whole period observed in this paper (available at <https://www.hnb.hr/-/pokazatelj-poslovanja-kreditnih-institucija>).


Not only that foreign direct equity investments in non-financial companies are relatively modest, their structure is also quite unfavorable, as can be seen in the Figure 1 (right). Namely, investments in non-tradable sectors such as trade, telecommunications and real estate are most represented. At the same time, the tradable industries are underrepresented, with most foreign investments realized in the oil industry and the manufacture of chemicals and tobacco, whereas the total value of foreign equity investments is again dominated by several companies that were privatized or taken over from the private owner. Apart from these industries, the other manufacturing industries and accommodation stand out as activities with somewhat greater export potential. In addition to the prevalence the non-tradable sector, the structure of investments in terms of technological intensity is also unfavorable. Namely, nearly four-fifths of foreign investments made in the manufacturing industry (excluding oil, tobacco and chemical industry) refer to low-tech or medium-low-tech activities⁴.

Figure 2 (left) shows foreign direct equity investments into non-financial companies by the mode of entry of foreign investors into the local market. Any foreign investment is preceded by a decision on the mode of entry, i.e. whether the investor will start the business from the very beginning by establishing a new company or by taking over an existing company. In this context, one can distinguish between⁵ greenfield investments, which imply the establishment of a new company, and brownfield investments involving the take-over of an existing company from a private resident or the privatization of a state-owned company. If the investor decides to establish a new company, the next decision is whether to do it independently or in the form of a joint venture where the key difference is that joint venture, along with potential advantages, also carries along certain risks for the foreign investor due to a lower degree of control. In this connection, it should be noted that in the context of a positive contribution of foreign investments to the host country, literature generally gives preference to greenfield investments (for example, Bayar, 2017; Neto et al., 2010; Luu, 2016). On the other hand, significant brownfield investments are not uncommon in transition and post-transition countries which went through the process of privatization and external liberalization of the economy, often pressed by insufficient domestic savings and macroeconomic imbalances.

⁴Sectoral division of manufacturing industry according to the degree of technological intensity is made according to Eurostat classification (investing in research and development / added value); http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statisticsexplained/index.php/Glossary:Hightech_classification_of_manufacturing_industries

⁵ The division by type of investment shown in Figure 2 (left) is based on the initial status of the company / project and any later recapitalization of the same company is attributed to the same investment type. In this way, the time dimension of the investment project is taken into account, which is especially relevant for the newly established companies, as the realization of greenfield projects can last for several years, whereas foreign investors often pay the minimum founding capital at the very beginning and later recapitalize the company.

Figure 2. Greenfield and brownfield investments into non-financial companies by mode of entry of foreign investor (left) and structure of investment values by activity (right)



Note: Data excludes round-tripping transactions, debt-to-equity swaps and equity investments associated with banks and insurance companies. Brownfield project data refers to the number of new acquisitions and privatizations per year, while data on the number of greenfield projects refer to the number of new companies being established by foreign investors (whether individually or jointly with other investors) in the observed year. Greenfield projects do not include real estate projects.

Sources: Authors' calculation based on FINA and CNB data

This is also the case in Croatia, where brownfield investments were significant in years before the crisis (amounted to around 53% of total foreign equity investments in 2002-2008 period), when large privatization projects took place. However, after the crisis, the importance of brownfield investment declined (accounting for around 35% of total foreign equity investments in 2009-2017 period), as there were no significant privatizations. However, the amount of transactions related to companies that were acquired from domestic private owners increased notably, primarily due to the later recapitalization of earlier takeovers, while the value of new takeovers started recovering only in 2012 (Figure 2 left). However, this structure is partly expected, given that acquisitions are often larger in value than greenfield projects. Looking at the number of new projects⁶, greenfield investments are much more frequent than brownfield projects, although the number of new projects, both greenfield and brownfield, has been severely reduced since the outbreak of the crisis. Only after Croatia's accession to the European Union the number of new projects increased shortly, but soon returned to the level recorded immediately after the EU entry.


Looking at greenfield investments in more detail, in Figure 2 (left) it can be noticed that a joint venture as a modality of direct investment is highly represented, most of which are actually joint ventures with local entrepreneurs. There are numerous motives why a foreign investor engages in a joint business venture with a local entrepreneur, but it is usually for two opposing reasons. First and foremost, a foreign investor associates with a domestic entrepreneur to share technology, know-how and resources, and to use local knowledge of business practices and established distribution channels, which significantly increases the likelihood of positive spillovers from foreign investments. On the other hand, there are also cases when the reason for the joint venture is in the high level of administrative and other barriers to doing business (for example, a high level

⁶ The number of new greenfield projects refers to the number of new companies established in the observed year, with the real estate business being excluded. Prior to Croatia's joining the European Union, it was difficult for non-residents to purchase real estate in Croatia, so it was often a practice to set up companies which served only for the acquisition of the real-estate and kept out of business thereafter.

of corruption), whereby joint ventures with local companies reduce the investment risks. The reasons why in fact foreign investors in Croatia associate with local entrepreneurs are difficult to establish and are not best explored, with the existing literature mainly dealing with the motives of local entrepreneurs, not foreign investors (for example, Matic and Čenan, 2007; Bilas et al. 2012).

However, the biggest differences between greenfield and brownfield investments in non-financial companies in Croatia are visible from the structure by activities (Figure 2 right). Most greenfield investments relate to trade and, to a lesser extent, other business services, real estate and other manufacturing industries (excluding oil industry and the manufacture of chemicals). By contrast, the majority of brownfield investments were realized in the manufacturing industry, which was greatly affected by the privatizations of oil and pharmaceutical industry, as well as significant takeovers in other manufacturing industries, while only a small part of the investment relates to trade. Nevertheless, it is not surprising that takeovers are more frequent in sectors with somewhat greater entry barriers and greater technological and capital intensity, such as the manufacturing industry, while the establishment of a new business is certainly more suitable in sectors such as trade.

Figure 3. Direct foreign investment in nonfinancial companies by export intensity (left) and the structure of investments by activities (right)



Note: Data excludes round-tripping transactions, debt-to-equity swaps and equity investments associated with banks and insurance companies.

Sources: Authors' calculation based on FINA and CNB data

Although it is difficult to go beyond determining the value and the number of projects when looking at the mode of entry, somewhat more precise conclusions can be drawn when looking at the investments distinguished by the motives of foreign investors. Literature generally recognizes three motives for investing abroad (Dunning, 1993), and these are: market-seeking, efficiency-seeking and resource-seeking. While it is quite difficult to determine when foreign investment is motivated by gaining strategic resources, the share of exports in total sales revenues of a company can be a pretty good indicator of whether the motive of the foreign investor for taking over or establishing a new company in a foreign country was only expanding on the local market or increasing the business efficiency of his own business group. Namely, given that the Croatian market is relatively small, the higher share of export revenues in foreign-owned companies suggests that such company was taken-over or established in order to increase the efficiency of the whole business group (lowering operating costs, using the proximity to foreign markets,

exploiting strategic resources, etc.) while producing goods and services that are mainly not intended for the local market but to be exported. Thus, according to the share of exports in total revenues, one can distinguish between: local-market-oriented companies that are mostly not exporting or are occasional exporters, with the share of sales on foreign markets in total sales revenues under 20%; limited exporters with this share between 20% and 50%; predominant exporters with export revenues accounting for between 50% and 75% of total revenues, and exclusive exporters whose export revenues make up more than 75% of total revenues.

In Figure 3 (left) direct foreign equity investments are divided according to the export intensity of the company that is the subject of foreign investment. In this context, the export intensity is used as an indicator of the company's predominant business orientation (local vs. foreign market) and thus points to the motivation behind each foreign investment project. Throughout the observed period, foreign direct investments in companies that were oriented towards the local market are dominant compared to those oriented towards the foreign market. The only exceptions are the years 2003, 2006, 2008 and 2015 when transactions related to the previously mentioned privatizations of two major exporting companies (in oil industry and the manufacture of chemicals) as well as one large takeover of exporting company (in tobacco industry) took place. Therefore, it can be concluded that extremely low inflow of direct equity investments during the observed period was related to export-oriented companies, i.e. was motivated by increasing the efficiency of the investor's group. This points to the lack of competitiveness of the domestic economy in attracting export-oriented investments. More investments of this type would certainly contribute to stronger trade integration and greater involvement in global value chains, as well as strengthening of the overall Croatia's export sector.

Croatia took little advantage of the surge of direct foreign equity investments into Central and Eastern Europe at the very beginning of the transition process in the 1990s, due to specific economic and political circumstances as well the legal and economic uncertainty. The analysis shows that this remained the case also during the later period, especially when it comes to export-oriented investments. Actually, the lack of export-oriented foreign investments in 2002-2017 period can be explained by a number of reasons, with a few worth mentioning. Compared to other new EU member states, Croatia was accepted into full EU membership almost a decade later. During this time other countries used their access to the common market as a comparative advantage in attracting export-oriented investments. In addition, it is well known that one of the key motives behind export-oriented investments is to increase the cost efficiency of the group by reducing the cost of labor, whereby Croatia is not among the countries that based their policy of attracting foreign investment on cheap labor. Also, other structural obstacles that make doing business difficult, such as unpredictable tax policy and legal uncertainty, could be at play, as indicated by Croatia's low ranking in the World Bank's Doing Business and World Economic Forum's World Competitiveness Report. The low inflow of export-oriented investments could not be compensated by local-market-oriented investments because of relatively small size and low purchasing power of the Croatian market, which ultimately explains why the total inflow of foreign direct equity investments in the observed period was so modest.

5. Foreign ownership premium in Croatian non-financial companies

In the text below, using a sample of Croatian non-financial companies, the hypothesis of the foreign ownership premium, i.e. the difference in features and performance between foreign-owned and domestically owned companies, is econometrically tested. As already described in Chapter 3, a sample of 35,324 non-financial companies is used, out of which 2,185 are foreign-owned enterprises. Despite "cleaning" of the data, the sample remained representative and appropriate for econometric estimation.

The features and performance indicators on which the existence of a foreign ownership premium is tested are defined in the Appendix (Table 2). They can be grouped into several categories. The organizational and technological premiums (representing the advantages arising from more developed management practices and the use of sophisticated knowledge and advanced technology) are tested using the following indicators: labor productivity, unit labor cost, added value, capital intensity and R&D intensity. The financial premium, i.e. the superiority in financial operations is tested using the indicators of indebtedness, the cost of financing of the long-term debt and financial stability indicator. In addition, the possibility that these advantages resulted in a premium for the interested parties in the company, primarily owners and employees, is examined using indicators of profitability and level of wages. Finally, the existence of a country of origin effect, i.e. the difference in the premium of foreign ownership depending on the country of the investor, is examined.

Similarly as the empirical literature often estimates the export premium (comparing exporters with non-exporters), such as in Valdec and Zrnc (2017), here the foreign ownership premium (comparing foreign-owned and domestically owned companies) is estimated by simple regression OLS model, such that selected features and performance indicators are regressed on multiple dummy variables. In the focus of this research is the dummy variable of the company's ownership status, while other dummy variables are included in the regression model only to control for differences in other features between companies. Specifically, the foreign ownership premium is estimated by the following regression model:

$$(\ln)X_i = \alpha + \beta \cdot \text{ownership}_i + \gamma \cdot \text{control}_i + \varepsilon_i \quad (1)$$

where i is the index of the company; X_i represents the vector of various features and performance indicators on which the premium is calculated (see Table 2 in the Appendix); ownership is a dummy variable of the company's ownership status (1 if the company is foreign-owned, otherwise 0); control is a vector of control dummy variables that relate to other characteristics of the company (activity at 2 digit-level of the NACE classification, size, region and business orientation); and ε is the error term. From the estimated β coefficients, the foreign ownership premium is calculated as $100 \cdot (\exp(\beta) - 1)$, showing the average percentage difference between foreign-owned and domestically owned companies after controlling for other company characteristics included in the vector of control variables. The model was estimated on the full sample and sub-samples broken down by size, region, business orientation, mode of entry and the country of origin of foreign investor. The econometric estimation does not take into account the

time dimension of the data, but the indicators and features of each company are expressed as the average values over the whole observed period (cross-section data)⁷.

The results of the econometric analysis presented in Tables 1 to 4 show that foreign-owned non-financial companies in Croatia undoubtedly have superior features and performance compared to domestically owned companies, i.e. that there is an obvious foreign ownership premium among Croatian non-financial companies, which is expected and consistent with most empirical literature. What is less expected is that this premium varies strongly when looking at different features and performance indicators (organizational, technological and financial), and depends on the size of the company, industry field, region, business orientation and the mode of foreign ownership.

Table 1 clearly shows a strong and significant foreign ownership premium in all features and performance indicators used in the analysis, but also reveals differences depending on the size and region of the company. Specifically, the organizational and technological premium of foreign ownership is higher in small and medium enterprises, according to all indicators except unit labor costs. Actually, while foreign-owned companies, regardless of their size, are more productive than their domestically owned peers, there is nevertheless much smaller difference in wages among large companies, which ensures them more competitive position in terms of unit labour costs. It is difficult to establish the reasons why the technological and organizational premium is more significant and stronger for small and medium companies. It is possible that large companies, regardless of the ownership, have sufficient financial resources and higher quality human capital, which enables them to improve their business organization and acquire and implement advanced technology, and by doing so make foreign ownership less important. This is also supported by the financial premium which is significant only for small and medium companies, suggesting that in this group of companies, foreign ownership allows for better access to direct foreign financing, under more favorable conditions. This is evident from the fact that, although they are obviously more indebted⁸, small and medium foreign-owned companies have a significantly lower cost of financing of long-term debt than peer domestic-owned companies. Although small and medium foreign-owned companies rely more on debt financing, they are more financially stable⁹ as they have more working capital¹⁰ than peer companies. This stems from a more favorable maturity structure of the debt of foreign-owned small and medium companies, as a result of the larger share of long-term debt to affiliated foreign companies or banks due to likely higher credibility of foreign owners among banking groups operating in countries of foreign investors, as well as in Croatia. Namely, most foreign investments in Croatia come from Italy and Austria, and it is likely that Austrian and Italian banks finance the parent companies, while their subsidiary banks in Croatia are financing the operations of Croatian branches.

⁷ All econometric calculations were made in the Stata 15 program and are available upon request.

⁸ Based on the share of debt and equity in total sources of funding.

⁹ Looking at the financial stability indicator that relates long-term assets and long-term sources of financing (equity and long-term liabilities).

¹⁰ Working capital refers to the difference between short-term assets and short-term liabilities of a company.

Table 1. Foreign ownership premiums, by size and regional affiliation of the company

Sample	Productivity	Unit labor cost	Added value	Capital intensity	R&D intensity	Indebtedness	Cost of long-term debt	Financial stability	Wages	Profitability
All non-financial companies	0.63*** 87.8	-0.14*** -9.5	0.60*** 82.2	0.58*** 78.6	0.42*** 52.2	0.30*** 35.0	-0.19*** -9.5	-0.14*** -9.5	0.49*** 63.2	0.12** 12.7
<i>Size:</i>										
Small and medium-sized companies	0.65*** 91.6	-0.11*** -9.5	0.61*** 84.0	0.70*** 101.4	0.41*** 50.7	0.33*** 39.1	-0.17*** -9.5	-0.10*** -9.5	0.53*** 69.9	0.06 6.2
Large companies	0.51*** 66.5	-0.28*** -18.1	0.51*** 66.5	0.46** 58.4	0.35 41.9	-0.05 0.0	0.1 10.5	0.02 2.0	0.23*** 25.9	0.25 28.4
<i>Region:</i>										
Zagreb region	0.79*** 120.3	-0.13*** -9.5	0.73*** 107.5	0.35*** 41.9	0.47*** 60.0	0.17*** 18.5	-0.01 0.0	-0.27*** -18.1	0.60*** 82.2	0.09 9.4
Northern Croatia region	0.62*** 85.9	-0.22*** -18.1	0.60*** 82.2	0.75*** 111.7	0.34 40.5	0.23** 25.9	-0.17 -9.5	-0.03 0.0	0.35*** 41.9	-0.01 0.0
Coastal region	0.37*** 44.8	-0.14*** -9.5	0.38*** 46.2	0.98*** 166.4	0.38*** 46.2	0.58*** 78.6	-0.56*** -39.3	0.04 4.1	0.33*** 39.1	0.18* 19.7
Continental region	0.47*** 60.0	-0.05 0.0	0.36*** 43.3	0.44** 55.3	0.19 20.9	0.13 13.9	0.1 10.5	-0.06 0.0	0.35*** 39.1	-0.02 0.0

Note: *, ** and *** refer to significance levels of 10%, 5% and 1%. Below the estimated regression coefficient, foreign ownership premiums are presented as the percentage difference between foreign and domestic companies, calculated as $100(\exp(\beta) - 1)$.

Source: Authors' calculations based on FINA and CNB data

Such a significant foreign ownership premium in the financing of small and medium companies and the absence of the same premium in large companies is not surprising. Namely, the financial market in Croatia is still quite underdeveloped and there is almost no significant alternative to bank financing. This particularly affects small and medium companies that have limited access to bank financing as they usually lack sufficient collateral to meet banks' credit requirements (Ljubaj and Martinis, 2017). In the segment of small and medium companies, foreign-owned ones are often in a position to ensure significant financial resources from parent companies, enabling them to alleviate financial limitations. In addition to the financial premium, for small and medium foreign-owned companies a substantial premium for employees in the form of higher wages is confirmed, but not for owners in the form of higher profitability. Namely, foreign-owned companies have higher wages than comparable domestic-owned companies, and the reasons are multiple. As Gelübcke (2012) suggests, it is possible that foreign-owned companies are seeking to retain their employees with higher wages, thereby preserving their competitive advantage, but there is also a possibility that foreign companies are less familiar with domestic labor market conditions which weakens their position in the wage negotiation process. It is also not excluded that there is a positive selection by the investors, whereby only the best companies with a better and more expensive workforce are the subject of foreign investment. However, the Croatian case may be more related to the fact that foreign-owned companies are more capital and technology intensive than their peer companies, as confirmed by the estimated premiums in Table 1, and this requires more trained, educated and thus more expensive workforce.

Looking at the econometric results for individual regions¹¹, Table 1 shows that the foreign ownership premium is widespread but largest in Zagreb where the business environment is most

¹¹ The regions are used solely for statistical and analytical purposes and in no way represent a proposal for territorial setup of the country.

competitive. Organizational and technological premiums of foreign ownership are present in all parts of the country, especially in terms of higher labor productivity, value added per employee and capital intensity, while noticeable differences between regions exist only when looking at R&D intensity. The latter is present only among companies operating in Zagreb and in the coastal region, which is expected as companies with significant research and development activities are concentrated in large cities.

Table 2 presents the foreign ownership premiums in different economic activities, with five of the most important activities being singled out: manufacturing, trade, tourism (mainly hotels and other accommodation), information technology and various professional services. Furthermore, in order to take into account its heterogeneity, the manufacturing industry is divided by technological intensity into low-tech and high-tech industries¹².

Table 2. Foreign ownership premiums, by business activity

Sample	Productivity	Unit labor cost	Added value	Capital intensity	R&D intensity	Indebtedness	Cost of long-term debt	Financial stability	Wages	Profitability
All non-financial companies	0.63***	-0.14***	0.60***	0.58***	0.42***	0.30***	-0.19***	-0.14***	0.49***	0.12**
	87.8	-9.5	82.2	78.6	52.2	35.0	-9.5	-9.5	63.2	12.7
<i>NACE activity:</i>										
Manufacturing industry	0.51***	-0.10***	0.40***	0.61***	0.54***	0.09	-0.33***	-0.05	0.31***	0.07
	66.5	-9.5	49.2	84.0	71.6	9.4	-25.9	0.0	36.3	7.3
High-tech manufacturing	0.58***	-0.08	0.43***	0.39*	0.62**	-0.06	-0.38*	-0.12	0.35***	-0.21
	78.6	0.0	53.7	47.7	85.9	0.0	-25.9	-9.5	41.9	-18.1
Manufacture of machinery and equipment	0.59***	0.05	0.36**	0.2	-0.13	-0.13	-0.14	-0.27	0.41***	-0.07
	80.4	5.1	43.3	22.1	-9.5	-9.5	-9.5	-18.1	50.7	0.0
Manufacture of electrical equipment	0.61***	-0.15	0.48***	0.19	0.87*	-0.09	-0.41	-0.26	0.33***	-0.15
	84.0	-9.5	61.6	20.9	138.7	0.0	-33.0	-18.1	39.1	-9.5
Manufacture of chemicals	0.52*	-0.1	0.42*	0.27	0.69	0.17	-0.1	0.0	0.27**	-0.3
	68.2	-9.5	52.2	31.0	99.4	18.5	-9.5	0.0	31.0	-25.9
Low-tech manufacturing	0.47***	-0.11**	0.39***	0.70***	0.47**	0.16*	-0.30**	-0.02	0.29***	0.25*
	60.0	-9.5	47.7	101.4	60.0	17.4	-25.9	0.0	33.6	28.4
Manufacture of textiles	0.73***	-0.35***	0.50***	0.91***	0.4	-0.25	-0.48*	0.04	0.21***	0.76**
	107.5	-25.9	64.9	148.4	49.2	-18.1	-33.0	4.1	23.4	113.8
Manufacture of wood and wood products	0.25	-0.1	0.29	0.56*	0.16	0.2	-0.89*	-0.1	0.21*	0.03
	28.4	-9.5	33.6	75.1	17.4	22.1	-55.1	-9.5	23.4	3.0
Manufacture of non-metallic products	0.99***	-0.41***	0.97***	1.03***	1.47**	-0.13	0.22	-0.36*	0.58***	0.59*
	169.1	-33.0	163.8	180.1	334.9	-9.5	24.6	-25.9	78.6	80.4
Manufacture of basic metals	0.34***	0.13*	0.16	0.76**	0.62*	0.37**	-0.50*	0.1	0.31***	0.09
	40.5	13.9	17.4	113.8	85.9	44.8	-39.3	10.5	36.3	9.4
Trade	0.69***	-0.14***	0.72***	0.27***	0.48***	0.11**	0.02	-0.26***	0.60***	0.17*
	99.4	-9.5	105.4	31.0	61.6	11.6	2.0	-18.1	82.2	18.5
Accommodation	0.05	0.21	-0.43	0.79	0.24	0.62	0.14	0.06	0.36***	-0.34
	3.0	23.4	-33.0	120.3	27.1	85.9	15.0	6.2	43.3	-25.9
Information technology	0.35***	-0.03	0.44***	0.17	0.75**	0.38***	-0.18	0.06	0.37***	-0.25
	41.9	0.0	55.3	18.5	111.7	46.2	-9.5	6.2	44.8	-18.1
Professional services	0.62***	-0.16***	0.62***	0.29*	0.50**	0.40***	-0.1	-0.24**	0.47***	0.01
	85.9	-9.5	85.9	33.6	64.9	49.2	-9.5	-18.1	60.0	1.0

Note: *, ** and *** refer to significance levels of 10%, 5% and 1%. Below the estimated regression coefficient, foreign ownership premiums are presented as the percentage difference between foreign and domestic companies, calculated as $100(\exp(\beta) - 1)$.

Source: Authors' calculations based on FINA and CNB data

¹² According to the above-mentioned Eurostat methodology. See footnote 3.

The results shown in Table 2 show that there are organizational and technological premiums of foreign ownership in all economic fields except tourism. The absence of foreign ownership premium in tourism can be explained by the fact that the Croatian hotel industry is dominated by domestic hotel chains, which are highly competitive and capitalized, and are considered as market leaders in the sector. Since domestic tourism companies have a long tradition dating back to the times before the economic transition and have no problems with access to quality financing, it is not surprising that foreign ownership makes little significance in tourism. When it comes to other activities, there is a significant foreign ownership premium in terms of higher productivity, value added, and R&D intensity. The results are somewhat different in terms of unit labor costs, which is only significant in trade, services and low-tech manufacturing industries. The absence of this premium in the high-tech manufacturing industry and information technology, as well as in tourism, can be attributed to the fact that these are mostly export-oriented industries in which domestic companies are also exposed to international competition, pushing them to be more efficient. As far as the financial premium is concerned, the lower cost of long-term debt is most pronounced in the manufacturing industry, while the financial stability premium is most evident in trade and professional services. It is again shown that the premiums in the form of higher wages are widespread across industries, while the premium of profitability is present only in the low-tech manufacturing industry and trade.

Looking at the manufacturing industry in more detail, Table 2 reveals significant differences in the foreign ownership premium in specific industries. In general, the benefits of foreign ownership are more widespread in low-tech industries than in the high-tech sector, confirming that the positive effects of foreign ownership are not only transmitted through the transfer of advanced technology that plays a key role in technologically highly intensive industries but also through other channels (management skills and better financing). In the high-tech sector, the biggest premium is in the manufacture of machinery and equipment and the manufacture of electrical equipment, notably looking at the indicators of labor productivity, value added value, R&D intensity and the level of wages. At the same time, in the pharmaceutical industry, the premium of foreign ownership is less pronounced. On the other hand, in the low-tech sector, the premium is visible on a much larger number of indicators, especially in the manufacture of textiles, non-metallic products and basic metals, while the differences between foreign and domestic-owned companies are not visible only in the manufacture of wood and wood products. Among different indicators, it can be pointed out that, unlike in the high technology sector, in low-tech industries, especially in manufacture of textiles and non-metallic products, foreign ownership brings premium in the form of lower unit labor costs, greater productivity, higher value added and higher profitability. Such strong and large differences can be partly explained by the greater capital intensity of foreign-owned companies, which may lead to the conclusion that their business is significantly more automated, even in traditionally labor-intensive industries.

Below are described the foreign ownership premiums according to the mode of entry of foreign investors. The results in Table 3 show that organizational and technological premium of foreign ownership is present in both greenfield and brownfield projects, with the difference being that the R&D intensity premium has proved to be positively significant only in greenfield projects. This is

not surprising as it is hard to expect that Croatian companies are subject to takeovers with the intent of gaining technological know-how (technology-seeking FDI). Furthermore, there are significant differences when it comes to financial premium and the premium of profitability. It has been shown that a strong and significant premium of lower cost of long-term debt and higher working capital is only present in greenfield projects, and only those that are wholly foreign-owned, while these effects do not exist in joint venture companies. These findings can be explained by the different structure of liabilities of wholly foreign-owned companies, as they have a significantly lower share of long-term debt to banks and a significantly higher share of debt to foreign-affiliated creditors. The foreign-affiliated debt is cheaper than regular bank financing as indicated by a strong and significant premium in terms of lower cost of financing of long-term debt. This represents a significant competitive advantage for foreign-owned companies, especially in the Croatian case, where direct access to external financing is limited, particularly for small and medium companies.

Table 3. Foreign ownership premiums, by the mode of entry and business orientation

Sample	Productivity	Unit labor cost	Added value	Capital intensity	R&D intensity	Indebtedness	Cost of long-term debt	Financial stability	Wages	Profitability
All non-financial companies	0.63***	-0.14***	0.60***	0.58***	0.42***	0.30***	-0.19***	-0.14***	0.49***	0.12**
	87.8	-9.5	82.2	78.6	52.2	35.0	-9.5	-9.5	63.2	12.7
<i>Mode of entry:</i>										
Greenfield investments	0.61***	-0.15***	0.59***	0.39***	0.49***	0.23***	-0.25***	-0.18***	0.49***	0.08
	84.0	-9.5	80.4	47.7	63.2	25.9	-18.1	-9.5	63.2	8.3
Wholly owned companies	0.61***	-0.14***	0.60***	0.23***	0.46***	0.20***	-0.33***	-0.24***	0.51***	0.03
	84.0	-9.5	82.2	25.9	58.4	22.1	-25.9	-18.1	66.5	3.0
Joint venture companies	0.54***	-0.15***	0.50***	0.71***	0.47***	0.26***	-0.06	-0.02	0.37***	0.18*
	71.6	-9.5	64.9	103.4	60.0	29.7	0.0	0.0	44.8	19.7
Brownfield investments	0.54***	-0.08**	0.48***	0.98***	0.13	0.43***	0.01	-0.01	0.41***	0.21**
	71.6	0.0	61.6	166.4	13.9	53.7	1.0	0.0	50.7	23.4
<i>Business orientation:</i>										
Domestic market oriented companies	0.69***	-0.20***	0.66***	0.67***	0.39***	0.43***	-0.13*	-0.14***	0.51***	0.19***
	99.4	-18.1	93.5	95.4	47.7	53.7	-9.5	-9.5	66.5	20.9
Partly foreign market oriented companies	0.69***	-0.11*	0.63***	0.33**	0.40*	0.11	0.13	-0.29***	0.52***	-0.14
	99.4	-9.5	87.8	39.1	49.2	11.6	13.9	-18.1	68.2	-9.5
Predominantly and exclusively foreign market oriented companies	0.46***	-0.01	0.41***	0.54***	0.39**	0.08	-0.46***	-0.05	0.42***	0.0
	58.4	0.0	50.7	71.6	47.7	8.3	-33.0	0.0	52.2	0.0

Note: *, ** and *** refer to significance levels of 10%, 5% and 1%. Below the estimated regression coefficient, foreign ownership premiums are presented as the percentage difference between foreign and domestic companies, calculated as $100(\exp(\beta) - 1)$.

Source: Authors' calculations based on FINA and CNB data

On the other hand, the profitability premium is only present in brownfield investments and, to a lesser extent, in joint venture investments, which is rather unexpected given that the organizational, technological and financial premium of foreign ownership is largest in the case of independently-established companies. So the absence of profitability premium is surprising. The explanation may be that a high degree of control of foreign owners in independently-established companies allows and facilitates the transfer of profits to a more favorable tax jurisdiction through transfer prices, as indicated by some other similar research (Gelübcke, 2012). This is also supported by the fact that around one hundred investors in the sample of foreign-owned companies (out of more than two thousand) are registered in countries that are considered as tax

havens. In addition, the lack of profitability premium in greenfield companies can partly be explained by the very nature of the project. Namely, as is apparent from the analysis in Chapter 4, the majority of foreign investment in Croatia is oriented towards the local market, so it is expected that such greenfield investments take longer period of market positioning before they become profitable. On the other hand, the rationale behind brownfield investment is acquiring a company that is already profitable or needs shorter restructuring to achieve a satisfactory level of profitability.

An additional, very important aspect of foreign ownership that can make different premiums is the motive of entering the local market, i.e. the degree of orientation towards local vs. foreign market. Expectedly, the size of the foreign ownership premium decreases with higher export orientation, i.e. the internationalization of business, primarily in unit labor costs, given that with increased export intensity the exposure to international competition also grows, which compels both foreign and domestic-owned exporters to increase business efficiency. However, the results show that the foreign ownership premium does not entirely fade in the export sector, which is understandable since foreign owners have better knowledge and access to foreign market.

Table 4 shows the foreign ownership premium depending on the country of origin of foreign investor¹⁵, indicating large differences in the significance and size of the premiums in different groups of countries. However, these finding should be taken with caution, as it is possible that the country from which the investment originates is only the administrative headquarters of the company for tax and other purposes, while the place of actual business is somewhere else. The premiums are the highest in companies whose owners come from old EU member states (and Switzerland and Norway), while the premiums slightly drop in companies owned by investors from new EU member states. What is particularly worth mentioning is that the financial premium fades in companies whose investors originate from the new member states, which is not surprising given that these countries do not have a significantly more developed financial market and thus better financing opportunities for parent companies that could translate to their related companies in Croatia. Also, the profitability premium is only present in companies owned by investors from old EU member states (and Norway and Switzerland). Furthermore, the technological and organizational premium is smaller and in certain cases completely non-existent for companies whose owners originate from non-EU European countries, which are on average less developed than Croatia. Also, in their case the R&D premium is non-existent, since it is difficult to expect that foreign investors from these countries would build their competitive advantage in this way. Among other countries, the United States stand out by the volume of investments and also by positive organizational and technological premiums in terms of higher capital intensity, productivity and value added.

¹⁵ In nearly 61.0% cases of all foreign investment projects, the foreign investor came from the old EU Member States, Norway and Switzerland. Investors from the new member states account for around 20.0% of all projects, and the investors from non-EU European countries account for around 9.0%. Investors from the United States account for less than 4.0% of the total number of foreign investment projects observed.

Table 4. Foreign ownership premium by investor country

Sample	Productivity	Unit labor cost	Added value	Capital intensity	R&D intensity	Indebtedness	Cost of long-term debt	Financial stability	Wages	Profitability
All non-financial companies	0,63***	-0,14***	0,60***	0,58***	0,42***	0,30***	-0,19***	-0,14***	0,49***	0,12**
	87.8	-9.5	82.2	78.6	52.2	35.0	-9.5	-9.5	63.2	12.7
<i>Country of foreign investor:</i>										
Old EU member states, Norway and Switzerland	0,68***	-0,12***	0,65***	0,74***	0,41***	0,24***	-0,16**	-0,14***	0,58***	0,13**
	97.4	-9.5	91.6	109.6	50.7	27.1	-9.5	-9.5	78.6	13.9
New EU member states	0,63***	-0,15***	0,55***	0,48***	0,43***	0,23***	0,08	-0,05	0,40***	-0,11
	87.8	-9.5	73.3	61.6	53.7	25.9	8.3	0.0	49.2	-9.5
Rest of Europe	0,41***	-0,15**	0,34***	0,57***	0,16	0,31***	-0,09	0,09	0,24***	0,02
	50.7	-9.5	40.5	76.8	17.4	36.3	0.0	9.4	27.1	2.0
United States of America	0,46***	0,0	0,50***	0,92***	0,55*	0,52***	-0,3	0,1	0,49***	-0,3
	58.4	0.0	64.9	150.9	73.3	68.2	-18.1	15.0	63.2	-18.1

Note: *, ** and *** refer to significance levels of 10%, 5% and 1%. Below the estimated regression coefficient, foreign ownership premiums are presented as the percentage difference between foreign and domestic companies, calculated as $100 (\exp(\beta) - 1)$.

Source: Authors' calculations based on FINA and CNB data

6. Conclusion

The conducted research has resulted in some new and very important findings that enable a better understanding of the factors driving foreign investment in Croatia as well as the microeconomic aspect of foreign ownership in Croatian non-financial companies. Namely, the analysis based on the new set of data compiled for the purpose of this research has shown that most of the equity investments in Croatia between 2002 and 2017 were motivated by the expansion on the local market (market-seeking FDI), while investments aimed at increasing efficiency of the investors' business group (efficiency-seeking FDI) were far less significant. This points to the lack of competitiveness of the domestic economy in attracting export-oriented investments, which combined with the limited potential of a relatively small local market to attract significant local-market-oriented investments, largely explains the modest inflow of total foreign direct equity investments into non-financial companies in Croatia. Furthermore, the analysis has shown that greenfield investments prevailed compared to brownfield, which is positive, but their structure is unfavorable, as they have mainly been realized in non-tradable sectors and low-tech industries.

Speaking about the microeconomic aspects of this research, the results of econometric analysis have confirmed that foreign-owned non-financial companies undoubtedly have superior characteristics and performance vis-à-vis domestically-owned companies, meaning that there is an apparent foreign ownership premium at the level of total population. However, the premium is not equally distributed in all aspects of business operations (organizational, technological and financial operations), whereby its magnitude depends on the size of the company, its activity and regional affiliation, its predominant business orientation, the mode of entry of foreign owner, as well as the origin of the foreign investor.

The organizational and technological premium of foreign ownership is the largest in case of small and medium companies, while it is noticeably smaller in large companies. In addition, the financial

premium of foreign ownership is non-existent in large companies. This is understandable since large companies have greater market power, longer traditions, easier access to finance, and accumulated knowledge and technology, so foreign ownership does not necessarily make a significant difference in their business performance. Furthermore, apparent differences in the foreign ownership premium were found depending on the business orientation of the company (local market vs. export-orientation). As expected, the difference between foreign-owned and domestically owned companies decreases with export orientation, i.e. internationalization of business operations, because the exposure to international competition compels both foreign and domestic-owned companies to increase their business efficiency. Nevertheless, the foreign ownership premium still does exist in the export sector, which is understandable since foreign ownership ensures better access to foreign markets and greater participation in global value chains.

Also, the foreign ownership premium is confirmed in most NACE activities, except in tourism, which can be explained by the fact that domestic tourism companies have a long tradition of business dating back to the times before economic transition and that they do not have problems accessing quality financing, so the foreign ownership should not bring significant benefits. As far as other activities are concerned, it is particularly worth mentioning the manufacturing industry, where the foreign ownership premium is widespread among high and low-tech industries, suggesting that benefits of foreign ownership are transmitted not only through the transfer of high technology but also through positive management practices and access to finance.

Looking from the mode-of-entry perspective, foreign ownership premiums are present in both greenfield and brownfield projects, whereas the premium of profitability exists only in brownfield investments. This can be attributed to the fact that greenfield investments usually imply a longer period of market positioning before they become profitable. In addition, the foreign ownership premium differs depending on the country of origin of the foreign investor. It is the biggest when investors come from more developed countries (old EU members). Only in that case, the profitability premium of foreign ownership is present along with higher technological and organizational premiums. In addition, it can be pointed out that the financial premium completely vanishes in companies whose investors originate from the new EU member states, which is not surprising given that these countries do not have more developed financial market and thus better financing opportunities for the parent companies.

Literature

Aydin, N., Sayim. M. and Yalama, A. (2007): "Foreign Ownership and Firm Performance: Evidence from Turkey," *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, No 11, 103-110.

Azzam, I., Fouad, J. and Ghosh, D.K. (2013): "Foreign Ownership and Financial Performance: Evidence from Egypt", *International Journal of Business*, 18(3), 2013.

Barbosa, N. and Louri, H. (2005): "Corporate Performance: Does Ownership Matter? Comparison of Foreign and Domestic owned Firms in Greece and Portugal," *Review of Industrial Organization*, 27, 73-102.

Bayar, Y. (2017): "Greenfield and Brownfield Investments and Economic Growth: Evidence from Central and Eastern European Union Countries", *Naše gospodarstvo/Our Economy*, Vol. 63, No.3

Bentivogli, C. and Mirenda, L. (2016): "Foreign ownership and performance: evidence from a panel of Italian firms," *Temi di discussione (Economic working papers) 1085*, Bank of Italy, Economic Research and International Relations Area.

Bilas, V., Čenan, D., and Kedačić, A. (2012): "Međunarodna zajednička ulaganja u Republici Hrvatskoj", *Ekonomski Vjesnik*, Vol. 25, No. 1.

Bobenic Hintošova, A. and Kubikova, Z. (2016): "The effect of the degree of foreign ownership on firms' performance", *Review of Economic Perspectives*, v. 16, iss. 1, pp. 29-43.

Caves, R. E. (2007): "Multinational enterprise and economic analysis", 3rd edition, Cambridge University Press.

Canyon, M.J., Girma, S., Thompson, S. and Wright, P.W. (2002): "The productivity and wage effects of foreign acquisition in the United Kingdom," *Journal of Industrial Economics*, 50(1), 85-102.

Derado, D. (2013): "Determinants of FDI in transition countries and estimation of the potential level of Croatian FDI", *Financial theory and practice*, 37 (3), 227-258.

Derado, D., Škudar, A. and Rakušić, S. (2011): "Regional aspects of FDI in Croatia", *Ninth International Conference on Challenges of Europe: Growth and Competitiveness – Reversing the Trends*, University of Split, Faculty of Economics, Split – Bol, 26-28 May 2011.

Doms, M. and Jensen, J.B. (1995): "Comparing Wages, Skills, and Productivity between Domestically and Foreign-Owned Manufacturing Establishments in the United States," in Robert E. Baldwin, Robert E. Lipsey, and J. David Richardson (eds.). *Geography and Ownership as Bases for Economic Accounting*, Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Dunning, J. (1993): *Multinational Enterprises and the Global Economy*, Addison-Wesley, Harlow.

Gelübcke, J. P. W. (2013): "The performance of foreign affiliates in German manufacturing: Evidence from a new database". *Review of World Economics*. 149 (1), pp. 151- 182.

Goethals, J. and Ooghe, H. (1997): "The Performance of Foreign and National Take- Overs in Belgium," *European Business Review*, 97(1), 24-37.

Huang, R. D. and Shiu, C. Y. (2009): "Local effects of foreign ownership in an emerging financial market: Evidence from qualified foreign institutional investors in Taiwan, *Financial Management*. 38 (3.), pp. 567-602.

Kersan-Škabic, I. and Tijanić, L. (2014): "The Influence of Foreign Direct Investments on Regional Development in Croatia", *Croatian Economic Survey*, December 2014, v. 16, iss. 2, pp. 59-90.

Khawar, M. (2003): "Productivity and Foreign Direct Investment: Evidence from Mexico," *Journal of Economic Studies*, 30(1), 66-76.

Konings, J. (2001): "The Effects of Foreign Direct Investment on Domestic Firm," *Economics of Transition*, 9(3), 619-633.

Lipsey, R., E. (2001): "Foreign Direct Investors in Three Financial Crises", NBER Working Paper 8084.

Loungani, P. and Razin, A. (2001): "How Beneficial Is Foreign Direct Investment for Developing Countries?", *Finance and Development*, IMF. 38.

Luu, H., N. (2016): "Greenfield investments, cross-border M&As, and economic growth in emerging countries", *Economics & Business Letters*, Vol. 5, No. 3

Ljubaj, I. and Martinis, A. (2017): "Prekomjerni dug poduzeća u Hrvatskoj: mikroprocjena i makroimplikacije"; *Istraživanja*, Hrvatska narodna banka, I-52 (2017.).

Marić, Z. (2008): "Foreign Direct Investment and the Productivity of Croatian Companies in the Industrial Sector", *Privredna Kretanja i Ekonomska Politika*, v. 18, iss. 116, pp. 28-51.

Matić, B., and Čenan, D. (2007): "Analiza motiva za međunarodna zajednička ulaganja u Republici Hrvatskoj", *Zbornik Ekonomskog Fakulteta u Zagrebu* 5.

Neto, P., Brandão, A., and Cerqueira, A. (2010): "The Impact of FDI, Cross Border Mergers and Acquisitions and Greenfield Investments on Economic Growth", *IUP Journal of Business Strategy*. Vol. 7, Issue 4.

Sula, O. and Willett, T., D. (2006): "Reversibility of Different Types of Capital Flows to Emerging Markets", *MPRA Paper No. 384*.

Škudar, A. (2004): "Pregled i analiza izravnih ulaganja u Republiku Hrvatsku", *Pregledi - Hrvatska narodna banka*, P-16 (2004).

Vukšić, G. (2005): "Impact of foreign direct investment on Croatian manufacturing exports", *Financial Theory and Practice*, 29(2), pp. 147-175.

Appendix

Table 1. Structure of the sample of non-financial companies

Sample	Foreign-owned companies						Domestically owned companies		Total
	<i>Greenfield</i>		<i>Brownfield</i>		<i>Total</i>				
All non-financial companies	1,628	4.6%	557	1.6%	2,185	6.2%	33,139	95.8%	35,324
Small and medium-sized companies	1,518	4.4%	430	1.2%	1,948	5.6%	32,624	94.4%	34,572
Large companies	110	14.6%	127	16.9%	237	31.5%	515	68.5%	752
Zagreb Region	948	7.3%	241	1.9%	1,189	9.2%	11,709	90.8%	12,898
Northern Croatia Region	128	2.7%	54	1.2%	182	3.9%	4,473	96.1%	4,655
Coastal Region	420	3.7%	180	1.6%	600	5.2%	10,866	94.8%	11,466
Continental Region	97	2.1%	50	1.1%	147	3.2%	4,396	96.8%	4,543
Domestic market oriented companies	981	3.2%	316	1.0%	1,297	4.3%	28,909	95.7%	30,206
Partly foreign market oriented companies	205	9.5%	91	4.2%	294	13.7%	1,853	86.3%	2,147
Predominantly and exclusively foreign market oriented companies	444	14.9%	150	5.0%	594	20.0%	2,377	80.0%	2,971
Manufacturing industry	334	5.8%	175	3.0%	509	8.8%	5,290	91.2%	5,799
Trade	513	5.8%	97	1.1%	610	6.9%	8,238	93.1%	8,848
Accommodation	9	5.2%	12	6.9%	21	12.1%	152	87.9%	173
Information technology	94	10.5%	55	6.2%	149	16.7%	742	83.3%	891
Professional services	231	5.4%	29	0.7%	260	6.1%	4,013	93.9%	4,273
Other	403	3.1%	132	1.0%	535	4.1%	12,506	95.9%	13,041

Table 2. Definition of the variables used in the model

Indicator	Calculation	Criteria and interpretation of results (+/-)*
Productivity	revenue from sale of goods and services / number of employees	increase in value (+) & decrease in value (-)
ULC	wages and other costs of employees / added value	increase in value (-) & decrease in value (+)
Added value	revenue from sale of goods and services - cost of raw material - selling costs	increase in value (+) & decrease in value (-)
Capital intensity	non-current assets / number of employees	increase in value (+) & decrease in value (-)
R&D intensity	intangible assets/ total assets	increase in value (+) & decrease in value (-)
Indebtedness	non-current liabilities / (total liabilities + long term provisions and other equity)	increase in value (-) & decrease in value (+)
Cost of long-term debt	accrued interest / non-current liabilities	increase in value (-) & decrease in value (+)
Financial stability	non-current assets / (equity + non-current liabilities)	increase in value (-) & decrease in value (+)
Wages	wages and other costs of employees/ number of employees	increase in value (+) & decrease in value (-)
Profitability	profit or loss before tax / total revenue	increase in value (+) & decrease in value (-)

* (+) is evaluated positive; (-) is estimated negative

Table 3. Sample division criteria

Dummy	Sample	Description
Size	Small and medium-sized companies	average number of employees in the observed period from 10 to 250
	Large companies	average number of employees in the observed period larger than 250
Regional affiliation	Zagreb Region	City of Zagreb and Zagreb County
	Northern Croatia Region	Međimurje County, Varaždin County, Krapina-Zagorje County, Bjelovar-Bilogora County and Koprivnica-Križevci County
	Jadran Region	Istra County, Primorje-Gorski Kotar County, Zadar County, Šibenik-Knin County, Split-Dalmacija County, Dubrovnik-Neretva County
	Slavonija Region	Virovitica-Podravina County, Požega-Slavonija County, Brod-Posavina County, Osijek-Baranja County i Vukovar-Srijem County
Business orientation	Local market oriented companies	the share of sales revenue from foreign markets in total sales revenues in the observed period does not exceed 20%
	Limited exporters	the share of sales revenue from foreign markets in total sales revenues in the observed period ranges from 20% to 50%
	Predominant exporters	the share of sales revenue from foreign markets in total sales revenues in the observed period ranges from 50% to 75%
	Exclusive exporters	the share of sales revenue from foreign markets in total sales revenues in the observed period exceeds 75%
Activity	Manufacturing industry, trade, accomodation, information technology and professional services	according to the first and second level of NACE classification