Firm Financing Constraints, Labour Demand and R&D*

Andrea Caggese
Pompeu Fabra University

October 2006

Abstract

This paper estimates a financing constraints test based on variable capital using a dataset of large US firms. We show that such test is very efficient in detecting financing constraints on both labour demand and R&D investment, and that is more efficient than a financing constraints test based on the Q model of fixed capital.

JEL classification: D21, G31

Keywords: Financing Constraints, Investment, labour demand, R&D

*Most of the content of this paper was part of a paper entitled "Testing Financing Constraints on Firm Investment Using Variable Capital". I would like to thank Martin Browning and Vicente Cunat for their valuable comments and suggestions, as well as the participants at the 2005 ASSA meetings in Philadelphia, the 2003 ESEM Congress in Stockholm, the 2003 CEPR Conference on Entrepreneurship, Financial Markets and Innovation, and at the seminars at UPF, LSE, Banco De España, University of Copenhagen and Ente Einaudi. All errors are, of course, my own responsibility. Research support from the Financial Markets Group and from Mediocredito Centrale are gratefully acknowledged. Please address all correspondence to: andrea.caggese@upf.edu or Pompeu Fabra University, Department of Economics, Room 1E58, Calle Ramon Trias Fargas 25-27, 08005, Barcelona, Spain

I Introduction

In order to explain the aggregate behaviour of investment and production, it is necessary to understand the factors that affect investment at firm level. Financing imperfections may prevent firms to access external finance and make them unable to invest unless internal finance is available. It is therefore important to study to what extent financing constraints matter for the investment decisions of firms.

Most of the recent literature estimates the intensity of firm financing constraints using models derived from the Q theory of fixed investment (see for example Almeida and Campello (2005), Carpenter and Petersen (2003) and Hennessy, Levy and Whited (2006)). Among the exceptions is Caggese (2006), who develops a new financing constraints test based on variable capital, and shows that this test is very efficient in estimating the financing constraints of small firms not quoted on the stock market.

The objective of this paper is to show that the variable capital test developed by Caggese (2006) is also very efficient in detecting the financing constraints on both labour demand and R&D investment, and that it is more efficient than the traditional test based on the Q model.

We first outline a model of a firm that produces using both fixed capital and labour, and that is subject to both financing frictions and adjustment costs of capital. We use the model to derive a financing constraints test based on a labour demand investment equation. Then we verify the power of this test on a balanced panel of US companies, drawn from the Worldscope database, with 8 years of balance sheet data (1996-2003). One appealing feature of this dataset is that, because it has been used in the previous literature, it allows us to evaluate the performance of the financing constraints test based on variable capital with respect to the standard test based on the Q model. We first use the sample to estimate the Q model augmented with cash flow, separately for groups of firms a priori considered with different likelihood of facing financing constraints, and we confirm the finding that the fixed investment-cash flow correlation is not a good indicator of financing constraints. We then estimate the new test of financing constraints. We make the assumption that labour input (number of employees) is a variable factor of production. One problem with this assumption is that adjustment costs are likely to affect labour dynamics at high frequencies, as a large body of literature shows.[1] However, we believe that in the context of our dataset labour is a factor of production flexible enough for the purpose of being used in our financing constraints test. This is because we use yearly data aggregated at the company rather than at the plant level. The empirical evidence shows that for US data adjustment costs mostly affect labor dynamics at monthly and quarterly frequency[2]. As Hall (2004) says, "*Many economists believe that adjustment costs for labour are unimportant from one year to the next...*".

Estimation results show that the correlation between labour input and net financial

[1]See Hamermesh and Pfann (1996) for a review of this literature.

[2]See footnote n.1

wealth is positive and higher for firms more likely to be financially constrained than for the other firms. The difference is strongly statistically significant, and the correlation increases for the groups of firms with the highest probability to be financially constrained. Furthermore we show that the results are robust to several different specifications and inclusion of additional variables.

In addition to contributing to the recent empirical literature on financing constraints and firm investment, this paper propose a specific application of a variable capital financing constraint test that uses labour input. Therefore it is related to earlier works that show how financial factors affect labour demand of firms, like Nickell and Wadhwani (1991) and Sharpe (1994).

This paper is organized as follows. Section II describes the model. Section III defines the new financing constraints test. Section IV verifies the validity of the new financing constraints test using a balanced panel of US firms. Section V summarizes the conclusions.

II The model

The aim of this section is to develop a structural model of investment with financing constraints and with adjustment costs of fixed capital. We consider a risk neutral firm which has the objective to maximize the discounted sum of future expected dividends. The discount factor is equal to $1/R$, where $R = 1 + r$, and r is the lending/borrowing risk free interest rate.

The firm operates with two inputs, k_t and l_t, that are respectively fixed capital and labour, and that generate output at time $t+1$. The production function is strictly concave in both factors. We assume a Cobb-Douglas functional form:

$$y_t = \theta_t k_t^{\alpha} l_t^{\beta} \text{ with } \alpha + \beta < 1 \tag{1}$$

All prices are constant and normalized to 1.[3] θ_t is a productivity shock that follows a stationary stochastic process. Labour demand l_t is not subject to adjustment costs, while fixed capital investment is subject to the adjustment cost function $\mu(i_t)$, where i_t is gross fixed investment:

$$i_t = k_{t+1} - (1 - \delta_k) k_t \tag{2}$$

$$\mu(i_t = 0) = 0; \ \mu(i_t \neq 0) \geq 0 \tag{3}$$

where δ_k is the depreciation factors of fixed capital. Assumption (3) allows for both concave and convex adjustment costs. Financial imperfections are introduced by assuming that new shares issues and risky debt are not available. At time t the firm can borrow from (and lend to) the banks one period debt, with face value b_{t+1}, at the market riskless interest rate r. A positive (negative) b_{t+1} indicates that the firm is a net borrower (lender). Banks only lend secured debt, and the only collateral they accept is physical capital. Therefore

[3]This simplifying assumption will be relaxed in the empirical section of the paper.

at time t the borrowing capacity of the firm is limited by the following constraint:

$$b_{t+1} \leq \tau_k k_{t+1} \tag{4}$$

$$0 < \tau_k \leq 1 - \delta_k \tag{5}$$

where τ_k is the share of fixed capital that can be used as collateral. One possible justification for constraint (4) is that the firm can hide the revenues from the production. Being unable to observe such revenues, the banks can only claim the residual value of the firm's physical assets as repayment of the debt (Hart and Moore, 1998). If $\tau_k = 1 - \delta_k$ then all the residual value of fixed capital is accepted as collateral. This is possible because we assume that adjustment costs do not apply when the firm is liquidated and all its assets are sold.[4]

The timing of the model is the following: at the beginning of period t the firm's technology becomes useless with an exogenous probability $1-\gamma$. In this case the assets of the firm are sold and the revenues are distributed as dividends. Instead with probability γ the firm continues activity. It inherits from time $t-1$ the stock of fixed capital k_t and the employment level l_t. Then θ_t is realized, y_t is produced and b_t repaid. w_t, the net financial wealth, is the following:

$$w_t = y_t + (1 - \delta_k)k_t - b_t \tag{6}$$

After producing, the firm allocates w_t plus the new borrowing between dividends, fixed capital and labour demand, according to the following budget constraint:

$$d_t + l_{t+1} + k_{t+1} + \mu(i_t) = w_t + b_{t+1}/R \tag{7}$$

Let's denote the value at time 0 of the firm, conditional on not liquidating the activity in period 0, and after θ_0 is realized, by $V_0(w_0, \theta_0, k_0)$:

$$V_0(w_0, \theta_0, k_0) = \underset{(k_{t+1}, l_{t+1}, b_{t+1})_{t=0,1,\ldots\infty}}{MAX} d_0 + E_0 \left\{ \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\gamma}{R}\right)^t \left[d_t + \frac{1-\gamma}{\gamma} w_t \right] \right\} \tag{8}$$

The firm maximizes (8) subject to (4) , (7) and the non negativity constraint on dividends:

$$d_t \geq 0 \tag{9}$$

For a large class of adjustment cost functions $\mu(.)$ these constraints define a compact and convex feasibility set for l_{t+1}, k_{t+1}, b_{t+1} and d_t, and the law of motion of w_{t+1} conditional on w_t, k_t and θ_t is continuous. Therefore, given the assumptions on θ_t and the concavity of the production function, a unique solution to the problem exists. In order to describe

[4] In theory, the interactions between financing constraints and adjustment costs of fixed capital may imply that in some cases the firm is forced to liquidate the activity to repay the debt, even if it would be profitable to continue. In order to simplify the analysis, we focus in this paper on the set of parameters for which this outcome never happens in equilibrium.

the optimality conditions of the model, we use equation (7) to substitute d_t in the value function (8). Moreover in the following analysis we assume that the marginal adjustment cost function $\mu'(i_t)$ is continuous and smooth in i_t. In appendix 3, equations (44)-(47) illustrate the optimality conditions of the problem when fixed capital is irreversible and this assumption is not satisfied.

Let λ_t and ϕ_t be the Lagrangian multipliers associated respectively with constraints (4) and (9). The solution of the problem is defined by the equations (10)-(13):

$$\phi_t = R\lambda_t + \gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right) \tag{10}$$

$$E_t\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial k_{t+1}}\right) = UK + R\mu'(i_t) - \Phi_t E_t\left[\mu'(i_{t+1})\right] + E_t\left(\Psi^k_{t+1}\right) \tag{11}$$

$$E_t\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}\right) = UL + E_t\left(\Psi^l_{t+1}\right) \tag{12}$$

$$D_k k_{t+1} + D_l l_{t+1} + \mu(i_t) \leq w_t - d_t \tag{13}$$

Where:

$$D_k = 1 - \frac{\tau_k}{R};\ D_l = 1 - \frac{\tau_l}{R};\ UK = R - (1-\delta_k);\ UL = R \tag{14}$$

$$\Phi_t = \frac{\gamma(1-\delta_k)\left[1 + E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)\right]}{1+\gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)} \tag{15}$$

$$E_t\left(\Psi^k_{t+1}\right) = \frac{R\left[R + R\mu'(i_t) - \tau_k\right]\lambda_t - \gamma\left[(1-\delta_k)cov\left[\phi_{t+1}, \mu'(i_{t+1})\right] - cov\left(\phi_{t+1}, \frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial k_{t+1}}\right)\right]}{1+\gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)} \tag{16}$$

$$E_t\left(\Psi^l_{t+1}\right) = \frac{R\left(R-\tau_l\right)\lambda_t - \gamma cov\left(\phi_{t+1}, \frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}\right)}{1+\gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)} \tag{17}$$

Equations (10), (11) and (12) are the first order conditions of b_{t+1}, l_{t+1} and k_{t+1} respectively. D_z for $z \in \{k, l\}$, is the downpayment required to purchase one additional unit of capital. Equation (13) combines together the budget constraint (7) and the collateral constraint (4) and implies that the downpayment necessary to buy k_{t+1} and l_{t+1} must be lower than the residual net worth after paying the dividends. By iterating forward equation (10) we obtain:

$$\phi_t = R\sum_{j=0}^{\infty} E_t\left(\lambda_{t+j}\right) \tag{18}$$

Equation (18) implies that as long as there are some current or future expected financing constraints, then $\phi_t > 0$ and the firm does not distributes dividends: $d_t = 0$.[5] In this case the solution of the investment problem depends on whether or not the collateral constraint is binding. If constraint (13) is not binding then equations (11) and (12) evaluated at

[5]It is possible to allow financing constraints and positive dividends to coexist in equilibrium by assuming that the discount factor of the firm is smaller than $\frac{1}{R}$. This means that some dividends are distributed even when there is some probability of being financially constrained. This alternative assumption would complicate the anaysis in the model, but would not affect the results derived in the paper.

$\lambda_t = 0$ can be solved to determine the optimal unconstrained input levels $k^*_{t+1}(k_t, \theta_t)$ and $l^*_{t+1}(k_t, \theta_t)$. The collateral constraint is instead binding when financial wealth is not sufficient as a downpayment for k^*_{t+1} and l^*_{t+1}, even if $d_t = 0$:

$$D_k k^*_{t+1} + D_l l^*_{t+1} + \mu\left(k^*_{t+1} - (1-\delta)k_t\right) > w_t \tag{19}$$

In this case the constrained levels of inputs $k^c_{t+1}(k_t, \theta_t, w_t)$ and $l^c_{t+1}(k_t, \theta_t, w_t)$ are such that:

$$D_k k^c_{t+1} + D_l l^c_{t+1} + \mu\left(k^c_{t+1} - (1-\delta)k_t\right) = w_t \tag{20}$$

And the solution is determined by the values k^c_{t+1}, l^c_{t+1} and λ_t that satisfy equations (11), (12) and (20).

III A new test of financing constraints based on variable capital

Equation (11) shows that the expected marginal productivity of fixed capital depends on current and future expected marginal adjustment costs and on the term $E_t\left(\Psi^k_{t+1}\right)$. Instead equation (12) shows that the expected marginal productivity of labour only depends on UL ad on the term $E_t\left(\Psi^l_{t+1}\right)$. Importantly, the term $E_t\left(\Psi^l_{t+1}\right)$ summarizes the effect of financing constraints on variable capital investment. This is illustrated in proposition 1:

Proposition 1 *if* $\lambda_t = 0$, *then* $\frac{\partial E_t\left(\Psi^l_{t+1}|\theta_t\right)}{\partial w_t} = 0$. *If* $\lambda_t > 0$, *then* $\frac{\partial E_t\left(\Psi^l_{t+1}|\theta_t\right)}{\partial w_t} < 0$

Proof: see appendix 3.

Proposition 1 states that if the financing constraint is binding then $E_t\left(\Psi^l_{t+1}\right)$ is monotonously decreasing in w_t, conditional on the productivity shock. Moreover the relationship between $E_t\left(\Psi^l_{t+1} \mid \theta_t\right)$ and w_t is convex, due to the decreasing marginal productivity of both factors. Following Caggese (2006) we develop a financing constraints test based on proposition 1 and on equation (12). When the financing constraint is binding, and for a given productivity shock θ_t and fixed capital stock k_{t+1}, labour demand l_{t+1} is a monotonously increasing function of w_t.[6] Instead when the financing constraint is not binding then variable capital investment l_{t+1} is not sensitive to w_t.[7] In order to formally derive the test, we take logs of both sides of equation (12). By noting that

[6] In the model we assume that the user cost of capital is constant, and therefore it does not affect investment decisions. In the empirical section of the paper we will discuss the consequences of relaxing this assumption.

[7] Actually when the financing constraint is not binding in period t then $\frac{\partial E_t\left(\Psi^l_{t+1}|\theta_t\right)}{\partial w_t}$ can be positive if $cov\left(\phi_{t+1}, \frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}\right)$ is positive and $\frac{\partial cov\left(\phi_{t+1}, \frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}\right)}{\partial w_t}$ is negative (see equation 7). This happens when a positive productivity shock at time $t+1$ increases at the same time $\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}$ and ϕ_{t+1} because the financing constraint becomes binding in period $t+1$. This implies that l_{t+1} can actually be negatively related to w_t for a financially unconstrained firm. This effect would in theory reinforce our financing constraints test. However, the results of the simulations show it to be always neglegible for realistic parameter values.

$E_t\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}\right) = \beta E_t\left(\theta_{t+1}\right) k_{t+1}^{\alpha} l_{t+1}^{\beta-1}$, we obtain the following:

$$\ln\beta + \ln E_t\left(\theta_{t+1}\right) + \alpha \ln k_{t+1} + (\beta - 1)\ln l_{t+1} = \ln\left[UL + E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^{l}\right)\right] \tag{21}$$

We take the linear approximation of $\ln\left[UL + E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^{l}\right)\right]$ around $\ln\left[UL + \overline{\Psi}^{l}\right]$ and we solve for $\ln l_{t+1}$:

$$\ln l_{t+1} = \pi_0 + \pi_1 \ln E_t\left(\theta_{t+1}\right) + \pi_2 \ln k_{t+1} - \pi_3 \frac{E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^{l}\right)}{UL + \overline{\Psi}^{l}} \tag{22}$$

$$\pi_0 = \frac{\ln\beta - \ln\left[UL + \overline{\Psi}^{l}\right] + \frac{\overline{\Psi}^{l}}{UL + \overline{\Psi}^{l}}}{1-\beta};\ \pi_1 = \frac{1}{1-\beta};\ \pi_2 = \frac{\alpha}{1-\beta};\ \pi_3 = \frac{1}{(1-\beta)}$$

Equation (22) shows that financing constraints directly affect labour demand through the term $E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^{l}\right)$. Since $E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^{l}\right)$ is a convex and decreasing function of w_t, we substitute $-\frac{E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^{l}\right)}{UL + \overline{\Psi}^{l}}$ with a concave transformation of w_t :

$$\ln l_{t+1} = \pi_0 + \pi_1 \ln E_t\left(\theta_{t+1}\right) + \pi_2 \ln k_{t+1} + \pi_3 f\left(w_t\right) \tag{23}$$

$$f'(.) > 0;\ f''(.) < 0$$

Equation (23) is the labour demand equation that we estimate for our financing constraints test. The financing constraints hypothesis predicts that π_3 is positive if the firm is subject to financing constraints. Instead if the firm is financially unconstrained then π_3 is equal to zero. Proposition 1 ensures that this financing constraints test is valid regardless of the type of fixed capital adjustment costs.

IV Empirical evidence

In this section we verify the validity of the test of financing constraints based on equation (23) on a sample of US companies. In order to allow for a comparison with the findings of the previous literature we select, from the Worldscope database, a balanced panel of 1357 US firms that have complete financial information for 8 years (the 1996-2003 period).[8] This sample is constructed with the same criteria as the sample used by Cleary (1999) in his estimation of the augmented Q model. We will show that our sample, which refers to a different time period, confirms Cleary's finding that the fixed investment-cash flow correlation is not a good indicator of financing constraints. Then we will use the sample to perform our new test of financing constraints.

As in Cleary (1999), our main criterion to select firm more likely to face capital markets imperfections is the dividend policy. We create a binary variable that has the value of

[8] We start by selecting all US firms in the Worldscope database with complete information from 1996 to 2003. Then we delete from the sample banks, insurance companies, other financial companies and utility companies. The complete list of all the companies included in the sample is available upon request.

one for all the observations in which the firms increase the dividends per share (2105 observations) and zero for all the observations in which firms reduce the dividends per share (432 observations). On the one hand firms usually increase dividends if they can sustain the increase in the long term. Hence this action is likely to signal that the cost of obtaining external finance is not higher than the opportunity cost of internal finance, and that these firms are likely to be not financially constrained. On the other hand a reduction in dividends is a strongly negative signal for the markets. Firms will do it only if the cost of distributing dividends is very high, and hence they presumably face an high cost of obtaining external finance. These firms are considered "likely financially constrained". We use these two groups to run a discriminant analysis based on several regressors:

$$Z = \beta_1 Current + \beta_2 FCCov + \beta_3 W/K + \beta_4 NI\% + \beta_5 GrSales + \beta_6 Debt + \beta_7 W \quad (24)$$

$Current$ =current ratio; $FCCOV$ = fixed charge coverage; $NI\%$ = net income margin; $GrSales$ = sales growth; $Debt$ = debt ratio. W = real value of the financial slack. Details about these variables are in appendix 1. This discriminant analysis correctly predicts which firms will cut or raise dividends 76% of the times, a result analogous to the estimation by Cleary (1999). We then calculate the discriminant score Z for all firms that did not increase nor decrease dividends, and hence were excluded from the discriminant analysis, and then following Cleary (1999) we create three equally sized groups of firm years observations, one with low score (likely financially constrained), one with medium score, and one with high score. Table I reports summary statistics about these groups. The firms in the likely financially constrained group are relatively smaller, more leveraged and less profitable than the firms in the other groups. However the variances are high and the differences are always not statistically significant. Table II illustrates the estimations of the augmented Q model of investment. The top part reports the estimates obtained by Cleary (1999), and shows that the investment-cash flow sensitivities are decreasing rather than increasing in the intensity of financing constrains. The mid part of the table shows that in our sample we obtain the same qualitative result.[9] In both cases the cash flow coefficient is positive mainly because it is positively correlated with the unobserved productivity shock, which is only partly captured by Q. In the bottom part of the table we report consistent estimates of the same coefficients obtained using a GMM estimation method. The significance of the cash flow coefficient is greatly reduced, and still not related to the intensity of financing constraints. This is consistent with the results obtained by Erickson and Whited (2000) and Bond *et al* (2004).

We now proceed to estimate the test of financing constraints based on labour demand. With respect to equation (23) we initially assume that fixed capital becomes productive one period after it is installed, while newly hired workers are immediately productive.

[9]The magnitude and significance of the cash-flow coefficients are lower than in Cleary (1999). This may be due to the dfferent treatment of outliers in the two samples. We eliminate outliers by cutting out all values of the variables beyond a certain thershold. Cleary (1999) keeps them in the sample by assigning a value equal to the threshold itself.

Therefore the equation we estimate is the following:

$$\ln l_{i,t+1} = a_i + d_t + \pi_0 + \pi_1 \ln E_t\left(\theta_{i,t+1}\right) + \pi_2 \ln k_{i,t} + \pi_3 \ln w_{i,t} + \epsilon_{i,t+1} \tag{25}$$

We introduce time and firm specific dummies to take into account, among other things, of the fact that the user cost of labour is non constant across firms. $k_{i,t}$ is the real value of net fixed assets (property, plant and equipment) at the end of period t. $E_t\left(\theta_{i,t+1}\right)$, the expected productivity shock, is estimated from the total factor productivity of the firm. $w_{i,t}$ is the real value of the financial slack available at the end of period t. $l_{i,t+1}$ is number of employees reported by the company at the end of period $t+1$. More detailed information about the variables used is reported in appendix 1.

Ideally we would have preferred to use a more flexible factor of production, such as the cost of materials, as the dependent variable in equation (25). Unfortunately this information is not available for most of the firms in the sample. Therefore we use the number of employees instead. A large literature finds evidence of adjustment costs in high frequency labor dynamics. However, we believe that in our dataset labor is a flexible enough factor to be used as dependent variable in our test. This is because our data is yearly, and aggregated at company rather than at the plant level. Temporal aggregation ensures that most of the adjustment to shocks takes place within the period. For example Mairesse and Brigitte (1985) examine a yearly panel data of US firms and show that 5/6 of the labour adjustment to shocks is completed in one year. Studies on aggregate data also show a fast speed of adjustment of labour, and infer small labour adjustment costs (see Hamermesh and Pfann (1996) for a review).

We estimate equation (25) using a System-GMM estimation technique (Blundell and Bond, 1998) applied to first differences.[10] We eliminate as outliers all the observations smaller than the 1% percentile and larger than the 99% percentile of every variable. The details of the specification tests run to determine the appropriate estimation method, and the *partial* R^2 test of the validity of the instruments, are reported in appendix 2. Tables from III to XI show the estimation results. In all the tables we provide the Hansen test of overidentifying restrictions, which is robust to heteroskedasticity and autocorrelation of unknown form. In the main estimations in tables (III)-(VI) the orthogonality of the instruments is never rejected at the 10% significant level, with only one exception.

The four columns of table III report the estimates of equation (25) for the three groups of firm-year observations selected according to the Z score and for the sample complementary to the low Z group. The results confirm the financing constraints hypothesis, because the value of the coefficient of $\ln w_{i,t}$ is significantly higher for the "likely financially constrained" (low Z) group than for the other groups.

In the mid part of table III we repeat the same estimation adding a variable that measures the cost of capital. $ccap_{i,t+1}$ is the ratio of the interest payment of debt during period $t+1$ over total debt at the end of period t. In the theoretical model the user cost of capital is constant and included in π_0. Therefore the variable $ccap_{i,t+1}$ could capture

[10] We use the command xtabond2 on the software package STATA.

changes in the user cost of capital that are not already captured by firm specific effects and time dummies. This is potentially important because the positive estimated value of π_3 for likely constrained firms could have the following explanation not related to financing constraints: firms that experience an increase in $w_{i,t}$ reduce their probability of bankruptcy and banks are willing to finance them at a lower interest rate. This reduces the cost of capital and increases investment. The estimates in the second part of table III reject this hypothesis. Even after the inclusion of the cost of capital the estimate of π_3 is still significantly higher for the likely financially constrained firms than for the other firms.

The last column shows that π_3 is also significantly higher than zero for the high Z group. Table I shows that these observations on average belong to the most productive and fast growing firms, and a positive π_3 could be capturing the unobservable productivity shock. Since the coefficient of $\ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$ has the expected sign but is not significant, we add two additional variables that are correlated with the productivity of the firm: $\left(\frac{profits}{sales}\right)_{i,t+1}$, the ratio of earnings before interest and taxes to net sales during period $t+1$; $Q_{i,t+1}$, the ratio of average market value during period $t+1$ to book value at the end of period t. The inclusion of these two variables slightly reduces the $\ln w_{i,t}$ coefficient for the high Z group and increases the statistical significance of the difference in this coefficient between likely constrained and likely unconstrained firms . After each regression in table III we report the p-value of a test of equality of the $\ln w_{i,t}$ coefficient between the group of likely financially constrained observations and the other groups. In order to ensure that the test is robust, we adopt a bootstrap procedure. We randomly select subsamples of firm year observations that have same size of the groups considered in table III. We perform the estimation of the model on these subsamples, and we compute the differences in the coefficient of $\ln w_{i,t}$. We repeat this procedure 1000 times. The p-value reported in the table is the ratio of the number of times the difference in the random coefficients is greater than the difference between the likely financially constrained group and the other groups. Therefore it represents the p-value of a one sided test of the equality of the coefficients. The results show that the $\ln w_{i,t}$ coefficient is significantly higher for the likely financially constrained group than for the complementary sample at more than the 0.1% significance level. The same result is obtained when we compare likely financially constrained and medium Z groups. Instead the $\ln w_{i,t}$ coefficient is higher for the likely financially constrained group than for the high Z group at the 7.9%, 6% and 2.5% significance levels in the base model, the augmented model 1 and the augmented model 2 respectively. These results show that our method successfully identifies more financially constrained firms on a sample where the investment-cash flow approach fails. In the remainder of this paper we illustrate the estimations of several alternative specifications that prove the robustness of this result.

A Box Cox transformation

Our theory predicts that a concave transformation of $w_{i,t}$ is an explanatory variable in equation (25), but the degree of concavity depends on several factors, such as the type of adjustment costs of fixed capital and the type of financing imperfections and constraints on external financing. Therefore we perform a grid search on different values of ν, the coefficient of the following Box-Cox transformation:

$$\frac{w_{i,t}^{\nu} - 1}{\nu} \tag{26}$$

The transformation which best fits the data for the overall sample is the one with $\nu = 0.082$. In table IV we report the corresponding estimated coefficients. This transformation confirms the previous results and does not improve the significance of the estimated parameters. Therefore we choose to keep the log transformation for the remainder of this paper.

B Alternative selection of groups

We have followed so far the group selection criterion of Cleary (1999), which divides all the observations in three equally size groups. This criterion implicitly assumes that at least 33% of the firm-year observations are likely financially constrained, in the sense that, for a given level of expected productivity, they would invest and hire more if they had more cash available. This seems a very high percentage for an economy with well developed financial markets. Therefore we estimate equation (25) for a different selection of groups. In table V we report the estimation results for 5 groups of firm-year observations selected according to the five quintiles of the Z score. The first quintile, which represents the 20% observations most likely to be financially constrained, has the highest sensitivity of employment to financial wealth. Moreover this sensitivity increases as we focus on the 10% and then the 5% observations most likely to be financially constrained, and it is always significantly higher than the sensitivity of the other groups of observations.

C Alternative selection criteria

We have so far always used the same criterion, the Z score from the discriminant analysis, to select observations in likely financially constrained and unconstrained groups. This leaves us with the doubt that the results could depend on some specific feature of this selection criterion which is not related to financing constraints. Therefore in this subsection we sort firms according to two alternative criteria to sort financially constrained firms, size and zero dividend policy.[11] Small firms are more likely to face capital market imperfections and therefore should have a bigger wealth coefficient in equation (25). Firms that do not distribute dividends in any of the sample years should on average have a premium in the cost of external finance with respect to the firms that distribute dividends. This criterion was originally used by Fazzari Hubbard and Petersen (1988), and is consistent

[11] Another commonly used selection criterion is wether or not firms issue bonds. Unfortunately we do not have access to this information for the firms in our sample.

with the predictions of our theoretical model. Table VI shows the estimation results for the size criterion. smaller firms have a significantly higher $\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t}$ coefficient than larger firms. Moreover conditional on a certain size class we also show that low Z observations have an higher $\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t}$ coefficient (except in the case of the largest class of firms with more than 10000 employees) than the complementary group. Importantly, for the medium to large size firms (250 to 10000 employees) the financing constraints test works and at the same time the estimated coefficient of the productivity shock $\Delta \ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$ is significantly greater than zero. This is consistent with the simulations results presented in the previous section, which showed that the amount of noise in the estimation of the productivity shock does not affect the power of the financing constraints test.

Table VII shows the estimation results for the zero dividends criterion, and it confirms the results obtained before. The coefficient of $\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t}$ is positive and strongly significant for firms that do not distribute dividends in any sample year, while it is not significantly different from zero for the firms that distribute dividends.

D Contemporaneous capital

In the previous estimations we maintained the assumption that capital is only productive one year after it is installed. In reality the time to install capital is likely to be less than one year, and therefore part of period t investment in fixed capital is likely to contribute to period t output. The omission of this component may bias the results of the estimations. In order to verify this, we repeat the analysis including contemporaneous rather than lagged fixed capital in the estimation of equation (25). The results are reported in table XI. The coefficient of contemporaneous fixed capital is much larger and significant than the coefficient of lagged fixed capital in the previous tables, even though it is still smaller than the value implied by the structural parameters.[12] Importantly, the coefficient of wealth is still able to identify financially constrained firms. The coefficient is significantly positive only for the likely financially constrained groups, and it increases as we consider the groups of 20%, 10% and 5% observations most likely to be financially constrained.

E The Q model

Table II shows that the investment-cash flow correlation is not a good proxy for the intensity of financing constraints. However our theoretical model suggests that cash stock rather than cash flow should be included as the regressor that captures the intensity of financing constraints. Therefore in the upper part of table IX we estimate the Q model adding the ratio of wealth over fixed capital among the regressors. Since the model does not predict whether financial wealth should enter in the Q model linearly or as a concave transformation, we perform a grid search over the full sample and find that

[12]The coefficient of $\Delta \ln k_{i,t+1}$ is equal to $\frac{\alpha}{1-\beta}$, where α and β are respectively the elasticities of capital and labour to output. Consistent estimates of α and β for the balanced sample are found to be respectively 0.35 and 0.58, which implies that the coefficient of $\Delta \ln k_{i,t+1}$ should be around 0.83.

the transformation with the Box-Cox coefficient equal to 0.21 achieves the best fit. The results confirm that the Q model is not useful to identify financing constraints. In the first regression the wealth coefficient is marginally higher for the likely financially constrained group, but it is not significantly different from zero. In the second regression the wealth coefficient is not increasing in the intensity of financing constraints.

F Irreversibility of fixed capital

The regression results presented in table IX show that the correlation between fixed investment and internal finance (cash stock) is not a good measure of the intensity of financing constraints. This confirms the findings of Bond *et al* (2004), on a sample of large UK companies. Our theoretical model predicts that this happens because fixed capital is subject to a certain degree of irreversibility. This assumption is supported by a large empirical literature.[13] In this section we provide some simple anecdotal evidence about fixed capital irreversibility in our sample. We calculate the net investment rates of fixed capital and labour for every firm year observation. We eliminate fixed effects by subtracting from the net investment rates the firm specific averages and we normalize by dividing them for the firm specific standard deviations. As pointed out by Caballero, Engel and Haltiwanger (1995) if fixed capital is irreversible then the response of fixed capital investment to the productivity shocks is asymmetrical, and the distribution of the standardized investment rates is skewed to the left even though the distribution of productivity shocks is symmetrical. In the upper part of table X we report the summary statistics for the standardized net investment rates of fixed capital, labour, and the productivity shock for the subset of financially unconstrained observations (medium Z and high Z groups). We exclude the low Z group because the above analysis applies in the absence of financing constraints. The distribution of fixed capital net investment rates presents positive skewness despite the distribution of the productivity shocks has a very mild negative skewness. The Kurtosis of all series is very close to 3. This is consistent with the empirical evidence produced by Doms and Dunne (1998), who show that the investment rates at the plant level present both positive skewness and excess kurtosis. The latter indicates lumpy investment. The same authors show that investment rates aggregated at the firm level are smoother (lower kurtosis), but still present positive skewness.

Table X also shows that labour net investment rates are positively skewed, but less so than fixed capital net investment rates. This finding is consistent with the prediction of the model that the sensitivity of labour to internal finance is a useful indicator of financing constraints because labour is not subject to the same degree of irreversibility than fixed capital.

[13] See footnote n.??.

G Alternative dependent variable

We have so far estimated equation (25) always using labour as the dependent variable. We claim that, in our dataset, labor is a flexible enough factor to be used as dependent variable in our test. This claim is supported by the statistics in table X. As an additional robustness check, we now consider alternative dependent variables for the estimation of equation (25). We first consider fixed capital. We expect that in this case the coefficient of internal finance should not be a good indicator of financing constraints. This is confirmed by the regression results in table XI, which show that the coefficient of $\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t}$ is almost identical for low Z firms and for the complementary firms. The same coefficient is higher for no dividend firms than for the other firms, but it is very imprecisely estimated and the null hypothesis of no significance cannot be rejected for both groups of firms. Finally, the coefficient is not significant for groups of firms selected according to size, with the exception of the firms between 250 and 2500 employees.

We then consider an alternative type of variable input, the R&D expenditure. We argue that R&D investment requires initial large fixed costs to establish a research unit in a company, but that conditional on these fixed costs R&D expenditure is more flexible than fixed capital expenditure. This is confirmed by the fact that the distribution of the standardized net percentage changes in R&D expenditures (calculated only for firms that present positive R&D expenditures in all the sample years) is much less skewed than the distribution of the standardized investment rates of both fixed capital and labour (see table XII). Therefore we consider an extended production function that includes also R&D expenditures, called r_t:

$$y_t = \theta_t r_t^{\eta} k_t^{\alpha} l_t^{\beta} \text{ with } \alpha + \beta + \eta < 1 \tag{27}$$

In this case the reduced form variable capital equation is the following:

$$\ln r_{i,t+1} = a_i + d_t + \pi_0 + \pi_1 \ln E_t\left(\theta_{i,t+1}\right) + \pi_2 \ln k_{i,t} + \pi_3 \ln l_{i,t+1} + \pi_4 \ln w_{i,t} + \epsilon_{i,t+1} \tag{28}$$

The estimation results are in table XIII. The sensitivity of *R&D* investment to internal finance is generally positive, and much higher for firms likely to be financially constrained (low Z firms, no dividends firms and smaller firms) than for the other firms, the difference being strongly statistically significant. The sensitivity of *R&D* investment to internal finance is the strongest for the group of firms smaller than 250 employees, while is not significantly different from zero at the 5% significance level for the group of firms larger than 10.000 employees.

V Conclusions

In this paper we estimate a financing constraints test based on labour demand on panel of large US companies (1996 to 2003). The sample, drawn from the Worldscope Database, is analogous to the one used by Cleary (1999), and therefore has the appealing feature of allowing a comparison with the results of the previous literature.

Our analysis confirms Cleary's (1999) finding that the sensitivity of fixed investment to cash flow is not a good indicator of financing constraints. Importantly, we show that our test of financing constraints instead yields consistent results: the sensitivity of labour demand and R&D to internal finance are always significantly higher for firms more likely to be subject to capital market imperfections. This is confirmed no matter whether we select more constrained firms using dividend policy, or size, or wether we use a combination of these two criteria.

References

[1] Almeida, E. and M. Campello, Financial Constraints, Asset Tangibility and Corporate Investment, Forthcoming, *Review of Financial Studies.*

[2] Arellano, M. and S. Bond, 1991, Some Tests of Specification for Panel Data: Monte Carlo Evidence and an Application to Employment Equations, *Review of Economic Studies*, 58, 277-97.

[3] Blundell, R. and S. Bond, 1998, Initial Conditions and Moment Restrictions in Dynamic Panel Data Models, *Journal of Econometrics* 87, 115-43.

[4] Blundell, R. and S. Bond, 2000, GMM Estimation with Persistent Panel Data: An Application to Production Functions, *Econometric Reviews* 19, 321-40.

[5] Bond, S., Klemm, A., Newton-Smith, R., Syed, M., and Vlieghe Gertjan, 2004, "The Roles of Expected Profitability, Tobin's Q and Cash Flow in Econometric Models of Company Investment", IFS working paper 04/12

[6] Caballero, R.J., Engel, E. and J. Haltiwanger, 1995, Plant-Level Adjustment and Aggregate Investment Dynamics, *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity,* 1-54.

[7] Caggese, A., 2006, Testing Financing Constraints on Firm Investment Using Variable Capital, mimeo, Pompeu Fabra University.

[8] Cleary, S., 1999, The Relationship between Firm Investment and Financial Status, *Journal of Finance* 54, 673-692.

[9] Doms,M. and T. Dunne, 1998, Capital Adjustment Patterns in Manufacturing Plants, *Review of Economic Dynamics,* 1, 409-429.

[10] Erickson, T. and T. Whited, 2000, Measurement Error and the Relationship between Investment and q, *Journal of Political Economy* 108, 1027-57

[11] Fazzari S.M., Hubbard G.R. and B.C. Petersen, 1988, Financing Constraints and Corporate Investment, *Brooking Papers on Economic Activity* 1, 141-195.

[12] Hall, R.E., 2004, Measuring Factor Adjustment Costs, *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 119, 899 - 927.

[13] Hamermesh, D. and G. Pfann, 1996, Adjustment Costs in Factor Demand, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 34, 1264-92

[14] Hart,O and J.H. Moore, 1998, Default and Renegotiation: a Dynamic Model of Debt, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 113, 1-41.

[15] Mairesse, J. and D. Brigitte, 1985, Labor and Investment Demand at the Firm Level: A Comparison of French, German and U.S. Manufacturing, 1970-79, NBER Working Paper No. W1554.

[16] Nickell, S. and S. Wadhwani, 1991, Employment Determination in British Industry: Investigations Using Micro-data, *Review of Economic Studies*, 58, 955-69.

[17] Sharpe, S., 1994, Financial Market Imperfections, Firm Leverage, and the Cyclicality of Employment, *American Economic Review*, 84, 1060-74.

[18] Shea, J., 1997, Instrument Relevance in Multivariate Linear Models: A Simple Measure, *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 49, 348-352.

Appendix 1

We describe the variables used in the empirical section of the paper. The discriminant analysis employs the same variables used by Cleary (1999), with the exception of the fixed charge coverage ratio, which is not corrected for taxation:

$Current$= current assets/current liabilities;

Debt= current portion of long term debt/total assets;

$FCCOV$= earnings before interest and taxes/(interest expense + preferred dividends payments);

$NI\%$=(net income before extraordinary items ± extraordinary items and discontinued operations)/net sales;

$GrSales$=(net sales$_t$ - net sales$_{t-1}$)/net sales$_{t-1}$;

$W = w_{i,t}$ (see below).

The variables used for the financing constraints tests are listed below:

$i_{i,t}$ =real value of gross capital expenditure during year t;

$k_{i,t}$ =book value, in real terms, of fixed assets at the beginning of year t;

$c_{i,t}$ =real value of: net income + depreciation and amortization expenses + change in deferred taxes during year t;

$l_{i,t}$ =number of employees at the end of year t;

$\left(\frac{profits}{sales}\right)_{i,t}$ =earnings before interest and taxes/net sales during period t;

$Q_{i,t}$ =average market value during period t divided by book value at the beginning of period t;

w_t =real value of :cash+short term financial assets-short term loans+0.5∗inventories+0.7∗accounts receivable. all stocks are measured at the beginning of period t;

r_t =real value of R&D expenditure during year t;

$E_{t-1}(\theta_{i,t})$=expected productivity at time t conditional on the information set in period $t-1$. In order to compute it we estimate the following production function:

$$\ln y_{i,t} = a_i + d_t + \alpha \ln k_{i,t} + \beta \ln l_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \tag{29}$$

$y_{i,t}$ is the real value of net sales during period t. We estimate $\widehat{\alpha}$ and $\widehat{\beta}$ from equation (29) using a SYSTEM GMM estimation method (Blundell and Bond, 1998 and 2000), separately for 6 groups of firms selected according to homogeneous types of activity. We use the estimates $\widehat{\alpha}$, $\widehat{\beta}$ and $\widehat{d_t}$ to calculate the total factor productivity. $\ln E_{t-1}(\theta_t)$ is the firm specific component of the total factor productivity in period $t-1$ (aggregate and sector specific components are eliminated using dummy variables).

Appendix 2

We describe the specification tests performed to determine the estimation method of equation (25). We expect that some or all the right hand side variables may be endogenous and correlated to $\epsilon_{i,t+1}$, because the term $\ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$ does not capture entirely the unobservable productivity shock. Moreover they are also most likely correlated with the firm specific effect a_i. In this case a suitable estimation strategy is to first difference equation (25) to eliminate the unobservable firm specific effect a_i, and then estimate it with a GMM estimation technique, using the available lagged levels of the explanatory variables as instruments for their first differences. In this case the set of instruments is different for each year, and equation (25) is estimated as a system of cross sectional equations, each one corresponding to a different period t (Arellano and Bond, 1991). More recent lags are likely to be better instruments, but they may be correlated with the error term if this is itself autocorrelated. The test of overidentifying restrictions can be used to assess the orthogonality of the instruments with the error term. Moreover, under the assumption that $E(\Delta z_{i,t-j}, a_i) = 0$, with $z = \{\ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1}), \ln k_{i,t}, \ln w_{i,t}\}$, $\Delta z_{i,t-j}$ are valid instrument for equation (25) estimated in levels. Blundell and Bond (1998) propose a SYSTEM GMM estimation technique that uses both the equation in level (instrumented using lagged first differences), and the equation in first differences (instrumented using lagged levels).

In table XIV we test the validity of the instruments for the estimation of equation (25). From the first stage regression we report, for each regressor, the *partial* R^2 measure proposed by Shea (1997). The higher is the *partial* R^2, the more the instruments are correlated with the instrumented regressor. Moreover we test the exogeneity of the instruments with the Hansen test of overidentifying restrictions, which is robust to heteroskedasticity and serial correlation of unknown form. We consider both the overall sample and the subsamples of firms selected according to the Z score.

$t-1$ to $t-3$ lagged first differences are reasonably good instruments for the equation in levels for both $\ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$ and $\ln w_{i,t+1}$, but their exogeneity is rejected by the orthogonality test. $t-2$ to $t-3$ lagged levels are less good instruments for the equation in first differences. This was expected given that the series in levels are very persistent. In any case also these instruments are rejected by the orthogonality test. We also report the orthogonality test for longer lags of the instruments, and we find that in most cases also

-5 and -6 lags are rejected. The presence of different grow path across firms, which implies the presence of firm specific effects in the first difference equation, can explain these findings. Consider for example the case in which the error $\epsilon_{i,t+1}$ includes an unobservable productivity trend:

$$\epsilon_{i,t+1} = \kappa_i t + \upsilon_{i,t} \tag{30}$$

Since we impose that the production function has decreasing returns to scale, equation (30) implies that firms are allowed to expand at different growth rates κ_i. In this case first differencing equation (25) yields:

$$\Delta \ln l_{i,t+1} = \Delta d_t + \pi_1 \Delta \ln E_t\left(\theta_{i,t+1}\right) + \pi_2 \Delta \ln k_{i,t} + \pi_3 \Delta \ln w_{i,t+1} + \kappa_i + \Delta \upsilon_{i,t} \tag{31}$$

If κ_i in equation (31) is correlated with a_i in equation (25) then lagged levels are not good instruments for equation (31) and lagged first differences are not good instruments for equation (25). The assumption that equation (31) contains a firm specific effect is consistent with the previous literature on firm investment. Reduced form investment equations, where the dependent variable is the fixed capital gross investment rate, usually present a firm specific effect which is correlated with the other regressors (see Bond, 2002, for an example). In equation (31) the dependent variable is an approximation of the net investment rate in labour input. In order to eliminate the firm specific effect κ_i we first differentiate equation (31). Table XV shows that the lagged second differences of $\ln E_t\left(\theta_{i,t+1}\right)$, $\ln k_{i,t}$ and $\ln w_{i,t+1}$ are valid instruments for the equation in first differences, and that the lagged first differences are valid instruments for the equation in second differences. Therefore we decide to use both sets of restrictions and to estimate equation (31) with the System GMM estimation technique.

Appendix 3

We provide both an intuitive and a more formal proof of proposition 1. For simplicity we assume that θ_t follows a two state stationary stochastic process without persistency, even though the proof can be generalized also for persistent stationary stochastic processes:

$$\theta_t \in \{\theta_L, \theta_H\} \tag{32}$$

$$\theta_H > \theta_L > 0 \tag{33}$$

$$pr(\theta_t = \theta_L) = 0.5;\ pr(\theta_t = \theta_H) = 0.5 \tag{34}$$

In this case θ_t is not a state variable of the problem. If equation (13) is not binding with equality, the solution is given by the capital input levels $l^*_{t+1}\left(k_t\right)$ and $k^*_{t+1}\left(k_t\right)$. The functional form that relates l^*_{t+1} and k^*_{t+1} to k_t depends on the type of adjustment costs. We defined $\underline{w}^*_t\left(k_t\right)$ as the minimum level of wealth that allows to finance $l^*_{t+1}\left(k_t\right)$ and $k^*_{t+1}\left(k_t\right)$.Therefore the financing constraint is binding when $w_t < \underline{w}^*_t\left(k_t\right)$. In this case λ_t is positive and it is jointly determined with l^c_{t+1} and k^c_{t+1} by the three following equations:

$$E_t\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial k_{t+1}}\right) - UK = \Omega_t + \Gamma_t \lambda_t \tag{35}$$

$$E_t\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}\right) = UL + \frac{R\left(R-\tau_l\right)\lambda_t - \gamma cov\left(\phi_{t+1}, y^l_{t+1}\right)}{1+\gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)} \tag{36}$$

$$D_k k_{t+1} + D_l l_{t+1} + \mu\left(i_t\right) = w_t \tag{37}$$

$$\Gamma_t \equiv \frac{R\left[R + R\mu'\left(i_t\right) - \tau_k\right]}{1+\gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)}$$

$$\Omega_t \equiv R\mu'\left(i_t\right) + \\ -\frac{\gamma(1-\delta_k)\left[1+E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)\right]E_t\left[\mu'\left(i_{t+1}\right)\right] - \left\{\gamma\left[(1-\delta_k)cov\left[\phi_{t+1}, \mu'\left(i_{t+1}\right)\right] + cov\left(\phi_{t+1}, y^k_{t+1}\right)\right]\right\}}{1+\gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)}$$

Before providing a sketched proof of proposition 1, we illustrate an intuitive argument of why $l_{t+1}\left(w_t \mid k_t, \theta_t\right)$ is positively related to w_t, conditional on a binding financing constraint ($w_t < \underline{w}^*_t$ and $\lambda_t > 0$). We illustrate the argument for the different types of adjustment costs of fixed capital.

i) Irreversibility constraint. If the irreversibility constraint is not binding, then a reduction in w_t causes a fall in both l_{t+1} and k_{t+1}. If the irreversibility constraint binds, then $k_{t+1} = (1-\delta)\,k_t$, but still a reduction in wealth causes a reduction in l_{t+1}. An analogous argument applies when w_t increases.

ii) Convex adjustment costs. if optimal investment choices require an increase in fixed capital, then $i^c_t > 0$. Equation (35) implies that in this case the excess productivity of capital, $E_t\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial k_{t+1}}\right) - UK$, is compensated by the net marginal adjustment costs (Ω_t) and the financing constraints costs (λ_t). As w_t decreases, The firm will find convenient to reduce i^c_t. This will reduce fixed capital adjustment costs, and the firm will be able to compensate the reduction in wealth with a smaller reduction in i_{t+1} and l_{t+1}. In equation (35) the increase in λ_t is partly offset by a reduction in Ω_t, and partly by an increase in $E_t\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial k_{t+1}}\right) - UK$, but still there is a positive relationship between l_{t+1} and w_t.

If optimal investment choices require a decrease in fixed capital, then $i^c_t < 0$. In this case both $E_t\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial k_{t+1}}\right) - UK$ and Ω_t are negative. When w_t decreases then the firm must decrease fixed investment, but this increases adjustment costs. Therefore most of the reduction in wealth will be absorbed by a reduction in labour demand.

iii) fixed adjustment costs. We assume fixed symmetrical adjustment costs:

$$\mu\left(i_t = 0\right) = 0;\ \mu\left(i_t \neq 0\right) = F$$

We do not provide a formal treatment of this case, but the existing literature on the subject (see Caballero, 1997, for a review) shows that in this case optimal investment choices imply "investment bunching". Optimal fixed investment i_t is zero if the loss in the value function from not investing is smaller then F. Otherwise investment is different from zero and equal to internal solution of the firm maximization problem. Therefore there are three distinct cases:

positive action: suppose that optimal fixed investment is positive ($i^*_t > 0$) conditional on $w_t \geq \underline{w}^*_t$ ($\lambda_t = 0$). The reduction in wealth below $\underline{w}^*_t$ initially reduces fixed investment and labour demand and increases λ_t. At some point the gain from investing will become too small to justify the fixed cost F. In this case i_t^c falls to zero, and also l_{t+1} falls down because the two factors are complementary. Then further decreases in wealth only affect labour demand. If the fixed cost F is small relative to w_t, at some point it may be optimal to pay it to reduce fixed capital together with labour demand. But if F is large then this may not be possible, and eventually the firm may be forced to exit from activity. However in all the previous cases the reduction in w_t always causes a reduction in l_{t+1}. Therefore the monotonous relationship between $l_{t+1}(w_t \mid k_t, \theta_t)$ and w_t also applies in the case of fixed costs. But in this case $\frac{\partial l_{t+1}(w_t|k_t,\theta_t)}{\partial w_t}$ is not continuous in w_t, and this could induce biases in the estimation of the labour demand equation. Therefore if fixed costs are expected to be important, the estimation should yield better results if it is performed conditional on positive or zero fixed capital investment, whose probabilities can themselves be estimated as an hazard function.

Inaction, $i_t^* = 0$, or negative action, $i_t^* < 0$. Essentially the above analysis applies.

The above discussion clarifies that, for a given productivity shock, labour demand is directly related to financial wealth when the financing constraints is binding. For a more formal proof of proposition 1, let's consider the solution of the model for the quadratic adjustment costs and irreversibility cases, which are those used in the simulation section of the paper.

Quadratic adjustment costs. In this case marginal adjustment costs are smooth and continuous in i_t. We differentiate $E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^l\right)$, as defined by equation (7), by w_t :

$$\frac{\partial E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^l\right)}{\partial w_t} = \frac{R^2 D_l\left(\partial\lambda_t/\partial w_t\right) - \gamma\left[\partial cov\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}, \phi_{t+1}\right)/\partial w_t\right]}{1+\gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)} - \frac{\gamma E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^l\right)\left(\partial E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)/\partial w_t\right)}{\left[1+\gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)\right]^2} \tag{38}$$

since the production function has decreasing returns to scale it follows that as wealth and investment decrease the total factor productivity must increase, and with it also the shadow cost of a binding financing constraint λ_t. therefore:

$$\left(\frac{\partial\lambda_t}{\partial w_t} \mid w_t \leq \underline{w}_t^*\right) < 0 \tag{39}$$

Moreover, the lower is w_t, the higher the probability that also future wealth will be lower, and this increases future expected financing constraints:

$$\left(\frac{\partial E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)}{\partial w_t} \mid w_t \leq \underline{w}_t^*\right) = \left(\frac{\partial R\sum\limits_{j=0}^{\infty} E_t\left(\lambda_{t+1+j}\right)}{\partial w_t} \mid w_t \leq \underline{w}_t^*\right) \leq 0 \tag{40}$$

Finally, lets consider the covariance term $cov\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}, \phi_{t+1}\right)$. Conditional on $\theta_{t+1} = \theta_H$ we have that $\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}} > E_t\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}\right)$. Moreover the positive productivity shock increases wealth and reduces future expected financing constraints: $\phi_{t+1} < E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)$. Using the symmetric argument for $\theta_{t+1} = \theta_L$, it is easy to show that $cov\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}, \phi_{t+1}\right) < 0$. Moreover the lower is the wealth, the more expected financing constraints are sensitive to a change in wealth, and therefore such covariance becomes more negative as w_t decreases:

$$\left(\frac{\partial \left| cov\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial l_{t+1}}, \phi_{t+1}\right)\right|}{\partial w_t} \mid w_t \leq \underline{w}_t^* \right) > 0 \tag{41}$$

Now we can turn to the sign of $\frac{\partial E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^l\right)}{\partial w_t}$. According to the discussion above, the first term on the right hand side of equation (38) is negative, while the second is positive. The numerical solution of the problem shows that the sum of the two terms is always negative. We are not able to provide an analytical proof of it, but the intuition is as follows: changes in wealth affect current financing constraints more than future expected financing constraints, because the productivity shock is stationary. Therefore $|\partial\lambda_t/\partial w_t|$ is large relative to $\left|\partial E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)/\partial w_t\right|$. Moreover $E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^l\right)$ is typically much smaller than one, and therefore the last term at the right hand side of (38) is always smaller than the first. Therefore:

$$\frac{\partial E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^l \mid \theta_t\right)}{\partial w_t} < 0$$

Which proves proposition 1.

Irreversibility of fixed capital. In this case the assumption of smooth marginal adjustment costs is substituted by the following irreversibility constraint:

$$k_{t+1} \geq (1-\delta)\, k_t \tag{42}$$

The budget constraint becomes the following:

$$d_t + l_{t+1} + k_{t+1} = w_t + b_{t+1}/R \tag{43}$$

The firm maximizes the value function (8) subject to (4), (9), (**??**) and (43). Let λ_t, ϕ_t and μ_t be the Lagrangian multipliers associated respectively with constraints (4), (9) and (**??**). in this case (10) and (12) are still the first order conditions of the problem. The only change in the solution regards (11) and (13), which become the following:

$$E_t\left(\frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial k_{t+1}}\right) = UK + R\mu_t - \Phi_t E_t\left(\mu_{t+1}\right) + E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^k\right) \tag{44}$$

$$D_k k_{t+1} + D_l l_{t+1} \leq w_t - d_t \tag{45}$$

Where:

$$\Phi_t = \frac{\gamma(1-\delta_k)\left[1 + E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)\right]}{1 + \gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)} \tag{46}$$

$$E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^k\right) = \frac{R\left[R + R\mu_t - \tau_k\right]\lambda_t + \gamma cov\left(\phi_{t+1}, \frac{\partial y_{t+1}}{\partial k_{t+1}}\right)}{1 + \gamma E_t\left(\phi_{t+1}\right)} \tag{47}$$

Since $E_t\left(\Psi_{t+1}^l\right)$ is still defined by equation (7), the proof of proposition 1 is the same as for the case of quadratic adjustment costs.

Tables

Table I: Summary statistics

	Low Z_{FC} (likely financially constrained)	Medium Z_{FC}	High Z_{FC}
Mean net fixed assets	670117 (4365691)	983064 (3763386)	956132 (4151552)
Median net fixed assets	36108	130400	81568
Median number of employees	1476	3200	1900
Current ratio[1]	2.43(1.99)	2.16(1.41)	2.73(2.03)
Debt ratio[1]	0.35(0.22)	0.26(0.15)	0.14(0.14)
Fixed charge coverage ratio[2]	-5.9(25)	9.6(40)	44.4(89)
Net income margin (%)[2]	-0.17(0.41)	0.035(0.044)	0.063(0.19)
Market-to-book ratio[2]	1.34(1.58)	1.32(1.11)	2.19(1.71)
Sales growth[2]	-0.024(0.23)	0.079(0.15)	0.23(0.29)
Slack/K[2]	2.16(3.55)	1.64(2.98)	2.79(4.61)
Cash Flow/K[2]	-0.31(1.45)	0.50(0.76)	0.81(1.22)
Investment/K[1]	0.22(0.22)	0.23(0.20)	0.33(0.27)
Discriminant score[2]	-2.27	-0.29	0.90

Standard deviations in parenthesis. 1) Largest 1% excluded from the computation; 2) largest 1% in absolute value excluded from the computation.

Table II: The Q model with cash flow added as an explanatory variable

dependent variable: $\left(\frac{i}{k}\right)_{i,t}$	$Q_{i,t}$	$\left(\frac{cf}{k}\right)_{i,t}$	*Adj.* R^2	N. obs.
1988-1994 sample, fixed effects estimates (from Cleary, 1999)				
All firms	0.024 (12.3)	0.096 (29.7)	0.1176	9219
Low Z score (financially constr.)	0.020 (5.8)	0.064 (14.0)	0.0778	3073
Medium Z score	0.028 (7.7)	0.090 (14.1)	0.0928	3073
High Z score	0.018 (5.8)	0.153 (23.5)	0.1824	3073
1997-2003 sample, fixed effects estimates				
All firms	0.049 (22.18)	0.032 (15.12)	0.1547	10191
Low Z score (financially constr.)	0.043 (10.06)	0.006 (1.76)	0.0973	3149
Medium Z score	0.036 (7.02)	0.027 (4.37)	0.1107	3280
High Z score	0.030 (7.42)	0.103 (13.30)	0.2146	3169
1997-2003 sample, GMM estimates				
	$Q_{i,t}$	$\frac{\text{Cash Flow}}{\text{Net fixed assets}}$	Overid. t.	N. obs.
All firms	0.025 (1.39)	-0.036 (-0.8)	0.057	8996
Low Z score (financially constr.)	0.044 (2.80)	0.007 (0.4)	0.282	2848
Medium Z score	0.085 (3.39)	-0.007 (-0.3)	0.102	3146
High Z score	0.024 (2.09)	0.063 (2.6)	0.120	2959

The outliers of the 1988-1994 sample are winsorised , see Cleary (1999) for details. The 1997-2003 sample is cleaned of outliers before estimation. We consider as outliers in each variable all observations above the 99% percentile and below the 1% percentile.

$\left(\frac{i}{k}\right)_{i,t}$ = gross fixed capital expenditure during period t divided by net fixed assets at the beginning of period t. $Q_{i,t}$ = market value divided by the book value of firm i at the beginning of period t. $\left(\frac{cf}{k}\right)_{i,t}$ = cash flow during period t dividend by net fixed assets at the beginning of period t.

Both fixed effects and GMM estimates include time dummies. The GMM estimates are computed by first differencing and then using t-3 and t-4 lagged levels as instruments of the dependent variables. The Overidentification test reports the p-value of the Hansen test of overidentifying restrictions, which is robust to autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity of unknown form.

Table III: The new test of financing constraints based on labour demand

Dependent variable: $\Delta \ln l_{i,t+1}$				
	Base Model			
	Likely fin. constrained (low Z)	Compl. sample	Medium Z	High Z
$\Delta \ln k_{i,t}$	.062(2.4)	.059(3.1)	.026(1.1)	.067(2.7)
$\Delta \ln w_{i,t}$	**.049(4.0)**	**.018(2.3)**	**.004(0.5)**	**.028(2.2)**
$\Delta \ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	.042(1.4)	.019(0.8)	.025(0.8)	.022(0.6)
Hansen test (p. val)	0.231	0.558	0.652	0.213
AR(1) in residuals	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AR(2) in residuals	0.481	0.089	0.044	0.916
test of equality of $\Delta \ln w_{i,t+1}$ coeff.		0.000	0.000	0.070
	Augmented model 1			
$\Delta \ln k_{i,t}$	0.64(2.5)	0.063(3.2)	0.029(1.3)	0.071(2.8)
$\Delta \ln w_{i,t}$	**0.049(4.0)**	**0.018(2.3)**	**0.004(0.4)**	**0.027(2.2)**
$\Delta \ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	0.040(1.4)	0.020(0.8)	0.027(0.8)	0.019(0.6)
$\Delta ccap_{i,t+1}$	-0.0009(-0.4)	-0.00004(-4.2)	0.0026(0.1)	-0.00002(-2.7)
Hansen test (p. val)	0.377	0.650	0.525	0.331
AR(1) in residuals	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AR(2) in residuals	0.482	0.088	0.044	0.905
test of equality of $\Delta \ln w_{i,t+1}$ coeff.		0.000	0.000	0.060
	Augmented model 2			
$\Delta \ln k_{i,t}$	0.062(2.4)	.067(3.4)	.042(1.9)	.068(2.6)
$\Delta \ln w_{i,t}$	**0.052(4.3)**	**.016(2.0)**	**.003(0.3)**	**.025(2.0)**
$\Delta \ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	.022(0.8)	.015(0.6)	.022(0.7)	.025(0.7)
$\Delta ccap_{i,t+1}$	-.001(-.4)	-.00004(-5.4)	.01(.24)	-.00002(-1.4)
$\Delta\left(\frac{profits}{sales}\right)_{i,t+1}$	.043(1.1)	-.022(-0.4)	.12(1.5)	-.076(-1.2)
$\Delta Q_{i,t+1}$	-.002(-1.1)	-.03(-3.1)	-.02(-2.2)	-.02(-1.4)
Hansen test (p. val)	0.380	0.134	0.070	0.189
AR(1) in residuals	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AR(2) in residuals	0.494	0.119	0.049	0.777
test of equality of $\Delta \ln w_{i,t+1}$ coeff.		0.000	0.000	0.025
number of observations	2363	5443	2762	2681

One step robust System GMM estimator. Time dummies included as strictly exogenous regressors. Other instruments are lags -1 to -3 of the first differences of the regressors for the equation in levels and lags -2 and -3 of the levels for the equation in first differences. t statistics in parenthesis.

$l_{i,t+1}$=number of employees at the end of period $t+1$. $k_{i,t}$ = real value of net fixed assets at the end of period t . $w_{i,t}$ = real value of financial slack at the end of period t. $E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$=expected productivity shock based on period t information set.

$ccap_{i,t+1}$ = interest payment on debt during period $t+1$ divided by total debt at the beginning of period $t+1$. $\left(\frac{profits}{sales}\right)_{i,t+1}$ = earnings before interest and taxes divided by total sales during period t. $Q_{i,t+1}$ = market value during period $t+1$ divided by the book value at the beginning of period $t+1$.

The p-value of the Hansen test of overidentifying restrictions is reported. This test is robust to autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity of unknown form. AR(1) and AR(2) report the p-value of the Arellano-Bond (1991) test of autocorrelation in the residuals of the first differences. We eliminate as outliers of each variable all observations above the 99% percentile and below the 1% percentile.

Table IV: The new test of financing constraints based on labour demand. Box - Cox transformation

Dependent variable: $\Delta \ln l_{i,t+1}$				
	Likely financially constr. (low Z)	Complementary sample	Medium Z	High Z
$\Delta \ln k_{i,t}$	.062(2.4)	.067(3.4)	.034(1.5)	.072(2.7)
$\Delta \frac{w_{i,t}^{0.082}-1}{0.082}$	**.034(4.3)**	**.008(1.7)**	**.0003(0.1)**	**.015(2.0)**
$\Delta \ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	.027(0.9)	.014(0.6)	.023(0.7)	.022(0.7)
$\Delta ccap_{i,t+1}$	-.001(-.4)	-.00004(-4.3)	.005(.22)	-.00002(-2.4)
$\Delta \left(\frac{profits}{sales}\right)_{i,t+1}$	.04(1.0)	-.019(-0.4)	.112(1.4)	-.072(-1.2)
$\Delta Q_{i,t+1}$	-.002(-1.2)	-.029(-3.1)	-.02(-2.4)	-.016(-1.4)
n.obs.	2370	5438	2759	2679
Hansen test (p. val)	0.254	0.289	0.123	0.219
Test of AR(1) in res.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Test of AR(2) in res	0.651	0.141	0.059	0.712
Test of equality of $\Delta \ln w_{i,t+1}$ coefficient with low Z group (p-value)				
		0.000	0.000	0.025

One step robust System GMM estimator. See footnote to table III for details.

Table V: The new test of financing constraints based on labour demand. Alternative selection of groups (quintiles of the Z score)

Dependent variable: $\Delta \ln l_{i,t+1}$							
	1^{st} quintile	2^{nd} quint.	3^{rd} quint.	4^{th} quint.	5^{th} quint.	10% lowest Z	5% lowest Z
$\Delta \ln k_{i,t}$	.067(2.0)	.023(0.8)	.055(1.9)	.095(1.7)	.053(1.7)	.036(.9)	-.033(-.7)
$\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t}$	.057(4.0)	.031(2.6)	-.004(-.4)	.027(1.9)	.001(0.5)	.068(3.3)	.086(3.3)
$\Delta \ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	.036(1.1)	.015(0.4)	.019(0.4)	.040(1.0)	.042(.97)	.072(1.9)	.072(1.7)
$\Delta ccap_{i,t+1}$	.001(.5)	-.01(-1.6)	-.002(-.1)	-.0001(-5.6)	-.042(-.8)	-.001(-1.4)	-.01(-1.2)
$\Delta \left(\frac{profits}{sales}\right)_{i,t+1}$	.063(1.5)	.049(0.7)	-.1(-.15)	.071(0.8)	-.074(-1.2)	.052(1.3)	.009(.3)
$\Delta Q_{i,t+1}$	-.002(-.9)	-.01(-1.1)	-.01(-2.1)	-.06(-4.1)	-.004(-0.6)	-.002(-1)	-.02(-3.7)
n.obs.	1563	1578	1576	1560	1546	780	389
Hansen test	0.650	0.275	0.496	0.428	0.680	0.438	0.536
AR(1) in res.	0.000	0.000	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.003
AR(2) in res.	0.092	0.199	0.111	0.881	0.727	0.615	0.900

Tests of equality of $\Delta \ln w_{i,t+1}$ coefficients (p-value)					
	compl. sample	2^{nd} quint.	3^{rd} quint.	4^{th} quint.	5^{th} quint.
1^{st} quintile	0.000	0.079	0.000	0.052	0.000
10% lowest Z	0.000	0.062	0.002	0.039	0.002
5% lowest Z	0.017	0.038	0.000	0.028	0.000

One step robust System GMM estimator. See footnote to table III for details.

Table VI: The new test of financing constraints based on labour demand. Firms selected according to size

Dependent variable: $\Delta \ln l_{i,t+1}$				
	Size classes (average number of employees in the sample period)			
	<250	>250 & <2500	>2500 & <10000	>10000
$\Delta \ln k_{i,t}$	.103(3.0)	.059(2.7)	.125(3.5)	.061(2.2)
$\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t}$	**.071(3.8)**	**.040(3.1)**	**.026(2.0)**	**-.001(-.1)**
$\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t+1} \mid Low\ Z$	**.095(3.3)**	**.049(2.4)**	**.043(2.1)**	**-.009(-.7)**
$\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t+1} \mid No\ low\ Z$	**.036(2.2)**	**.021(1.5)**	**-.002(-0.2)**	**-.004(-.2)**
$\Delta \ln E_t (\theta_{i,t+1})$	-.006(-.2)	.052(1.8)	.059(1.65)	-.002(-.1)
$\Delta ccap_{i,t+1}$	.030(.7)	-.0004(-.3)	.001(.02)	-.00006(-7.0)
$\Delta \left(\frac{profits}{sales}\right)_{i,t+1}$	.014(.5)	.084(1.3)	.098(.8)	.065(.9)
$\Delta Q_{i,t+1}$	-.009(-2.4)	-.028(-2.6)	-.009(-1.3)	-.0007(-1.6)
n.observations	1059	3124	2355	1811
% with low Z	39%	32%	23%	21%
Hansen test	0.352	0.464	0.246	0.105
AR(1) in res.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
AR(2) in res.	0127	0.783	0.195	0.059

One step Robust System GMM estimator. See footnote to table III for details. The coefficients of $(\Delta \ln w_{i,t+1} \mid low\ Z)$ and $(\Delta \ln w_{i,t+1} \mid no$ low $Z)$ are obtained from the unrestricted model (all coefficients are allowed to be different for each size group and Z-score group).

Table VII: The new test of financing constraints based on labour demand: sample selected according to the zero dividends criterion

Dependent variable: $\Delta \ln l_{i,t+1}$		
	Zero dividends firms	Positive dividends firms
$\Delta \ln k_{i,t}$	0.089 (4.4)	0.063 (3.1)
$\Delta \ln w_{i,t}$	**0.051 (4.9)**	**0.010 (1.1)**
$\Delta \ln E_t (\theta_{i,t+1})$	0.033 (1.4)	0.004 (0.2)
$\Delta ccap_{i,t+1}$	-0.00004 (-4)	0.002 (1.1)
$\Delta \left(\frac{profits}{sales}\right)_{i,t+1}$	0.28 (0.7)	0.02 (0.5)
$\Delta Q_{i,t+1}$	-0.14 (0.1)	-0.001 (-1.1)
n.obs.	4184	3988
Hansen test (p. val)	0.110	0.055
Test of AR(1) in res.	0.000	0.000
Test of AR(2) in res	0.697	0.035

One step robust System GMM estimator. See footnote to table III for details.

Table VIII: A new test of financing constraints based on labour demand. Contemporaneous fixed capital

Dependent variable: $\Delta \ln l_{i,t+1}$							
	Constr. (low Z)	Compl. sample	Med. Z	High Z	20% low. Z	10% low. Z	5% low. Z
$\Delta \ln k_{i,t+1}$	.452(8.8)	.495(7.3)	.472(6.7)	.491(7.7)	.383(7.7)	.404(7.8)	.357(7)
$\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t}$	**.026(2.6)**	**.004(0.5)**	**-.003(-.4)**	**.007(.6)**	**.032(2.8)**	**.034(2.3)**	**.05(2.7)**
$\Delta \ln E_t\left(\theta_{i,t+1}\right)$	-.003(-.1)	.028(1.1)	.019(0.7)	.041(1.3)	.016(0.5)	.038(1.0)	.031(1)
$\Delta ccap_{i,t+1}$	.009(3.1)	-.0001(-5)	.016(.9)	-.0001(-2)	.009(5.2)	-.001(-.0)	.002(.5)
$\Delta\left(\frac{profits}{sales}\right)_{i,t+1}$	.034(.98)	.047(0.8)	.168(2.3)	.001(0.1)	.059(1.6)	.054(1.6)	0.08(.3)
$\Delta Q_{i,t+1}$	.00(-0.5)	-.01(-1.7)	-.006(-1.2)	.006(0.1)	-.001(-1)	-.001(-1)	-.013(-3)
n.observations	2362	5460	2760	2683	1559	777	387
Hansen test	0.375	0.315	0.638	0.161	0.741	0.437	0.696
AR(1) in res.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.001	0.014
AR(2) in res.	0.250	0.128	0.099	0.985	0.588	0.718	0.264

One sided tests of equality of $\Delta \ln w_{i,t+1}$ coefficients			
	Complementary sample	Medium Z score	High Score
Low Z	0.008	0.002	0.047
1st quintile of Z	0.008	0.002	0.018
10% lowest Z	0.043	0.021	0.067
5% lowest Z	0.008	0.006	0.023

One step robust System GMM estimator. See footnote to table III for details.

Table IX: The Q model augmented with cash stock

Dependent variable: $\Delta\left(\frac{i}{k}\right)_{i,t+1}$				
	Base specification			
	Low Z	Compl. sample	Med. Z	High Z
$\Delta\left(\frac{c}{k}\right)_{i,t+1}$	-.035(-0.6)	.028(1.0)	-.008(-0.3)	.067(2.0)
$\Delta\left(\frac{w}{k}\right)_{i,t+1}$	**.009(1.2)**	**.002(1.5)**	**.001(0.1)**	**.002(2.8)**
$\Delta Q_{i,t+1}$	.015(0.9)	-.001(-.1)	-.016(-1)	-.008(-0.8)
Hansen test (p. val)	0.129	0.470	0.774	0.403
Test of AR(1) in res.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Test of AR(2) in res	0.808	0.154	0.978	0.167
	Box Cox transformation			
$\Delta\left(\frac{c}{k}\right)_{i,t+1}$	.019(0.4)	.054(2.2)	.029(1.0)	.069(2.0)
$\Delta\frac{(w/k)^{0.21}_{i,t+1}-1}{0.21}$	**.094(2.7)**	**.101(2.9)**	**.060(1.6)**	**.141(3.3)**
$\Delta Q_{i,t+1}$	.036(2.3)	-.011(-.9)	-.011(-1)	-.016(-1.3)
Hansen test (p. val)	0.140	0.556	0.688	0.412
Test of AR(1) in res.	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Test of AR(2) in res.	0.852	0.000	0.221	0.010
n. of observations	2624	5847	2989	2842

One step robust System GMM estimator. Time dummies included as strictly exogenous regressors. Other instruments are lags -2 to -4 of the first differences of the regressors for the equation in levels and lags -3 and -4 of the levels for the equation in first differences. t statistics are reported in parenthesis. The

sample is cleaned of outliers before estimation.

We considered as outliers in each variable all observations above the 99% percentile and below the 1% percentile. $\left(\frac{i}{k}\right)_{i,t}$ = gross fixed capital expenditure during period t dividend by net fixed assets at the beginning of period t. $Q_{i,t+1}$ = market value during period $t+1$ divided by the book value at the beginning of period $t+1$. $\left(\frac{cf}{k}\right)_{i,t}$ =cash flow during period t dividend by net fixed assets at the beginning of period t.

The P-value of the Hansen test of overidentifying restrictions is reported. This test is robust to autocorrelation or heteroskedasticity of unknown form. AR(1) and AR(2) report the p-value of the Arellano-Bond (1991) test of autocorrelation in the residuals of the first differences.

Table X: Distribution of the standardised net investment rates of $k_{i,t}$ and $l_{i,t}$

Empirical data, financially unconstrained firms (low Z excluded)		
	Skewness	Kurtosis
$\frac{\Delta k_{i,t}}{k_{i,t-1}}$	0.800	3.50
$\frac{\Delta l_{i,t}}{l_{i,t-1}}$	0.587	3.52
$\Delta \ln \theta_{i,t}$	-0.128	2.73

Empirical data: $l_{i,t}$=number of employees at the end of period t; $k_{i,t}$ = real value of total assets at the end of period t.

Table XII: Distibution of the standardised net percentage changes of the expenditure in Research and Development,

Empirical data, financially unconstrained firms (low Z excluded)		
	Skewness	Kurtosis
$\frac{\Delta r_{i,t}}{r_{i,t-1}}$	0.488	3.28

Table XI: A new test of financing constraints based on labour demand. fixed capital as dependent variable

Dependent variable: $\Delta \ln k_{i,t+1}$								
	Low Z	Comp. sample	Size 1	Size 2	Size 3	Size 4	No div.	Comp. sample
$\Delta \ln l_{i,t+1}$	.78(7)	.66(7)	.74(6)	.44(5)	.64(8)	.82(9)	.85(9)	.70(8)
$\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t}$	.014(1.2)	.013(1.6)	.028(1.4)	.034(2.4)	.002(.2)	.012(1.2)	.019(1.5)	.004(.5)
$\Delta \ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	.03(.8)	-.03(-1.1)	.003(.1)	-.01(-.4)	-.01(-.2)	.03(.7)	-.03(-1)	.05(1.5)
$\Delta ccap_{i,t+1}$	-.02(-6)	.000(.1)	.002(.1)	-.01(-1)	-.02(-.5)	.000(.2)	.000(1.4)	-.02(-6)
$\Delta \left(\frac{prof.}{sales}\right)_{i,t+1}$	-.04(-.8)	-.13(-2)	-.01(-.3)	-.08(-1.3)	-.01(-.01)	-.06(-1)	-.1(-1.5)	-.04(-1.2)
$\Delta Q_{i,t+1}$	-.01(-1)	-.03(-1)	-.01(-1.9)	-.03(-2.8)	-.003(-.5)	-.00(-1.4)	-.01(-1.3)	-.001(-.3)
n.observations	2362	5985	1057	2123	2355	1812	4182	4165
Hansen test	.028	.527	.492	.186	.210	.409	.075	.067
AR(1) in res.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
AR(2) in res.	.042	.142	.563	.069	.209	.115	.924	.031

One step robust System GMM estimator. See footnote to table III for details. Size 1: firms smaller than 250 employees. Size 2: firms between 250 and 2500 employees. Size 3: firms between 2500 and 10000 employees. Size 4: firms larger than 10000 employees.

Table XIII: A new test of financing constraints based on labour demand. expenditure in Research and Development as dependent variable

Dependent variable: $\Delta \ln r_{i,t+1}$								
	Low Z	Comp. sample	Size 1	Size 2	Size 3	Size 4	No div.	Comp. sample
$\Delta \ln k_{i,t}$	.12(2.9)	.10(2.8)	.11(2.3)	.06(1.3)	.14(2.5)	.14(2.9)	.12(3.3)	.15(3.6)
$\Delta \ln l_{i,t+1}$	.44(4.9)	.36(4.9)	.41(3.6)	.31(2.9)	.53(8.5)	.42(3.1)	.39(5.9)	.29(2.6)
$\Delta \ln \mathbf{w}_{i,t}$	.129(5.3)	.045(2.9)	.133(4.1)	.067(2.6)	.077(3.3)	.033(1.7)	.106(5.3)	.048(3.2)
$\Delta \ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	-.11(-2.8)	.008(.2)	-.06(-1.2)	-.09(-2.3)	-.07(-1)	-.14(-1.7)	-.06(-1.8)	.004(.11)
$\Delta ccap_{i,t+1}$	.01(1.6)	.01(.7)	-.02(-.6)	.006(1.4)	.04(1.6)	.12(1.4)	.009(1.7)	.012(.93)
$\Delta \left(\frac{prof.}{sales}\right)_{i,t+1}$	-.01(-.3)	-.20(-2.2)	-.02(-.5)	-.20(-2.6)	-.21(-2.0)	-.17(-2.1)	-.048(-1)	-.18(-1.6)
$\Delta Q_{i,t+1}$	-.005(-1)	-.02(-2.1)	-.001(-.1)	-.09(-2.3)	-.02(-1.9)	-.01(-1.3)	-.01(-1.3)	-.03(-3.2)
n.observations	862	2065	432	1317	940	778	1464	1528
Hansen test	.038	.115	1.000	.144	.970	1.000	.153	.304
AR(1) in res.	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
AR(2) in res.	.841	.665	.646	.253	.077	.065	.265	.707

One step robust System GMM estimator. See footnote to table III for details. Size 1: smaller than 250 employees. Size 2: between 250 and 2500 employees. Size 3: between 2500 and 10000 employees. Size 4: larger than 10000 employees.

Table XIV: Specification tests - model in levels

$\ln l_{i,t+1} = \pi_0 + \pi_1 \ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1}) + \pi_2 \ln k_{i,t} + \pi_3 \ln w_{i,t} + \epsilon_{i,t+1}$				
$t-1, t-2$ and $t-3$ first diff. as instr. of the equation in levels				
	All sample	Low Z	Medium Z	High Z
Shea's partial R^2				
$\ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	0.39	0.45	0.37	0.12
$\ln k_{i,t}$	0.06	0.09	0.06	0.02
$\ln w_{i,t+1}$	0.15	0.18	0.14	0.17
Hansen test of overid. restrictions (p-value)				
lags 1,2,3	0.000	0.006	0.012	0.000
lags 2,3,4	0.000	0.027	0.030	0.001
lags 3,4,5	0.000	0.021	0.035	0.029
lags 4,5,6	0.000	0.010	0.029	0.091
$t-2$ and $t-3$ levels as instr. of the equation in first differences				
	All sample	Low Z	Medium Z	High Z
Shea's partial R^2				
$\ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	0.11	0.14	0.12	0.11
$\ln k_{i,t}$	0.04	0.04	0.05	0.05
$\ln w_{i,t+1}$	0.04	0.04	0.06	0.05
Hansen test of overid. restrictions (p-value)				
lags 2,3	0.175	0.001	0.540	0.000
lags 3,4	0.067	0.029	0.621	0.000
lags 4,5	0.177	0.000	0.568	0.000
lags 5,6	0.188	0.003	0.581	0.000

Table XV: Specification tests. Model in first differences

$$\Delta \ln l_{i,t+1} = \pi_0 + \pi_1 \Delta \ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1}) + \pi_2 \Delta \ln k_{i,t} + \pi_3 \Delta \ln w_{i,t} + \epsilon_{i,t+1}$$

$t-1, t-2$ and $t-3$ first diff. as instr. of the equation in levels				
	All sample	Low Z	Medium Z	High Z
Shea's partial R^2				
$\ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	0.80	0.81	0.77	0.81
$\ln k_{i,t}$	0.60	0.60	0.58	0.61
$\ln w_{i,t+1}$	0.82	0.81	0.83	0.80
Hansen test of overid. restrictions (p-value)				
lags 1,2,3	0.560	0.505	0.922	0.581

$t-2$ and $t-3$ levels as instr. of the equation in first differences				
	All sample	Low Z	Medium Z	High Z
Shea's partial R				
$\ln E_t(\theta_{i,t+1})$	0.62	0.66	0.62	0.58
$\ln k_{i,t}$	0.45	0.50	0.46	0.41
$\ln w_{i,t+1}$	0.62	0.65	0.65	0.59
Hansen test of overid. restrictions (p-value)				
lags 2,3	0.629	0.452	0.286	0.547