Financing constraints, fixed capital and R&D investment decisions of Belgian firms[♦]

Michele Cincera[♣]
March 2003

Abstract

This paper aims at assessing the relationship between the possible existence of financial constraints and the decisions of Belgian private firms as regards their investments in both capital and R&D investments over the last decade. The main system GMM estimates from the error-correction equations indicate that the sensitivity of both types of investments to cash flow variations are rather differentiated. On the whole, these effects are more important for investments in ordinary assets, young small-scale firms located in the Walloon region that are not part of a multinational. Firms that perform R&D on a permanent basis appear to be less cash constraints, while an opposite finding is found for firms that receive public support for their R&D.

JEL classification: C23, E22, O31

Keywords: financial constraints, investments in capital and R&D, Belgian private companies, error-correction investment equations, system GMM panel data econometric models

[♦] This paper is part of the research project "New views on firms' investment and finance decisions" organised by the Belgian National Bank in 2002. I would like to thank the researchers of the Bank and the other participants of this joint project for their many helpful comments and suggestions. Financial support from the Belgian National Bank is gratefully acknowledged. I am solely responsible for any errors and omissions.
[♣] Associate professor at Université Libre de Bruxelles (ULB), Département d'Economie Appliquée (DULBEA) and CEPR. Corresponding address: ULB CP.140, 50, Av. F.D. Roosevelt B-1050 Brussels. Email: mcincera@ulb.ac.be

1. INTRODUCTION

The existence of capital market imperfections such as asymmetric information between lenders and borrowers affects the firms' capital investment decisions and introduces possible financing constraints, i.e. credit rationing by lenders. Such constraints, actually, may even be more pronounced in the case of intangible investments such as Research and Development (R&D) since these activities are more risky by essence and typically provide less collateral to lenders than capital goods do. Based on a new sample of Belgian manufacturing firms active in R&D activities over the last decade, this study aims at assessing the impact of financing constraints on both capital and R&D investment decisions. In particular, the extent to which these constraints differ across firms is investigated from different perspectives, e.g. industry sectors, firms' size and age, regions, domestic firms versus subsidiaries of foreign groups, quoted versus unquoted firms on the stock market. The impact of public support to R&D is also taken into account allowing to gauge the interactions between public interventions and financing constraints.

The empirical analysis is based on a representative sample of about 11000 firms in the manufacturing sector over the period 1991-2000. The sources of this information are the bi-annual "Inventaire permanent du potentiel scientifique" surveys organised by the OSTC in collaboration with the regional authorities as well as the Belgian Central Balance Sheet Office gathering financial information, among which the financial structure that the firms operates. The econometric framework rests on two non-structural models based on an investment accelerator specification and an error-correction one for both types of investments[1]. Given the panel structure of the data set, these econometric specifications use system GMM estimators that allow one to deal with possibly correlated firms' specific unobserved fixed effects and weak exogeneity of the right-hand side variables[2].

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 briefly reviews some theoretical aspects of the literature on firms' investment in R&D as well as the main empirical findings of some selected previous studies. The construction of the data set, the different samples estimated and their main features are documented in Section 3. Section 4 presents the framework implemented for the econometric analysis. Section 5 discusses the main estimation results. Section 6 covers conclusions and suggestions for future work.

2. REVIEW OF ISSUES AND EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

It is widely agreed that given the existence of asymmetric information between firms and lenders and other agency costs or moral hazard problems, investments in physical capital and more particularly in Research and Development must be primarily funded by internal

[1] See Bond and Meghir (1994) and Harhoff (1998).
[2] See Arellano and Bond (1991, 1998).

resources of firms. On the theoretical side, Stiglitz and Weiss (1981) and Myers and Majluf (1984) developed formal models of moral hazard problems in debt and equity markets. On the empirical side, since the pioneering work of Fazzari, Hubbard and Petersen (1988), many studies have examined the extent of liquidity constraints in the financing of physical investment. The agency costs between the shareholders and the R&D management, i.e. risk-adverse R&D managers will under-invest in risky R&D projects and managers tend to spend on activities that benefit them, can be avoided by leveraging the firm. However, the costs of the external funds to finance the R&D projects will be higher (Jensen and Meckling, 1976). Then, investments in intangible such as R&D are riskier by essence than ordinary investments and R&D managers often have better information regarding the likelihood of the success of their R&D projects than outside investors or lenders. Furthermore, R&D provide less collateral to outsiders since they can not make accurate appraisals of the values associated with this type of investment[3]. As a result, R&D firms may encounter credit rationing by potential lenders and be constraint if they do not have enough internal resources to finance their R&D projects[4].

Besides the risks and uncertainties inherent to R&D activities, strategic considerations are another source of asymmetric information between the borrower and the lender. Inventors may indeed be reluctant to fully or partly disclose to the outside world information as regards the contents and the objectives of their technological activities since this knowledge could leak out to rivals. This imperfect appropriability of the returns of innovative activities arises from the non-rival and partially excludable property of the knowledge good. Non rivalry means that the use of an innovation by an economic agent does not preclude others from using it, while partial excludability implies that the owner of an innovation can not impede other to benefit from it free of charge[5].

Another essential characteristics of R&D that makes it different from ordinary investment, is the presence of high adjustment and sunk costs[6]. The wages of the R&D personnel for instance represent more than 50% of R&D expenditures and training, firing or re-hiring this highly specialised personnel embedded in the firm's intangible asset implies

---

[3] The output of R&D activities consists of new products and processes, which are typically hard to use as collateral. According to Himmelberg and Petersen (1994) who refer to Ackerlof's (1970) classic example of a car market with asymmetric information and adverse selection problems, "*A potential buyer of a used car can, at relatively low cost, hire a mechanic to assess the car's true quality. In contrast, a potential investor might have to hire a team of scientists to make an accurate appraisal of the potential value of a firm's R&D projects.*"

[4] For Schumpeter (1942), the profits generated by ex-ante market power provide internal resources, which can be allocated to innovative activities without calling on external funds. Capital market imperfections can prevent firms to access to these external funds at least at the same costs than the internal resources. As stressed by Harhoff (1998), "*If providers of finance face greater uncertainty with respect to R&D than to investment projects, they will require a higher lemon's premium for the former type of investment. Hence, even without rationing behaviour on behalf of banks and other financial institutions, there will be a premium to be paid for obtaining external funding.*"

[5] Conversely, firms will try to free ride as much as possible from the public stock of knowledge without having to finance it (Nelson, 1959).

[6] As emphasised by Arrow (1962), given the time it takes to succeed, a typical R&D project involves important fixed set-up costs. This 'indivisible' aspect of R&D as an input views R&D activities mainly as a fixed factor of production.

substantial costs[7]. Hence the levels of R&D expenditures associated to any innovation projects are unlikely to change substantially from years to years. This feature makes it difficult to assess empirically the relationship between possible liquidity constraints and expenses in R&D investments since the changes in the costs of this type of capital can be weak in the short term.

The reminder of this section reviews the main empirical findings of some selected studies that have investigated the relationship between internal finance and R&D[8]. There have been only a few studies examining financing constraints and R&D. The studies of Hall (1992), Hao and Jaffe (1993) and Himmelberg and Petersen (1994) are based on samples of US firms. Harhoff (1998) uses German data. Bond, Harhoff and Van Reenen (1999) try to identify whether differences exist in the impact of financial variables on R&D between German and British firms. Hall, Mairesse, Brandstetter and Crépon (1999) and Mulkay, Hall and Mairesse (2001) do the same by presenting comparative results between French, Japanese and US firms.

In an older study, Kamien and Schwartz (1982) offer a survey of the empirical literature that examine the relationship between internal finance and R&D. These studies are based on cross sections of large firms or industries. In Scherer (1965), Mueller (1967) and Elliott (1971) no significant impact of liquidity constraints or profitability on R&D is found while an opposite result is reported in Grabowski (1968), Branch (1974) and Switzer (1984).

The study of Hall (1992) explores the differences in the relationship between investment, R&D and cash flow by taking into account firms specific unobserved fixed effects and simultaneity. The data consist of an unbalanced panel of 1247 US large publicly traded manufacturing firms from 1973 to 1987. The results point to a positive impact of cash flow on both types of investments, although more significant for physical investment, hence indicating the presence of liquidity constraints in addition to just future demand expectations. Another result of this analysis is the strong negative correlation between R&D and the level of leverage which suggests that debt is not the preferred source to finance R&D.

On the basis of a sample of 179 US small firms in high-tech industries, Himmelberg and Petersen (1994) estimate the relationship between R&D investment, physical capital and internal finance. The results support the schumpeterian hypothesis, which states that internal finance is an important determinant of R&D expenditures. As stressed by Arrow (1962), moral hazard problems hinder external financing of highly risky business activities such as innovation. The absence of collateral value for investment like R&D creates adverse incentives and selection problems in debt and equity markets. The authors estimate several

[7] In Belgium in 1995, the distribution of intramural R&D expenditures by type of costs was as follows: 58% for the R&D personnel, 9% for investment and 33% for the organisation of these activities (Cincera, 2002).

[8] Schiantarelli (1996) and Hubbard (1998) provide recent reviews of the literature regarding the role of financial constraints on firms' investment activities on fixed capital. Mairesse, Mulkay and Hall (1999) discuss and compare alternative modelling specifications, i.e. simple accelerator and error correction specifications, as well as panel data econometric methodologies, i.e. traditional between and within firm estimation versus GMM estimators, for estimating firms investment equations.

econometric specifications, which allow them to take into account firm unobserved (fixed) effects (within firm estimates) and a differential response of R&D to the permanent and transitory components of cash flow (error-correction model). The latter specification is estimated by a GMM Instrumental Variables estimator and controls for the downward bias induced by high adjustment costs for R&D. The results indicate an important impact of internal finance on R&D investments.

The paper by Hall, Mairesse, Brandstetter and Crépon (1999) uses three panel of 953 French, 424 Japanese and 863 US companies in the high tech sector[9] for the period 1978-1989 to estimate the causal relationship between cash flow and sales and cash flow and R&D and investment by means of a panel data version of the vector auto regressive methodology. The results indicate that investment and R&D are sensitive to cash flow in the USA only and show evidence of a positive impact of both investment and R&D in predicting sales and cash flow for the US firms while the results are somewhat more mixed in France and Japan. In a nutshell, these results support the hypothesis of softer budget constraints on investment in Japan and continental Europe as compared to the USA.

Harhoff (1998) estimate a structural Euler equation and two non structural accelerator and error-correction specifications for a panel of 236 large manufacturing German firms over the period 1990-1994 in order to investigate the relationship between R&D, physical capital and financing constraints. The results show important sensitivity of R&D and investment to cash flow for the accelerator and error-correction equations, though significant results are found for small firms only for the latter specification. No conclusion for R&D can be drawn from the Euler equation model probably because the sample is too small for a precise estimation.

Bond, Harhoff and Van Reenen (1999) estimate the impact of cash flow on both physical and R&D investments using two panels of 263 British and 246 German firms in the high tech sector over the period 1985-1994. The econometric specification rests on a simple error-correction model which allow for different dynamics and costs of adjustment. The main drawback of such an approach is that the estimated dynamics combine effects from both capital adjustment and expectations-formation mechanisms. This issue is addressed by testing the extent to which cash flow is a proxy for liquidity constraints or for expectations of future demand. The results lead one to conclude that the differences between the two countries in the effects of cash flow cannot be simply explained by a greater role of this variable in predicting future sales. On the whole, the empirical findings indicate that financial constraints are significant in the UK economy while no effect is found for German firms which can be explained by the institutional differences across the financial systems in the two countries[10].

[9] Chemicals, Pharmaceuticals, Electrical Machinery, Computing Equipment, Electronics and Scientific Instruments.

[10] Quoting the authors, "*Shareownership in Germany tends to be more concentrated than in Britain, which may mitigate asymmetric information and conflicts of interest between shareholders and managers. Bank representation on supervisory boards and long-term repeated relationships between banks and firms in Germany may mitigate asymmetric information between lenders and borrowers. Large German firms are more likely to remain unquoted, hostile takeovers are extremely rare, and dividend payout ratios tend to be both lower*

Furthermore cash flow has an impact on the decision to engage in R&D rather than on the levels of R&D expenditures. According to the authors, the important sunk costs associated with the establishment of a R&D program and the high adjustment costs linked to large fluctuations in the level of spending of existing research projects imply that "*financial constraints if they are significant at all, may manifest themselves more in the decision to set up R&D facilities, rather than in decisions about the year to year levels of spending in existing research programs*".

The paper by Mulkay, Hall and Mairesse (2001) estimates a dynamic specification of an error corrected investment model for both physical and R&D investments. Output as measured by sales and cash flow are used as predictors for investments. The investment and R&D behaviour of firms is compared for two samples of about 500 large manufacturing firms in France and in the USA over the period 1982-1993. The investment equations are estimated by means of least squares within firm and (first difference and system) GMM estimators. The former estimates are similar to the GMM ones, which are much more imprecise because of the weak power of the instruments in the GMM estimation. On the whole, the authors do not find any significant differences (for both countries) in the effects of output on physical and R&D investments. Yet, cash flow or profit appears to have a much higher impact on both types of investments in the USA than in France. Hence the impact of financial factors on investment and R&D do not differ within a country but rather across them. This finding indicates that it is the financial market environment specific to a country, which matters in explaining the impact of financial factors on investment.

3. DATA SET CONSTRUCTION

The primary source used to construct the dataset consists in the annual accounts of (almost) all companies with activities in Belgium that are legally bound to file their annual accounts at the Central Balance Sheet Office. The Belgian biannual R&D surveys, jointly organised by the federal Office for Scientific, Technical and Cultural Affairs (OSTC) and the regional authorities in charge of the S&T policy, are the second source which gathers information on the R&D activities carried out by Belgian firms in the private business sector. An important feature of these surveys is that the questionnaires are sent to the firms with 10 employees or more. Then, as a result of the regionalisation of S&T policy in the beginning of the nineties, no R&D survey have been organised for the years 1990 and 1991. Furthermore, the surveys since 1992 are based on a new developed methodology, which introduces a statistical break in the firms R&D series after 1990-1991 and before[11]. For these reasons and in order to have a homogenous sample in terms of size and coverage, the period retained for the present analysis covers the period 1991-2000 and the firms considered are those ones active in the private business sector and with more than 10 employees under the period

---

and less rigid in German firms than in British firms."

[11] See Capron et al. (1999) for more details.

investigated. Table 1 lists the variables that have been extracted from these two data sources and for the period 1991-2000[12].

All the flow variables are expressed in 1995 constant BEF and have been deflated with several prices indices. For the added value, sales and cash flow, output price indices at the sectoral level (NACEBEL two digits) have been used. For investment, the price index of the total gross fixed capital formation, also at the sectoral level, has been used. R&D expenditures have been deflated with the GDP price index[13].

Table 1. List of the main variables

variable	definition
VAT	VAT number of the firm
ZIP	ZIP code of the firm
LS	Legal situation of the firm
TS	Type of scheme of the firm
DATE	Date of creation of the firm
IND	Firms' NACEBEL codes and description
QUOT	Quotation (yes=1, no=0)
I	Investment in tangible fixed assets
C_0	Net book value of the firm fixed assets
CF	Cash flow
Y	Net added value
S	Turnover
L	Average number of employees
R	Total intra-mural R&D and development expenditures
PUBL	Part of intra mural R&D expenditures financed by Belgian public authorities (yes=1, no=0)

Source: Belfirst DVD, version of November 2001 and Belgian national bi-annual R&D surveys.

The following variables have been constructed[14]:

C: Stock of firm's physical capital;
K: Stock of firm's R&D capital;
I/C: Investment-physical capital stock ratio;
CF/C: Cash flow-physical capital stock ratio;
R/K: R&D expenditures-R&D capital stock ratio.

Table 2 gives the size (in terms of the number of firms) of the initial data set and the different criteria retained for the construction of the raw data sample (before the trimming and merging procedures). As discussed before, only firms with at least 10 employees and more have been retained in the analysis. For the period 1998-2001, there are 15021 such firms in the Belgian economy. In terms of net added value, these firms account for about 30% of the Belgian GDP in 2000. When we impose this criterion for each year of the whole period the number of firms reduces to 12080 units. Furthermore, only limited or private limited liability

[12] See Appendix 1 for the exact definition.
[13] The construction of these price indices is documented in Appendix 2.
[14] The details regarding the construction procedure are documented in Appendix 5.

companies without any particular legal status[15] and operating in the private business sector have been selected. Finally, imposing to have at least two years of information for the basic variables leads to a sample of 10841 firms or about 72% of the initial data set.

Table 2. Size of the initial data set and criteria used for the sample construction

Criteria	# of firms	% of initial sample
Firms with 10 employees and more for each year of the period 1998-2001	15021	100%
Firms with 10 employees and more for each year of the whole period 1991-2001	12080	80.4%
Firms without any particular legal status	11924	79.4%
Firms operating in the private business sectors (NACEBEL codes 01 to 74)	11424	76.1%
Limited companies and private limited liability companies[a]	11042	73.5%
At least one year of information for added value, cash-flow, investment and tangible fixed assets[b]	10868	72.4%

Notes: a) excluding co-operative companies, limited or general partnership companies, public organisations and economic interest group based in Belgium.
b) and strictly positive value for investment and added value.

Table 3. Size of samples after trimming

	# of firms	# of obs.	Average # of years
TRIMMING			
All firms			
I/C	10855	93570	8.62
Y/C	10828	93287	8.58
CF/C	10786	93556	8.67
ΔI	10778	78700	7.30
ΔC	10776	78932	7.32
ΔCF	10868	88435	8.14
ΔY	10841	88394	8.15
ΔS	8551	59160	6.92
ΔL	10675	67817	6.35
Firms with R&D activities			
R	1049	3304	3.15
R/K	1049	3245	3.09
MERGING (a)			
All firms			
Sample 1: I/C, CF/C, ΔI, ΔCF, ΔY	10201	59908	5.75
Firms with R&D activities			
Sample 2: I/C, CF/C, ΔI, ΔCF, ΔY, R	548	1849	3.37

In order to trim the variables for outliers, observations for which the following variables were below the lower centile or beyond the upper centile have been excluded: I/C, Y/C, CF/C, ΔI, ΔC, ΔC^0, ΔCF, ΔY, ΔS, ΔL and R/K. Note that this procedure as been done on a yearly basis rather than on the whole period. For the R&D variables, since several consistency

[15] See Appendix 6 for more details as regards the different legal status.

Table 4. Descriptive statistics on variables (after trimming)

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
I/C										
Median	.0212	.0321	.0453	.0523	.0589	.0656	.0704	.0742	.0556	.0659
Min	.0115	.0114	.0121	.0123	.0132	.0132	.0132	.0137	.0117	.0124
Max	.4944	.8894	1.651	2.127	2.502	3.050	2.359	2.884	2.042	3.067
Standard error	.0442	.089	.1545	.1947	.2345	.2667	.2383	.2777	.1993	.2811
CF/C										
Median	.4628	.3223	.2426	.2065	.1792	.1577	.1507	.1400	.1703	.1614
Min	-1.214	-1.003	-1.073	-.8001	-.6839	-.5678	-.6041	-.6341	-1.130	-.9607
Max	14.09	9.491	7.889	5.411	4.976	4.361	4.601	4.144	1.183	6.931
Standard error	1.053	.7042	.5308	.4372	.4007	.3706	.3601	.3388	.877	.5938
Δ log (I)										
Median		-.0841	-.1395	.0343	.0187	.0112	.0237	.0553	.0442	-.0293
Min		-.9745	-.9788	-.9750	-.9781	-.9763	-.9730	-.9762	-.9671	-.9746
Max		25.99	29.28	4.53	36.99	35.85	36.72	39.56	54.46	39.87
Standard error		2.862	3.029	3.970	3.652	3.550	3.793	3.953	4.617	3.733
Δ log (CF)										
Median		-.0511	-.0820	-.0258	-.0318	-.0491	.0091	.0078	-.0162	-.0026
Min		-7.262	-8.053	-7.414	-8.451	-8.500	-1.321	-9.712	-8.601	-8.613
Max		7.846	8.071	9.018	7.900	8.640	1.615	9.019	8.466	8.473
Standard error		1.044	1.129	1.196	1.181	1.195	1.391	1.293	1.260	1.282
Δ log (VA)										
Median		.0224	-.0037	.0146	.0096	-.0341	.0233	.0233	.0197	.03132
Min		-.4919	-.4730	-.4812	-.4626	-.5465	-.4877	-.5088	-.5325	-.5715
Max		1.431	1.468	1.354	1.418	1.226	1.663	1.275	1.170	1.202
Standard error		.2129	.2128	.2027	.2096	.2091	.2310	.2096	.2022	.2121
Δ log (S)										
Median		.0136	-.0150	.0197	.0202	.0022	.0402	.0272	.0136	.04956
Min		-.4968	-.5189	-.5216	-.4938	-.4864	-.4570	-.5333	-.5242	-.5580
Max		1.822	1.398	1.337	1.444	1.298	1.486	1.380	1.141	1.231
Standard error		.2231	.2110	.2075	.2103	.2103	.2170	.2102	.1990	.2038
L										
Median	28	28	28	28	28	27	27	28	29	29
Min	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Max	17966	25895	24092	16921	16605	16598	16238	16256	16063	15568
Standard error	477.9	511.3	474.3	388.5	386.3	363.0	38.1	403.3	401.3	396.5
Δ log (L)										
Median		.0370	-.0107	.0156	.0205	-.0488	.0222	.0357	.0357	.0333
Min		-.3913	-.4167	-.4432	-.3667	-.4615	-.3478	-.3478	-.3243	-.3579
Max		1.0421	.9592	.9130	.8182	.8182	.7917	.7297	.5455	.6087
Standard error		.1809	.1708	.1667	.1581	.1745	.1505	.1358	.1241	.1297
Log (R)[a]										
Median		4.216	4.130	4.192	4.241	4.287	4.244	4.261		
Standard error		.9362	.9123	.8874	.8565	.7760	.7825	.7654		

Note: a) the minimum and maximum values could not be reported because of confidentiality of data.

criteria and tests have already been performed to the raw survey-data used, the trimming procedure has been implemented only for the R&D-knowledge stock ratio[16]. Table 3 gives

[16] Among these tests, we can mention the ratio of R&D activities to the firm's turnover and employment, the equality between different components of these activities, e.g. product vs. process R&D, research vs. development, the costs components of R&D expenditures, to total R&D expenses or the annual growth rates of these variables. This cleaning procedure is documented in Capron et al. (1999).

some information as regards the number of information available for each variable after the implementation of the cleaning procedure and Table 4 some descriptive statistics as regards the main variables.

The next step consists in merging the main variables to be used in the empirical analysis. The objective is to set an unique data set that integrates the information for all variables for the same firms and years of observation. This operation is done on the basis of the VAT number of firms[17]. In order to estimate the different investment equations for both ordinary and R&D capital, two samples have been constructed. These samples jointly optimise the number of firms as well as the number of time periods.

Table 5. Representativeness of Sample 1: Added value with respect to the national corresponding aggregate (in %) by industry sector

Industries[a]	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	# of firms
Agriculture	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.8	2.1	2.3	2.3	87
Energy product, water	53.2	52.9	51.8	47.8	50.5	0.6	0.7	0.6	18
Metal and non metallic product	61.8	69.5	67.5	68.3	68.9	46.9	45.0	48.3	899
Chemical products	97.0	98.5	94.4	88.2	88.2	35.4	31.9	39.9	211
Machinery and equipment	66.7	76.2	74.7	74.0	77.2	35.5	34.6	34.4	449
Transport equipment	57.3	58.1	61.4	68.4	64.7	31.7	35.2	38.0	120
Food	56.3	61.2	64.3	59.4	57.3	19.2	18.9	23.7	488
Textile	45.7	50.8	57.0	56.4	60.9	27.6	28.4	35.4	475
Paper	45.1	49.9	49.8	52.2	54.8	25.8	26.5	27.9	364
Rubber	59.2	72.0	67.9	68.8	66.4	37.7	35.7	48.0	192
Wood and other manufacturing	37.9	42.9	43.0	42.5	40.3	23.4	21.6	22.2	392
Construction	28.7	30.8	30.2	30.3	31.3	17.4	17.5	18.2	1613
Wholesale and retail trade	26.7	30.1	31.7	32.1	32.0	11.8	12.9	13.5	2862
Hotels et restaurants	20.3	22.9	21.1	21.0	20.6	12.7	13.6	13.7	274
Transports and communications	17.7	20.4	21.2	18.5	18.8	13.3	15.9	15.9	916
Financial intermediation	2.4	2.6	2.7	2.8	3.1	1.6	1.9	2.2	76
Real estate and other business services	6.2	6.4	6.4	6.6	5.8	2.7	3.2	3.4	765
Total	22.9	25.1	25.3	25.0	25.5	11.4	11.7	12.9	10201

Note: a) see Appendix X for the full definition.
Source: Institute for National Accounts (2001) and own calculation.

Table 6. Representativeness of sample 2: R&D expenditures (10^9 BEF of 1995) with respect to the national corresponding aggregate

		1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998p
1	Raw data set	57.131	49.813	45.760	51.983	56.582	52.184	50.499
2	Sample 2	47.483	40.185	39.888	44.114	43.983	40.471	37.426
3	BERD[a]	93.780	94.500	96.802	99.695	106.619	114.298	117.568
1 / 2	%	60.9	52.7	47.3	52.1	53.1	45.7	43.0
1 / 3	%	50.6	42.5	41.2	44.2	41.3	35.4	31.8

Note: a) BERD = Total intramural business enterprise R&D expenditures.
Source: Belgian and Office for Scientific, Technical and Cultural Affairs (2001) and own calculation.

[17] More details regarding these procedures can be found in Capron et al. (1999) and Cincera and Veugelers (2000).

Tables 5 and 6 gives an idea of the representativeness for the two samples constructed of the variables added value and intra-mural R&D expenditures with respect to the corresponding aggregates reported in the national accounts. It follows from these tables that the two samples are representative of 11.7 to 25.5% for added value and 31.8% to 50.6% for R&D over the period investigated.

4. ECONOMETRIC FRAMEWORK

This section aims at presenting the investment accelerator model and the error-correction equation as well as the econometric methodology to be implemented for estimating the relationship between cash flow, R&D and physical investments. The methodological framework is close to that in Harhoff (1998), Bond, Harhoff and Van Reenen (1999), Mairesse, Hall and Mulkay (1999) and Mulkay, Hall and Mairesse (2001). Following the neo-classical long run model (Jorgenson, 1963), the logarithm of the desired (or long run) stock of fixed capital is proportional to the logarithm of output and of the user cost of capital:

$$\log(C_{it}) = \alpha_t + \beta \log(Y_{it}) - \sigma \log(UCC_{it}) \tag{1}$$

This model can be derived by assuming a profit maximising firm with a CES production function with elasticity σ. Equation (1) taken in first difference leads to:

$$\frac{I_{it}}{C_{it-1}} = \delta + \beta\, \Delta\log(Y_{it}) - \sigma \log(UCC_{it}) \tag{2}$$

by applying the usual approximation $\Delta\log(C_{it}) \approx I_{it}/C_{it-1} - \delta$.

The user cost of capital, $UCC_{it} = \left(P_t^I/P_t\right)\left(r_t\, P_{t-1}^I/P_t^I + \delta_i - \Delta P_t^I/P_t^I\right)$, as noted by Mulkay, Hall and Mairesse (2001), is difficult to measure at the firm level given the absence (in general) of the output P_t and investment P_t^I prices at such a disaggregated level. This problem is in general addressed by assuming that the variations in the user costs can be proxied by time dummies and firms' specific fixed (over time) effects[18]. Following Fazzari, Hubbard and Petersen (1988), if we assume that investments of credit-constrained firms are more sensitive to the availability of internal finance, equation (2) can be augmented with cash flow effects to test for the presence of financial constraints:

$$\frac{I_{it}}{C_{it-1}} = \eta \frac{I_{it-1}}{C_{it-2}} + \beta_1 \Delta\log(Y_{it}) + \beta_2 \Delta\log(Y_{it-1}) + \beta_3 \frac{CF_{it}}{C_{it-1}} + \beta_4 \frac{CF_{it-1}}{C_{it-2}} + \alpha_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it} \tag{3}$$

[18] See however the recent study by Butzen, Fuss and Vermeulen (2001) for an application that estimates the user cost of capital.

A similar equation is obtained for the R&D investment:

$$\frac{R_{it}}{K_{it-1}} = \eta \frac{R_{it-1}}{K_{it-2}} + \beta_1 \Delta\log(Y_{it}) + \beta_2 \Delta\log(Y_{it-1}) + \beta_3 \frac{CF_{it}}{K_{it-1}} + \beta_4 \frac{CF_{it-1}}{K_{it-2}} + \alpha_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (4)$$

It should be noted that as claimed by Kaplan and Zingales (1997, 2000), the interpretation of the estimated coefficient associated to the cash flow ratio can be misleading since cash flow can be correlated with current profitability. In this case, cash flow will also proxying profit or demand expectations and this variable cannot be interpreted directly as evidence of financing constraints[19]. In this paper, we follow the view point of Himmelberg and Petersen (1994), which states that changes in output, i.e. ΔY_{it} and ΔY_{it-1} in equations (3) and (4), are better proxies for changes in demand than the cash flow variable and thus allow to control, even if imperfectly, for the expectations role played by this variable. Equation (3) and (4) can also be augmented with the Tobin's q to control for investment opportunities. As noted by Van Cayseele (2002), this approach is not well suited for Belgium which is characterised by an European financial system where a few firms are listed on the stock exchange and external finance comes primarily from bank loans. Another possibility is to consider the projections of future profits on past variables and use them as implicit proxies for the expectations of future profits (Abel and Blanchard, 1986) or implement a structural Euler equation model derived from the firm's intertemporal maximisation problem (Bond and Meghir, 1994). However, as pointed out by Butzen, Fuss and Vermeulen (2001) among others, this last approach, while more appropriate from a theoretical point of view, has often failed to produce significant and correctly signed adjustment costs parameters.

Following Bond and Meghir (1994) and Harhoff (1998), equation (3) and (4) can be rewritten in an error correction framework:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{I_{it}}{C_{it-1}} &= \eta \frac{I_{it-1}}{C_{it-2}} + \beta_1 \Delta\log(Y_{it}) + \beta_2 \Delta\log(Y_{it-1}) + \rho(\log(C_{it-2}) - \log(Y_{it-2})) + \\ &\beta_3 \frac{CF_{it}}{C_{it-1}} + \beta_4 \frac{CF_{it-1}}{C_{it-2}} + \alpha_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{R_{it}}{K_{it-1}} &= \eta \frac{R_{it-1}}{K_{it-2}} + \beta_1 \Delta\log(Y_{it}) + \beta_2 \Delta\log(Y_{it-1}) + \rho(\log(C_{it-2}) - \log(Y_{it-2})) + \\ &\beta_3 \frac{CF_{it}}{K_{it-1}} + \beta_4 \frac{CF_{it-1}}{K_{it-2}} + \alpha_i + \lambda_t + \varepsilon_{it} \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

These equations nest equation (1), which represents their long run solution.

These equations can be estimated in first differences in order to remove the firm specific unobserved effect, α_i, which is assumed to be constant over the period under investigation, and which may be correlated with other regressors. The ability of the R&D personnel to find new

[19] For Fazzari, Hubbard and Petersen (2000), however, the theoretical model of Kaplan and Zingales fails to capture the approach used in this literature and therefore does not provide a relevant critique.

inventions is one example of such an unobserved effect specific to the firm[20]. These unobservables are likely to be 'transmitted' to the R&D decision since firms with higher technological opportunities or abilities of their scientists and engineers will generally invest more in research activities. Hence, we are in the presence of a (positive) correlation between these unobservables and the R&D which invalidates the inference which can be made from equation (5). Another solution to get ride of the fixed effect is to apply the so called within transformation by taking deviations from individual means.

While the within and first differences estimators take care of the biases arising from possible correlated effects, it should be noted however that these estimators could still be biased for three other possibly important reasons. The first source of bias rests in possible random measurement errors in the right hand side variables. These errors typically tend to be magnified when applying the first difference or within transformations (Griliches and Hausman, 1986). The two other sources of bias refer to the simultaneity between the contemporaneous regressors and the disturbances and the endogeneity of the contemporaneous regressors and the past disturbances. A solution to these three potential sources of biases consists in using an instrumental variable approach by choosing an appropriate set of lagged value of the regressors for the instruments. Such an approach can be implemented by means of a GMM framework such as the one developed by Arellano and Bond (1991) among others. If the original error term follows a white noise process, then values in levels of these variables lagged two or more periods will be admissible instruments.[21]. The validity of the instruments is generally verified by the classical Sargan test of the over-identifying restrictions[22].

More recently Arellano and Bover (1995) and Blundell and Bond (1998) developed a system GMM estimator, which combines the instruments of the first difference equation with additional instruments of the untransformed equation in level. Given the higher number of instruments, the system GMM estimator can lead to dramatic improvements in terms of efficiency as compared to the first difference GMM estimator[23]. The validity of these additional

[20] R&D opportunity or managerial skills may also be mentioned. Quoting Salter (1969), "*Differences in the personal skill, effort, intelligence and co-operation of labour may alone lead to substantial inter-plant variations in productivity. Equally, if not more, important are variations in the efficiency of management which are not reflected in the managers' salaries; an efficiently managed firm employing outmoded capital equipment may achieve lower operating costs than a poorly managed firm using modern equipment. Other special advantages, such as favourable location, access to ancillary services, trade goodwill, ect., may also contribute to inter-plant differences in operating costs and productivity. Barriers to the diffusion of knowledge, especially the patent system, are also relevant in this context. Some plants may employ outmoded methods, not because replacement is unprofitable, but simply because patent restriction prevent the use of the best methods. Other restrictions, such as imperfect channels for the diffusion of technical knowledge, ignorance and inertia, may have the same effects.*"

[21] As noted by Bond et al. (1997), if the error term in levels is serially uncorrelated, then the error term in first difference has a moving average structure of order 1 (MA(1)) and only instruments lagged two periods or more will be valid. If the error term in levels has already a moving average structure, then longer lags will have to be considered.

[22] The DPD software developed by Arellano and Bond (1991) and (1998) proposes a number of tests statistics that can be used for testing the validity of various assumptions among which the serial correlation and the validity of the chosen set of instruments.

[23] More fundamentally, as shown by Blundell and Bond (1998), when the autoregressive parameter is high and the number of time periods is small, the first difference GMM estimator can be subject to serious finite sample biases as a result of the weak explanatory power of the instruments.

instruments, which consist of past first difference values of the regressors, can again be tested through Difference Sargan over-identification tests.

5. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

5.1. Error correction models of investments in physical capital and R&D

Table 7 exhibits four regression results as regards the physical capital error correction model: first difference, within, first difference GMM and system GMM estimates. For the GMM estimates, the test statistics do not suggest any problems with the choice of instruments and their time structure. The Sargan test is not statistically significant at the 5% level and the same holds for the second order correlation test. This last result is not confirmed for the first two models and as consequence the first difference OLS and within estimates are biased. For the first difference GMM estimates, the error correction term has the expected negative sign and is statistically significant at the 5% level. The coefficient of output lagged two periods is not significant. This suggests that there are constant returns to scale. Cash flow effects appear to have a positive and significant effect on investment (the long run effect is about .160 for the first difference GMM and .245 for the system GMM) and this indicates the presence of liquidity constraints[24].

Table 7. Error correction model for physical capital

Model[a]	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM[b]	GMM SYS[b]
C	.24 (.006)*	-.26 (.005)*	.00 (.009)	.16 (.022)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.12 (.006)*	-.36 (.006)*	.06 (.014)*	.06 (.011)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.25 (.015)*	.25 (.014)*	.14 (.051)*	.22 (.040)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.12 (.011)*	.19 (.010)*	.01 (.018)	.01 (.015)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.34 (.012)*	.87 (.020)*	-.17 (.092)*	-.11 (.067)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.17 (.011)*	.60 (.021)*	-.13 (.092)	.03 (.024)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.43 (.010)*	1.2 (.020)*	-.18 (.044)*	-.01 (.014)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.13 (.012)*	.55 (.024)*	-.18 (.100)	-.01 (.025)
Wald test of joint signif.	2239 [.000]	6654 [.000]	191 [.000]	576 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	2441 [.000]	3189 [.000]	14.4 [.044]	99.7 [.000]
Wald test for CF	432 [.000]	506 [.000]	22.4 [.000]	53.7 [.000]
Sargan test			109 [.725]	183 [.058]
Test M1	-27.5 [.000]	22.9 [.000]	-27.1 [.000]	-28.5 [.000]
Test M2	-10.5 [.000]	-7.2 [.000]	.47 [.640]	-.46 [.634]
# of obs. (firms)	58880 (10049)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets; M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

The results from the error correction specification for R&D are reported in Table 8. The first order serial correlation test invalidates the first difference OLS and to a lesser extent the

[24] The study of Butzen, Fuss and Vermeulen (2001) is based on a sample of about 30000 Belgian companies. The first difference GMM long run estimated effect of cash flow on investment reported in this study is also .160.

first difference estimates. Conversely, the second order serial correlation test does not point do any misspecification for these models. The additional instruments implied by the GMM system pass the Sargan test. The error correction term has the expected negative sign and the positive and significant coefficient associated with the changes in added value suggest positive expectations of future profitability to the extent that these variables are a proxy of firm's investment opportunities. The test statistic for the joint test of the cash flow effects is significant for the last three models. However the cash flow coefficients appear to be very small as compared to the investment equation. The system (First difference) GMM estimates indicate a long-term effect of cash-flow effects of .245 (.160) for investments against .007 (.005) for R&D[25]. Interestingly this smoother pattern of investment rates for R&D as compared to physical capital has already been brought to the fore in previous studies, e.g. Harhoff (1988), Bond, Harhoff and Van Reenen (1999), Mulkay, Hall and Mairesse (2001), or Audretsch and Weigand (1999). These authors explain this result by the presence of high adjustment costs for R&D, which makes responses to transitory movements in cash flow expensive.

Table 8. Error correction model for R&D capital

Model[a]	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM[b]	GMM SYS[b]
C	-.078 (.0266)*	.078 (.0156)*	.000 (.0200)	.088 (.0646)
R_{t-1}/K_{t-2}	-.517 (.1061)*	-.606 (.0465)*	.004 (.0617)	.025 (.0304)
CF_t/K_{t-1}	.001 (.0019)	.001 (.0013)	.001 (.0004)	.001 (.0003)*
CF_{t-1}/K_{t-2}	.004 (.0024)	.002 (.0012)*	.004 (.0004)*	.006 (.0003)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.042 (.0327)	.012 (.0245)	.105 (.0272)*	.195 (.0119)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.037 (.0259)	.002 (.0206)	-.012 (.0179)	.000 (.0146)
$\log(K_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	-.855 (.1920)*	-.894 (.1559)*	-.322 (.0504)*	-.317 (.0231)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	-.900 (.2395)*	-.937 (.1769)*	-.342 (.0603)*	-.337 (.0258)*
Wald test of joint signif.	88.1 [.000]	865 [.000]	519 [.000]	3162 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	12.2 [.016]	27.0 [.000]	33.3 [.000]	46.9 [.000]
Wald test for CF	3.2 [.200]	17.5 [.000]	115 [.000]	441 [.000]
Sargan test			26.6 [.541]	36.1 [.726]
Test M1	1.2 [.238]	1.8 [.075]	-2.0 [.045]	-1.7 [.098]
Test M2	1.3 [.186]	1.0 [.296]	1.6 [.112]	1.1 [.265]
# of obs. (firms)	375 (160)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets. M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

[25] As can be seen in Appendix 7, this result is not a consequence of the sample composition. Cash flow effects for the investment equation estimated on the R&D sample, i.e. sample 2, are still much larger and significant than the corresponding ones obtained for the R&D equation.

5.2. Error correction models of R&D investment: permanent R&D and publicly funded R&D

As noted by Bond, Harhoff and Van Reenen (1999), the presence of high adjustment costs associated with the establishment of R&D projects may imply that financial constraints, may they be present at all, are more likely to affect the decision to start new R&D activities rather than just their year-to-year level of spending. In order to examine this point, a interaction term has been added in the R&D investment equation, which picks-up the permanent versus occasional nature of the R&D activities carried out by the firms in the sample[26]. The results are displayed in Table 9. It follows from the test statistics that only the GMM estimates can be interpreted. On the whole, the estimated coefficients do not change as compared to the previous table. The first difference GMM estimates of the R&D status interaction terms with cash flow are not significant. Yet, a negative coefficient is found for the system GMM model, which suggests that firms with permanent R&D activities are less subject to financial constraints than firms engaged in such activities on an occasional basis. This result confirms the findings of Bond, Harhoff and Van Reenen (1999). According to the authors, "*The R&D performing firms are a self selected group who choose to make long term commitments to R&D programmes, partly on the basis that they do not expect to be seriously affected by financial constraints – this is why cash-flow tends to matter less for these firms' investment decisions than for other companies*".

Table 9. Error correction model for R&D: **Permanent vs. occasional R&D**

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	-.078 (.0252)*	.077 (.0154)*	-.005 (.0229)	.079 (.1060)
R_{t-1}/K_{t-2}	-.514 (.1005)*	-.606 (.0431)*	.039 (.0661)	.043 (.0383)
CF_t/K_{t-1}	.001 (.0023)	-.001 (.0015)	.001 (.0004)	.001 (.0004)
CF_t/K_{t-1}*PERMA	.004 (.0094)	.000 (.0064)	-.012 (.0064)	-.014 (.0045)*
CF_{t-1}/K_{t-2}	.004 (.0032)	.002 (.0015)	.005 (.0006)*	.006 (.0004)*
CF_{t-1}/K_{t-2}*PERMA	.002 (.0111)	.002 (.0071)	.001 (.0042)	.001 (.0034)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.038 (.0343)	.012 (.0262)	.152 (.0441)*	.237 (.0365)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.034 (.0285)	.001 (.0234)	-.023 (.0209)	-.012 (.0206)
$\log(K_{t-2})-\log(Y_{t-2})$	-.895 (.2203)*	-.931 (.1588)*	-.305 (.0644)*	-.306 (.0352)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	-.848 (.1704)*	-.889 (.1398)*	-.298 (.0538)*	-.291 (.0319)*
Wald test of joint signif.	6714 [.000]	2320 [.000]	786.6 [.000]	24154 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	15.8 [.003]	28.0 [.000]	32.9 [.000]	35.5 [.000]
Wald test for CF	8.7 [.013]	50.4 [.000]	11.8 [.003]	218 [.000]
Sargan test			24.9 [.527]	30.3 [.810]
Test M1	1.2 [.222]	1.8 [.069]	-2.1 [.033]	-1.5 [.122]
Test M2	1.3 [.182]	1.1 [.286]	1.5 [.124]	1.1 [.262]
# of obs. (firms)	375 (160)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets. M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

[26] This dummy variable takes the value 1 if firms reported being permanently active in R&D versus carrying out these activities on an ad-hoc basis.

As discussed before, R&D activities are inherently risky and this leads firms to invest to little in this activity. Moreover, since firms cannot fully appropriate the benefits of the research activities undertaken, the incentives to engage in R&D are reduced and this creates a gap between the socially desirable level of R&D and the private one[27]. This market failure has been acknowledged since a long time (Arrow, 1962) and justifies the public intervention to support R&D and reduce this underinvestment problem. Given the costs of external finance are higher for R&D as compared to ordinary investments, it is also worth examining to what extent the provision of public funds can affect the possible financing constraints faced by the firms[28]. The results of this investigation are shown in Table 10.

Table 10. Error correction model for R&D: Impact of **publicly funded R&D**

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	-.076 (.0154)*	.073 (.0153)*	-.009 (.0197)	.067 (.0904)
R_{t-1}/K_{t-2}	-.516 (.0315)*	-.605 (.0470)*	.010 (.0601)	.021 (.0376)
CF_t/K_{t-1}	.001 (.0027)	-.001 (.0014)	.000 (.0006)	.001 (.0004)*
CF_t/K_{t-1}*PUBL	.004 (.0175)	.008 (.0035)*	.060 (.0386)	.096 (.0353)*
CF_{t-1}/K_{t-2}	.004 (.0025)	.002 (.0012)*	.004 (.0004)*	.005 (.0003)*
CF_{t-1}/K_{t-2}*PUBL	-.002 (.0203)	-.003 (.0074)	-.013 (.0189)	-.044 (.0185)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.041 (.0353)	.009 (.0250)	.036 (.0373)	.120 (.0362)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.037 (.0396)	.002 (.0209)	.005 (.0182)	-.004 (.0195)
$\log(K_{t-2})- \log(Y_{t-2})$	-.900 (.0511)*	-.939 (.1776)*	-.341 (.0581)*	-.353 (.0345)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	-.855 (.0380)*	-.895 (.1557)*	-.322 (.0495)*	-.310 (.0278)*
PUBL	.011 (.0287)	.022 (.0132)	-.001 (.0189)	-.033 (.0151)*
Wald test of joint signif.	822 [.000]	864 [.000]	754 [.000]	27992 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	53.4 [.000]	24.4 [.000]	29.8 [.000]	44.4 [.000]
Wald test for CF	2.9 [.240]	16.4 [.000]	.94 [.623]	252 [.000]
Sargan test			23.2 [.805]	29.1 [.786]
Test M1	3.0 [.003]	1.8 [.075]	-2.2 [.025]	-2.0 [.051]
Test M2	1.1 [.256]	1.1 [.282]	1.8 [.075]	1.4 [.171]
# of obs. (firms)	375 (160)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

The estimates associated with the current and one year lagged value of the cash flow R&D stock ratio are not statistically different from the ones reported in the basic R&D error correction equation. The contemporaneous effect of the interaction term between this variable and the dummy variable PUBL, which reflects that parts of the firm's intra mural R&D expenditures have been financed by Belgian public authorities, is positive and significantly different from zero while an opposite result is found for the one year lagged coefficient. On the whole these results suggest that financial constraints are more binding for firms that

[27] The imperfect appropriability of the innovation's benefits generates externalities or knowledge spillovers that can occur via different channels, e.g. imitation, reverse engineering, R&D personnel mobility or transfers of technology. Cincera and van Pottelsberghe (2001) provide a recent review on international spillovers. The impacts of R&D spillovers on the productivity performance of large companies inside the Triad is examined in Capron and Cincera (1998).

[28] See Capron, Cincera and Dumont (1999) for a description of the different policies and instruments used in the field of S&T activities by the Belgian federal and regional authorities. Another instrument is Venture Capital. The contribution of Manigart, Baeyens and Verschueren (2002) examine the role of these external resources in financing young unquoted Belgian companies.

receive public funds. This result is not surprising since a large share (more than 80%) of the public funds consists of subsidies for all R&D costs related to basic research performed by firms or by universities and research centres in collaboration with firms as well as reimbursable loans for research activities of a more applied nature. Given the more fundamental and risky nature of these publicly funded R&D activities, firms that benefit from these funds will have access less easily to external capital markets.

5.3. Physical investment error correction models: additional results

The results of the error correction equations presented so far point to important sensitivities of physical investment to cash flow effects hence indicating the presence of liquidity constraints. This appears to be also the case for R&D though the cash flow dependency is much weaker[29]. This section presents additional results that shed further light on the differences between financial constraints for investments in tangible assets of firms belonging to different groups. More precisely, the extent to which these constraints differ across firms is investigated from different perspectives, e.g. size of firms, domestic firms versus subsidiaries of foreign groups, listed versus unquoted firms on the stock market, age of the firms, their regions and industry sectors. The full results are displayed in Appendix 9 to 14 and the main conclusions as regards the effects of cash flow are summarised hereafter.

Several studies have shown the central role played by firms' size in explaining the sensitivity of capital investment to cash flow variations[30]. Small firms are more dependent upon internal resources since the loan rates charged by commercial banks tend to be higher[31]. Conversely larger firms can finance capital expenditures from internal resources, issuance of equity or debt. In a similar vein, liquidity constraints should be less important for firms listed on the stock market. The long run effect of cash flow on physical investment reported in Appendix 9 corroborates these arguments. While the long term cash flow coefficients are not statistically different for medium and large firms, i.e. firms with more than 25 and 200 employees respectively, they appear to be considerably smaller than the corresponding one for small firms (system GMM estimates of .116, .138 and .344 for large, medium and small firms respectively)[32]. Furthermore, the possibilities of issuing new equity for firms quoted on the stock market should alleviate their financing constraints. The results shown in Appendix 10 support this hypothesis. Indeed the long run cash flow coefficient of .106 is relatively smaller for quoted companies than for the other firms (estimated parameter of .232).

As discussed before, the existence of asymmetric information problems between lenders and borrowers tend to increase the likelihood of credit rationing and the impact of liquidity constraints on the firm's investment behavior. Such informational asymmetries are higher in global capital markets and multinational enterprises are typically viewed as a means to

[29] As can be seen from tables in Appendix 8, all these conclusions remain valid when an investment accelerator specification is used.
[30] See Schiantarelli (1996) for a survey of the empirical literature on this subject.
[31] See for example Stoll (1984) for the US credit market.
[32] These results are in line with the findings reported in Butzen, Fuss and Vermeulen (2001). The authors report a cash flow sensitivity that is about 3.5 times smaller for large firms as compared to small ones.

provide alternative investment opportunities to shareholders that are constrained by restrictions on international capital markets[33]. The availability of financial resources from the mother company should alleviate the liquidity constraints faced by their subsidiaries. The findings in Appendix 11 are consistent with these predictions. Long run cash flow effects are higher for the domestic firms (estimated coefficient of .242) than for firms that are part of a foreign group (estimated coefficient of .139). As regards the age of the firm, as noted by Harhoff (1998), young firms are likely to have more limited access to external finance[34]. These firms have less collateral in terms of existing assets and lenders may have less information to distinguish between good and bad managers or investment opportunities. Here also the results reported in Appendix 12 confirm these arguments. The long run cash flow measure is about .450 for the younger firms, i.e. firms created less than 10 years ago, against .175 for the ones that are between 10 and 20 years old. However, these effects appear to be more important for the oldest firms in the sample (long run cash flow effect of .258). These firms belong more to the manufacturing sector, which is more capital intensive than the services industry.

Table 11. Long run cash flow effects: Differences across industry sectors and regions

	LT effect of CF	Capital Intensity (%)	Ranking	Share of small firms (%)	Ranking
Industry sector					
16 Financial services	.100	.24	1	.18	5
3 Metal	.118	.51	9	.23	10
17 Other services	.152	.24	2	.22	9
15 Transport and communication	.214	.64	13	.30	12
13 Retail and wholesale	.226	.42	7	.40	15
10 Rubber	.250	.76	14	.18	6
9 Paper	.264	.56	10	.22	8
5 Electrical machinery	.270	.37	5	.15	2
11 Other manufacturing	.304	.43	8	.27	11
12 Construction	.390	.36	3	.31	13
7 Food	.435	.81	15	.20	7
8 Textile	.478	.41	6	.16	4
4 Chemicals	.482	.63	12	.07	1
14 Hotels and restaurants	.523	.59	11	.38	14
6 Motor vehicles	.635	.36	4	.15	3
1 Agriculture	.773	.84	16	.47	16
Belgian regions					
Brussels Capital	.143	.29	1	.23	1
Flanders	.253	.46	2	.28	2
Wallonia	.313	.47	3	.31	3

Sources: Appendix 13 and 14 and own calculations.

The last set of results examine the extent of differences in financing constraints and firms' investment behaviours across 16 industry sectors of the economy as well as between the three Belgian regions. Full results are presented in Appendix 13 and 14 and summarised in

[33] Quoting Kogut (1983), "*The primary advantage of the multinational firm, as differentiated from a national corporation, lies in the flexibility to transfer resources across borders through a globally maximising network*".
[34] See also the discussion in Manigart, Baeyens and Verschueren (2002).

Table 11. The long run cash flow measures range between .100 for the sector of financial services to .773 for agriculture and .143 in the Brussels-Capital region to .313 in the Walloon region. It should be noted that the financial services sector is the only one for which the coefficients associated with cash flow effects are not statistically different from zero. Table 11 provides additional information as regards the capital intensity and the share of small firms by industry sector and region. The higher importance of services in the Belgian capital can explain the relative smaller capital intensity in this region and as a result the lower sensitivity of physical investment to cash flow variations. The higher share of large companies in this region is another explanation. For the breakdown by branch of activity, the size and the capital intensity provide a more clouded explanation of the differences observed in the cash flow effects.

6. CONCLUSION

Based on two newly constructed samples of Belgian private companies, this paper investigates the impact of financing constraints on both capital and R&D investment decisions over the last decade. R&D activities are more risky by essence and generally provide less collateral to lenders as compared to investments in capital goods. As a result financing constraints may even be more pronounced in the case of such intangible investments. However, given the existence of high adjustment and sunk costs associated with this kind of investment, firms will engage in R&D activities if they do not expect to be seriously affected by financial constraints. As such cash flow effects tend to matter less for these firms' investment decisions than for other companies. Moreover the provision of public support to R&D may also interfere with the firm's investment decision by alleviating liquidity constraints problems, may they be present at all.

The results based on two non structural investment accelerator and error correction equations have been performed by using the recently developed system GMM estimator, which compared to the usual first difference GMM estimator produce in general more precise estimates and reduces the possible bias arising from the weak explanatory power of the instruments and high values of the autoregressive parameter. Traditional within and first difference panel data estimates are also reported. Although these models allow one to deal with correlated firms' specific and unobserved effects with the right hand side variables, they are not suited when these variables are weakly exogenous and contain random measurement errors.

The main empirical findings indicate a positive impact of cash flow effects in the firms' investment decisions. These effects appear to play a considerably more important role for investment in physical capital than for R&D investments. These conclusions confirm the results of the investment accelerator specifications and the findings of previous studies. Furthermore, firms that perform R&D on a permanent basis are found to be less subject to liquidity constraints, which is not the case for the ones that receive public funds to support their R&D. As additional results, the importance of these constraints on the investment behaviour of firms of different groups has also been examined. On the whole, large firms, firms listed on the stock exchange, subsidiaries of foreign MNE's are less likely to experience liquidity constraints. Conversely younger and to some extent older firms appear to be more liquidity constrained. Finally the impacts of these constraints are rather differentiated according to the firm's industry sector and region.

As stressed before, cash flow effects can be correlated with firms' demand expectations and investment opportunities that are not captured by changes in output and as such this variable can not be interpreted as a direct measure of the presence of liquidity constraint in the firm's investment decision mechanisms. In order to get a clearer picture, it would be useful to try to disentangle between these two effects. One approach consists in adding proxies of investment opportunities such as the Tobin's q for instance. However, this method does not appear to be well suited for the Belgium economy given the few firms listed on the stock market[35]. Another approach rests in the estimation of forecasting equations to predict future sales with cash flow[36]. Finally, the Euler equations approach allows one to explicitly model the firm's investment behaviour but results based on this structural framework are generally weak and mitigated.

Another interesting extension of this work would be to investigate the interactions between the level of competition in the firms' product market, the level of outside finance and the level of managerial effort. The agency model of Aghion, Dewatripont and Rey (2000) adresses this question and leads to interesting predictions that could be tested empirically. Among these conclusions, we can mention the following ones. The incentives of the managers to work first decrease and then increase with the need for external finance, the relation between market size and market concentration is negative when the industry rely more on outside finance, firms that rely more on internal resources will invest more in response to a positive shock on demand and firms relying more on external finance will invest relatively more in tangible vs. intangible investments.

---

[35] As an alternative of Tobins' q, the method proposed by Abel and Blanchard (1986) is worth being mentioned.

[36] This is what is done in Bond, Harhoff and Van Reenen (1999) who estimate a VAR specification and find that cash flow does not play any role in predicting future sales in the UK which is not the case in Germany. For the authors, however, these results do not alter their conclusion as regards the impact of liquidity constraints on investment: the differences between the two countries in the effects of cash flow cannot be simply explained by a greater role of this variable in predicting future sales.

REFERENCES

ABEL, A.B., O.J., BLANCHARD, (1986), "*The Present Value of Profits and the Cyclical Movements in Investment*", **Econometrica**, 54, pp. 249-273.

ACKERLOF, G.A., (1970), "*The Market for 'Lemon': Quality, Uncertainty and the Market Mechanism*", **Quarterly Journal of Economics**, 84, pp. 488-500.

AGHION Philippe, Mathias DEWATRIPONT and Patrick REY, (1999), "*Agency Costs, Firm Behavior and the Nature of Competition*", CEPR discussion paper #2130.

ARELLANO, M., O., BOVER, (1995), "*Another Look at the Instrumental Variable Estimation of Error-Components Models*", **Journal of Econometrics**, 68(1), pp. 29-51.

ARELLANO, M., S., BOND, (1991), "*Some Tests of Specification for Panel Data: Monte Carlo Evidence and Application to Employment Equations*", **Review of Economic Studies**, 58, pp. 277-97.

ARELLANO, M., S., BOND, (1998), "*Dynamic Panel Data Estimation Using DPD98 for Gauss: A guide for Users*", mimeo.

ARROW, K., (1962), "*Economic Welfare and the Allocation of Resources for Invention*", in R. Nelson (ed.),"The Rate and Direction of Inventive Activity", Princeton, pp. 609-626.

AUDRETSCH, D.B., J., WEIGAND, (1999), "*Does Science Make a Difference? Investment, Finance and Corporate Governance in German Industries*", Centre for Economic Policy Research Discussion Paper #2056, 36 pages.

BLUNDELL, R., S.R. BOND, (1998), "*Initial Conditions and Moment Restrictions in Dynamic Panel Data*", **Journal of Econometrics**, 87, pp. 115-143.

BOND, S., C., MEGHIR, (1994), "*Dynamic Investment Models and the Firm's Financial Policy*", **Review of Economic Studies**, 61(2), pp.197-222.

BOND, S., D., HARHOFF, J., VAN REENEN, (1999), "*Investment, R&D and Financial Constraints in Britain and Germany*", Institute for Fiscal Studies Working Paper #W99/05, 45 pages.

BOND, S., J., ELSTON, J., MAIRESSE, B., MULKAY, (1997), "*Financial Factors and Investment in Belgium, France, Germany and the U.K.: A Comparison Using Company Panel Data*", NBER working paper #5900.

BOSWORTH, D., (1978), "*The Rate of Obsolescence of Technical Knowledge - A Note*", **Journal of Industrial Economics**, 26(3), pp. 273-279.

BRANCH, B., (1974), "*Research and Development Activity and Profitability: A Distributed Lag Analysis*", **Journal of Political Economy**, 82, pp. 999-1011.

BUTZEN, P., C., FUSS, P., VERMEULEN, (2001), "*The Interest Rate and Credit Channels in Belgium: An Investigation with Micro-Level Firm Data*", National Bank of Belgium, Working Papers Research Series, 18.

CAPRON, H., M. CINCERA, (1998), "*Assessing the R&D Determinants and Productivity of World-wide Manufacturing firms*", **Annales d'Economie et de Statistiques**, 49/50, pp. 565-587.

CAPRON, H., M., CINCERA, M., DUMONT, (2000), "*The Institutional Profile*", in H. CAPRON and W. MEEUSEN (eds.), The National Innovation System of Belgium, Heidelberg New York: Physica-Verlag, pp. 43-69.

CAPRON, H., M., CINCERA, A., HOLLANT, W., MEEUSEN, (1999), "*Harmonisation of Belgian Annual Business Expenditures on Research and Development (ANBERD) Data - 1973-1996*", research report for the Belgian Federal Office for Scientific, Technical and Cultural Affairs (OSTC) and OECD.

CINCERA, M., (2002), "*Patenting Strategies of Belgian Manufacturing Companies*", paper presented at the Third CEPR Conference on Applied Industrial Organization, 30 May 2002 - 1 June 2002, Bergen, Norway.

CINCERA, M., B., van POTTELSBERGHE de la POTTERIE, (2001), "*International R&D Spillovers: A Review*", **Cahiers Economiques de Bruxelles**, 169, pp. 3-33.

CINCERA, M., R., VEUGELERS, (2000), "*Debinnenlandse O&O-uitgaven van de Belgische ondernemingen 1992-98*", VTO-studies #31.

ELLIOTT, J.W., (1971), "*Funds Flow vs. Expectational Theories of Research and Development Expenditures in the Firm*", **Southern Economic Journal**, 37, pp. 409-422.

FAZZARI, S.M., R.G., HUBBARD, B.C., PETERSEN, (1988), "*Financing Constraints and Corporate Investment* ", Brookings Papers on Economic Activity, 1, pp. 141-195.

FAZZARI, S.M.; R.G., HUBBARD, B.C. PETERSEN, (2000), "*Investment-Cash Flow Sensitivities Are Useful: A Comment on Kaplan and Zingales*", **Quarterly Journal of Economics**, 115(2), pp. 695-705.

GRABOWSKI, H.G., (1968), "*The Determinants of Industrial Research and Development: A Study of the Chemical, Drug and Petroleum Industries*", **Journal of Political Economy**, 76, pp. 292-306.

GRILICHES, Z., (1979), "*Issues in Assessing the Contribution of R&D to Productivity Growth*", **Bell Journal of Economics**, 10, pp. 92-116.

GRILICHES, Z., J.A., HAUSMAN, (1986), "*Errors in Variables in Panel Data*", **Journal of Econometrics**, 31, pp. 93-118.

HALL, B.H., (1992), "*Investment and Research and Development at the Firm Level: Does the Source of Financing Matter?*", National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper #4096, 21 pages.

HALL, B.H., J., MAIRESSE , (1995), "*Exploring the Relationship Between R&D and Productivity in French Manufacturing Firms*", **Journal of Econometrics**, 65, pp. 263-94.

HALL, B.H., J., MAIRESSE, L., BRANSTETTER, B., CREPON, (1999), "*Does Cash Flow Cause Investment and R&D: An Exploration Using Panel Data for French, Japanese and United States Scientific Firms*", in D. Audretsch and A. R. Thurik (eds.), Innovation, Industry Evolution and Employment, Cambridge University Press.

HAO, K.Y., A.B., JAFFE, (1993), "*Effect of Liquidity on Firms R&D Spending*", **Economics of Innovation and New technology**.

HARHOFF, D., (1998), "*Are There Financing Constraints for R&D and Investment in German Manufacturing Firms?*", **Annales d'Economie et de Statistiques**, 49-50, pp. 421-56.

HIMMELBERG, C.P., B.C., PETERSEN, (1994), "*R&D and Internal Finance: A Panel Study of Small Firms in High-Tech Industries*", **Review of Economics and Statistics**, 76(1), pp. 38-51.

HUBBARD, R.G., (1998), "*Capital Market Imperfections and Investments*", **Journal of Economic Literature**, 36, pp. 193-225.

HUBBARD, R.G., A.K., KASHYAP, T.M., WHITED, (1995), "*International Finance and Firm Investment*", **Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking**, 27(3), pp. 683-701.

JENSEN, M., W., MECKLING, (1976), "*Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behaviour, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure*", **Journal of Financial Economics**, 3, pp. 305-60.

JORGENSON, D.W., (1963), "*Capital Theory and Investment Behaviour*", **American Economic Review**, 53(2), pp. 247-259.

KAMIEN, M.I., N.L., SCHWARTZ, (1982), *Market Structure and Innovation*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

KAPLAN, S.N., L., ZINGALES, (1997), "*Do Investment-Cash Flow Sensitivities Provide Useful Measures of Financing Constraints*", **Quarterly Journal of Economics**, 112(1), pp. 169-215.

KAPLAN, S.N., L., ZINGALES, (2000), "*Investment-Cash Flow Sensitivities are Not Valid Measures of Financing Constraints*", **Quarterly Journal of Economics**, 115(2), pp. 707-712.

KOGUT, B., (1983), "*Foreign Direct Investment as a Sequential Process*", C. KINDLEBERGER, D. AUDRETSCH (eds.), The Multinational Corporation in the 1980s, Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, pp. 38-56.

MAIRESSE, J., B., MULKAY, B.H., HALL, (1999), "*Firm-Level Investment in France and the United States: An Exploration of What we Have Learned in Twenty Years*", National Bureau of Economic Research Working Paper #7437.

MANIGART, S., K., BAEYENS, I., VERSCHUEREN, (2002), "*The Role of Venture Capital in Financing Unquoted Companies*", National Bank of Belgium, Working Papers Research Series, ??.

MUELLER, D.C., (1967), "*The Firm's Decision Process: An Econometric Investigation*", **Quarterly Journal of Economics**, 81, pp. 58-87.

MULKAY, B., B.H., HALL, J., MAIRESSE, (2001), "*Investment and R&D in France and the United States*", in Herrmann Heinz and Rolf Strauch (eds.), Investing Today for the World of Tomorrow, Springer Verlag, forthcoming.

MYERS, S.C., N.S., MAJLUF, (1984), "*Corporate Financing and Investment Decisions when Firms Have Information that Investors Do not Have*", **Journal of Financial Economics**, 13, pp. 187-221.

NELSON, R.R., (1959), "*The Simple Economics of Basic Scientific Research*", **Journal of Political Economy**, 67, pp. 297-306.

SALTER, W.E.G., (1969), *Productivity and Technical Change*, University of Cambridge, Department of Applied Economics, Monographs 6.

SCHERER, F.M., (1965), "*Firm Size, Market Structure, Opportunity, and the Output of Patented Inventions*", **American Economic Review**, 55, pp. 1097-1125.

SCHIANTARELLI, F. (1996), "*Financial Constraints in Investment: Methodological Issues and International Evidence*", **Oxford Review of Economic Policy**, 12(2), pp. 70-89.

SCHUMPETER, J.A., (1942), "*Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy*", New York: Harper.

STIGLITZ, J.E., A., WEISS, (1981), "*Credit Rationing in Markets with Imperfect Information*", **American Economic Review**, 71(3), pp. 393-410.

STOLL, H.R., (1984), "*Small Firms' Access to Public Equity Financing*", in P.M. HORVITZ, R.R. PETIT (eds.), Small Business Finance: Problems in the Financing of Small Business, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, pp. 187-238.

SWITZER, L., (1984), "*The Determinants of Industrial R&D: A Funds Flow Simultaneous Equation Approach*", **The Review of Economic and Statistics**, 66, pp. 163-168.

VAN CAYSEELE, P., (2002), "*Investment, R&D and Liquidity Constraints: A Corporate Governance Approach to the Belgian Evidence*", National Bank of Belgium, Working Papers Research Series, ??.

APPENDIX 1. Definition of variables

Investment	Sales and disposals of tangible fixed assets (8179) + Revaluation surpluses of tangible fixed assets acquired from third parties (8229) - Cancelled depreciation & amounts written down of tangible fixed assets (8309) + Acquisitions of tangible & fixed assets (8169)
Employees	Average number of employees (A001)
Sales	Turnover (70)
Cash flow	(70/67+630)
Netbook value	Tangible fixed assets (2227)
Net added value	Net value added (70/74-60-61) – Operating subsidies & compensating amounts (740)

APPENDIX 2. Construction of the price deflators for the added value and the total gross fixed capital formation

The adaptations of sources, methods of calculation and methodology following the introduction of the ESA[37] 1995 create a break in the series of the price indices for added value by industry sector (at the two digit level) and gross fixed capital formation[38]. The publication of long series concerning these aggregates recomputed on the basis of ESA 1995 not being yet available, they have been built by grouping together some industry sectors of the series ESA 79 and ESA 95 according to the table of conversion listed in Appendix 3. Once these series at constant price obtained, the annual growth rate of the series ESA 79 (1970-1995) and SEC 95 (1995-2000) have been performed for each sub-period. The two series of growth rates are joined by using those of SEC 95 as from the year 1996. The series in level are then performed by using the value of 2000 as a starting point and by retro-polating by means of the growth rates calculated previously. The new constructed series are reported in Appendix 4.

APPENDIX 3. Concordance table between ESA 1979 and ESA 1995

	ESA 79 (NACE Rev.3 1970)		ESA 95 (NACEBEL)
01	Agricultural, forestry and fishery products	01-02 05	Agriculture, hunting and forestry Fishing
03 05 07 09 11	Water Electric power. Gas, steam and water Other energy products	10 11 12 23 40 41	Mining of coal and lignite ; extraction of peat Extraction of crude petroleum and natural gas; Mining of uranium and thorium ores Manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel Electricity, gas, steam and hot water supply Collection, purification and distribution of water
13 15 19	Ferrous and non-ferrous ores and metals Non-metallic mineral products Metal products except machinery and transport equipment	13 14 26 27 28	Mining of metal ores Other mining and quarrying Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products Manufacture of basic metals Manufacture of fabricated metal products, except machinery
17	Chemical products	24	Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products

[37] ESA = European System of National and Regional Accounts.

[38] Among these changes, the classification of activities is modified, the added value is expressed at the basic prices, i.e. with the amount less invoiced the balance of the taxes and subsidies on products (ICN 1995).

APPENDIX 3. Concordance table between ESA 1979 and ESA 1995 (continued).

21 23 25	Agricultural and industrial machinery Office and data processing machines; precision and optical instruments Electrical goods	29 30 31 32 33	Manufacture of machinery and equipment, not elsewhere classified Manufacture of office, accounting and computing machinery Manufacture of electrical machinery and apparatus, not elsewhere classified Manufacture of radio, television and communication equipment Manufacture of medical, precision and optical instruments, watches
27 29	27 Motor vehicles 29 Other transport equipment	34 35	Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers Manufacture of other transport equipment
31 33 35 37 39	Meat preparations and preserves, other products from slaughtered animals Milk and dairy products Other food products Beverages Tobacco products	15 16	Manufacture of food products and beverages Manufacture of tobacco products
41 43	Textiles and clothing Leathers, leather and skin goods, footwear	17 18 19	Manufacture of textiles Manufacture of wearing apparel; dressing and dyeing of fur Tanning and dressing of leather; manufacture of luggage,
47	Paper and printing products	21 22	Manufacture of paper and paper products Publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media
49	Rubber and plastic products	25	Manufacture of rubber and plastic products
45 51	Timber, wooden products and furniture Other manufacturing products	20 36	Manufacture of wood and of products of wood and cork, Manufacture of furniture; manufacturing, not elsewhere classified
53	Building and construction	45	Construction
55 57	55 Recovery and repair services 57 Wholesale and retail trade	37 50-52	Recycling wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles, motorcycles and personal and household goods
59	Lodging and catering services	55	Hotels and restaurants
61 63 65 67	Inland transpon services Maritime and air transport services Auxiliary transpon services Communication services	60 61 62 63 64	Transport, storage and communications
69	Services of credit and insurance institutions	65-67	Financial intermediation
71 73 75 79	Business services provided to enterprises Services of renting of immovable goods Market services of education and research Recreational and cultural services, personal services, other market services n.e.c.	70-74 90-93	Real estate, renting and business activities Other service activities
77 89	Market services of health Non-market services of health provided by general government and private non-profit institutions	85	Health and social work
81	General public services	75	Public administration
85	Non-market services of education and research provided by general government and private non-profit institutions	80	Education
93	Domestic services and other non-market services nec	95	Domestic services
	Charged production of banking services; statistical adjustment		Financial intermediation services (indirectly measured) (SIFIM)
	Total		Total

APPENDIX 4. Price deflators of value added and physical capital investment

Price deflator of added value	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Agriculture, hunting and forestry, fishing	1.4351	1.2541	1.1448	1.2075	1.0000	1.0579	1.0691	.9822	.8370	.9326
Extraction of crude petroleum and natural gas, manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel, electricity, gas, steam and hot water supply	.8798	.9198	.9616	.9933	1.0000	.9786	.9918	1.0117	.9453	.9877
Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products, manufacture of basic metals	.8711	.9332	.9463	.9713	1.0000	.9956	.9717	1.0100	.9508	.9940
Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products	.9083	.9049	.8939	.9240	1.0000	.9726	.9148	.9124	.9014	.9030
Manufacture of machinery and equipment, office, accounting and computing machinery, electrical machinery, radio, television and communication equipment, medical, precision and optical instruments	.8660	.8861	.9766	.9851	1.0000	.9933	.9613	.9626	.9318	.8428
Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers, manufacture of other transport equipment	.8690	.8841	.9733	.9857	1.0000	.9280	.8937	.8613	.8608	.8691
Manufacture of food products and beverages and tobacco products	.9161	.9502	.9610	.9873	1.0000	.9920	1.0688	1.0174	1.0828	1.1128
Manufacture of textiles, wearing apparel, tanning and dressing of leather; manufacture of luggage	.9218	.9319	.9261	.9718	1.0000	.8949	.8204	.7836	.8072	.8617
Manufacture of paper and paper products, publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media	.9369	.9387	.9077	.9144	1.0000	1.0342	1.0496	1.1015	1.1198	1.1672
Manufacture of rubber and plastic products	1.0065	1.0230	.9859	.9721	1.0000	1.0455	1.0101	1.0291	1.0828	.9969
Manufacture of wood, furniture; manufacturing, not elsewhere classified	.8970	.9211	.9474	.9675	1.0000	.9898	.9776	.9826	1.0112	1.0262
Construction	.8973	.9403	.9554	.9812	1.0000	.9951	1.0021	1.0414	1.0949	1.0680
Recycling, wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and personal and household goods	.9169	.9529	.9789	.9988	1.0000	1.0519	1.0793	1.1208	1.1811	1.2093
Hotels and restaurants	.8358	.9121	.9501	.9798	1.0000	1.0283	1.0511	1.0946	1.1669	1.2118
Transport, storage and communications	.8946	.9128	.9398	.9785	1.0000	1.0071	1.0587	1.0796	1.0373	1.0055
Financial intermediation	.9894	.9979	.9833	1.0050	1.0000	1.0378	.9667	1.0270	1.0368	1.0791
Real estate, renting and business activities, other service activities	.8574	.9022	.9474	.9779	1.0000	1.0198	1.0396	1.0528	1.0783	1.0970
Health and social work	.7995	.8459	.9123	.9506	1.0000	1.0419	1.0592	1.1132	1.1343	1.1452
Total	.8921	.9276	.9647	.9832	1.0000	1.0118	1.0253	1.0416	1.0543	1.0685

Price deflator of investment in physical capital	1971	1972	1973	1974	1975	1976	1977	1978	1979	1980
Agriculture, hunting and forestry, fishing	.3842	.4330	.4412	.5002	.5245	.5521	.5815	.5996	.6254	.6399
Extraction of crude petroleum and natural gas, manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel, electricity, gas, steam and hot water supply	.3534	.3812	.4028	.4635	.4998	.5421	.5789	.5919	.6231	.6480
Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products, manufacture of basic metals	.4701	.4940	.5142	.5829	.6037	.6271	.6492	.6575	.6799	.6981
Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products	.4636	.4849	.5074	.5738	.5935	.6218	.6507	.6697	.6942	.7047
Manufacture of machinery and equipment, office, accounting and computing machinery, electrical machinery, radio, television and communication equipment, medical, precision and optical instruments	.4481	.4725	.5030	.5730	.5889	.6180	.6490	.6644	.6883	.7019
Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers, manufacture of other transport equipment	.4200	.4372	.4626	.5303	.5558	.6033	.6312	.6590	.6772	.6931
Manufacture of food products and beverages and tobacco products	.4435	.4636	.4886	.5538	.5706	.6026	.6282	.6480	.6709	.6828
Manufacture of textiles, wearing apparel, tanning and dressing of leather; manufacture of luggage	.4586	.4787	.5000	.5670	.5865	.6194	.6444	.6624	.6838	.6949
Manufacture of paper and paper products, publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media	.4799	.4981	.5230	.5938	.5890	.6292	.6517	.6665	.6889	.6992
Manufacture of rubber and plastic products	.4570	.4755	.4950	.5667	.5868	.6167	.6486	.6611	.6859	.6976
Manufacture of wood, furniture; manufacturing, not elsewhere classified	.4169	.4389	.4595	.5249	.5476	.5947	.6118	.6365	.6622	.6772
Construction	.4395	.4596	.4746	.5383	.5564	.5851	.6107	.6237	.6470	.6591
Recycling, wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and personal and household goods	.3639	.3819	.4023	.4612	.4926	.5272	.5588	.5771	.6032	.6218
Hotels and restaurants	.3270	.3439	.3719	.4365	.4761	.5183	.5552	.5796	.6143	.6411
Transport, storage and communications	.4414	.4501	.4762	.5631	.6129	.6251	.6590	.6903	.7236	.6469
Financial intermediation	.3286	.3478	.3762	.4427	.4903	.5349	.5699	.5984	.6308	.6591
Real estate, renting and business activities, other service activities	.2550	.2670	.2880	.3469	.4172	.4581	.4936	.5223	.5528	.5977
Health and social work	.2881	.3016	.3295	.3787	.4344	.4756	.4989	.5167	.5379	.6152
Total	.3346	.3499	.3719	.4328	.4819	.5134	.5425	.5667	.5951	.6284

	1981	1982	1983	1984	1985	1986	1987	1988	1989	1990
Agriculture, hunting and forestry, fishing	.6384	.6955	.7646	.7861	.8167	.8153	.8200	.8397	.8807	.9145
Extraction of crude petroleum and natural gas, manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel, electricity, gas, steam and hot water supply	.6898	.7338	.7678	.7983	.8288	.8279	.8247	.8433	.8803	.9032
Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products, manufacture of basic metals	.7252	.7685	.8039	.8294	.8512	.8637	.8614	.8725	.9028	.9237
Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products	.7244	.7655	.7981	.8300	.8508	.8635	.8621	.8738	.9037	.9236
Manufacture of machinery and equipment, office, accounting and computing machinery, electrical machinery, radio, television and communication equipment, medical, precision and optical instruments	.7223	.7665	.8019	.8295	.8495	.8607	.8590	.8723	.9012	.9216
Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers, manufacture of other transport equipment	.7247	.7688	.8050	.8326	.8497	.8620	.8610	.8727	.9014	.9218
Manufacture of food products and beverages and tobacco products	.7120	.7546	.7932	.8179	.8416	.8539	.8539	.8648	.8979	.9191
Manufacture of textiles, wearing apparel, tanning and dressing of leather; manufacture of luggage	.7171	.7599	.7994	.8258	.8478	.8608	.8592	.8710	.9011	.9215
Manufacture of paper and paper products, publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media	.7256	.7666	.8035	.8299	.8481	.8624	.8604	.8732	.9024	.9228
Manufacture of rubber and plastic products	.7207	.7679	.8022	.8257	.8527	.8615	.8621	.8712	.9005	.9209
Manufacture of wood, furniture; manufacturing, not elsewhere classified	.7036	.7483	.7889	.8191	.8409	.8516	.8511	.8650	.8957	.9184
Construction	.6886	.7270	.7720	.8034	.8293	.8431	.8396	.8580	.8911	.9172
Recycling, wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and personal and household goods	.6461	.6937	.7431	.7795	.8123	.8221	.8256	.8442	.8832	.9120
Hotels and restaurants	.6800	.7291	.7565	.7886	.8258	.8229	.8211	.8382	.8780	.9023
Transport, storage and communications	.6812	.7378	.7782	.8067	.8321	.8377	.8392	.8583	.8925	.9185
Financial intermediation	.6989	.7489	.7812	.8106	.8419	.8474	.8442	.8591	.8952	.9168
Real estate, renting and business activities, other service activities	.6530	.6659	.6840	.7140	.7491	.7687	.7963	.8142	.8542	.8796
Health and social work	.6723	.7420	.7618	.7946	.8259	.8176	.8135	.8320	.8720	.8924
Total	.6741	.7176	.7472	.7771	.8050	.8142	.8219	.8387	.8755	.8996

	1991	1992	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000
Agriculture, hunting and forestry, fishing	.9252	.9331	.9360	.9842	1.0000	1.0165	1.0187	1.0213	1.0419	1.0597
Extraction of crude petroleum and natural gas, manufacture of coke, refined petroleum products and nuclear fuel, electricity, gas, steam and hot water supply	.9209	.9445	.9581	.9783	1.0000	1.0032	1.0123	1.0209	1.0547	1.1193
Manufacture of other non-metallic mineral products, manufacture of basic metals	.9452	.9637	.9746	.9838	1.0000	1.0046	1.0119	1.0064	1.0420	1.0800
Manufacture of chemicals and chemical products	.9449	.9634	.9731	.9841	1.0000	1.0053	1.0130	1.0156	1.0522	1.1025
Manufacture of machinery and equipment, office, accounting and computing machinery, electrical machinery, radio, television and communication equipment, medical, precision and optical instruments	.9422	.9614	.9726	.9837	1.0000	1.0058	1.0134	1.0205	1.0568	1.0689
Manufacture of motor vehicles, trailers and semi-trailers, manufacture of other transport equipment	.9427	.9603	.9704	.9834	1.0000	1.0023	1.0115	1.0178	1.0547	1.1019
Manufacture of food products and beverages and tobacco products	.9400	.9597	.9704	.9837	1.0000	1.0041	1.0119	1.0292	1.0531	1.0542
Manufacture of textiles, wearing apparel, tanning and dressing of leather; manufacture of luggage	.9426	.9614	.9719	.9847	1.0000	1.0086	1.0107	.9934	1.0333	1.0766
Manufacture of paper and paper products, publishing, printing and reproduction of recorded media	.9434	.9620	.9731	.9834	1.0000	1.0044	1.0130	.9988	1.0367	1.0834
Manufacture of rubber and plastic products	.9417	.9600	.9710	.9833	1.0000	1.0083	1.0135	.9703	1.0216	1.0659
Manufacture of wood, furniture; manufacturing, not elsewhere classified	.9405	.9614	.9725	.9840	1.0000	1.0077	1.0140	1.0103	1.0446	1.0733
Construction	.9423	.9660	.9740	.9868	1.0000	1.0047	1.0116	1.0198	1.0570	1.0944
Recycling, wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and personal and household goods	.9369	.9652	.9780	.9905	1.0000	1.0046	1.0126	1.0189	1.0453	1.1262
Hotels and restaurants	.9192	.9438	.9609	.9803	1.0000	1.0044	1.0073	1.0131	1.0519	1.0715
Transport, storage and communications	.9420	.9624	.9686	.9841	1.0000	1.0013	1.0148	1.0232	1.0543	1.1118
Financial intermediation	.9363	.9564	.9693	.9832	1.0000	1.0041	1.0117	1.0223	1.0355	1.0690
Real estate, renting and business activities, other service activities	.8961	.9314	.9524	.9797	1.0000	1.0198	1.0297	1.0362	1.0528	1.0843
Health and social work	.9058	.9355	.9521	.9811	1.0000	1.0039	1.0103	1.0175	1.0386	1.0961
Total	.9188	.9457	.9612	.9827	1.0000	1.0105	1.0195	1.0252	1.0495	1.0920

Source: Institute for National Accounts (2001) and own calculation.

APPENDIX 5. Data construction

- **Stock of firm's physical capital**

The net physical capital stock (in constant 1995 BEF) has been computed by applying a perpetual inventory method with a depreciation of 8 percent[39] per year for all years following the first year for which historic costs data are available:

$$C_{it} = (1-\delta)C_{it-1} + I_{it}$$

where:

C_{it} = stock of physical capital for firm i at time t;

I_{it} = tangible investments in fixed assets deflated by the total gross fixed capital formation deflator at the two digits industry level;

δ = rate of depreciation.

The starting value is based on the net book value of tangible fixed capital assets, C_{i0}, in the first observation within the sample period, adjusted for previous years inflation. This value is obtained by multiplying C_{i0}, by the ratio of the total gross fixed capital formation deflator at the two digits industry level in the current year by the one AA years ago, where AA is the estimated average age of each firm's physical capital stock. AA is computed as the difference between the year of the firm's creation, DATE, and the year for which the starting value, C_{i0}, is available, with a maximum of 16 years if we assume that the full depreciation of physical capital takes 16 years for accounting purposes.

- **Stock of firm's R&D capital**

The stock of R&D capital has also been built on the basis of the permanent inventory method originally proposed by Griliches (1979). Actually this method is the most commonly used for constructing the firm's knowledge capital. This method assumes that the current state of knowledge is a result of present and past R&D expenditures:

$$\begin{aligned} K_{it} &= (1-\delta)K_{it-1} + R_{it} \\ &= R_{it} + (1-\delta)R_{it-1} + (1-\delta)^2 R_{it-2} + \ldots) \\ &= \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} (1-\delta)^{\tau} R_{it-\tau} \end{aligned}$$

where:

K_{it} = knowledge capital or own R&D stock of firm i at time t;

R_{it} = intra-mural Research and Development expenditures deflated by the GDP deflator;

δ = rate of depreciation.

[39] This is the depreciation rate generally assumed in the previous studies.

This formulation raises at least three questions. First, we have very little idea about the magnitude of the depreciation rate (should it be constant across firms and time periods). Hence, it is not clear which value to retain. Second, since the available history of R&D is usually not very long, we need a way to construct the initial knowledge stock. Finally, constructing the knowledge stock as in the above equation supposes a particular distribution of the R&D effects over time. Regarding the value of the depreciation rate, Bosworth (1978) has estimated, on the basis of patent renewal data, a value ranging from .1 to .15. Indeed, most studies assume a depreciation rate of 15%. Moreover, several authors, e.g. Hall and Mairesse (1995), have experimented with different values of δ and report very small changes if not at all in the estimated effects of R&D capital[40]. The initial knowledge capital is constructed as above and by assuming a growth rate of presample R&D equal to g:

$$K_{i0} = R_{i0} \sum_{\tau=0}^{\infty} \frac{(1-\delta)}{(1-g)}^{\tau} = \frac{R_{i0}}{(g+\delta)}$$

Here also, a presample growth rate of 5% is usually assumed. As Hall and Mairesse (1995) point out, the precise choice of growth rate only affects the initial stock which in turn declines in importance as time passes.

APPENDIX 6. Legal status of firms

Without any particular legal status	11924
Absorption by another company	69
Early dissolution – liquidation	27
Bankruptcy	17
Official approval of legal composition	16
Other incidents of solvability	10
Scission into several companies	12
Closing of a liquidation	3
Merger with another company to form a third one	2
TOTAL	12080

[40] This arises from the log-log functional form of the Cobb-Douglas function used in these studies. Indeed, the log of K varies as the log of R in the cross section when the depreciation rate and growth rate are roughly constant over time at the firm level. In that case, log $K_{it} \approx \log [R_{it}/(g+\delta)] = \log R_{it} - c$ where $c = \log (g+\delta)$. This will not be true if ones does not take the log of K.

APPENDIX 7. Error correction model: physical capital and sample 2

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.10 (.0216)*	-.14 (.0211)*	-.07 (.0270)*	.36 (.1442)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.35 (.0845)*	-.48 (.0696)*	-.27 (.0849)*	-.20 (.0468)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.27 (.0658)*	.21 (.0540)*	.32 (.1288)*	.68 (.0889)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.22 (.0587)*	.19 (.0651)*	.24 (.0577)*	.19 (.0540)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.43 (.1165)*	.81 (.0899)*	.44 (.1436)*	-.17 (.0628)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.28 (.1131)*	.65 (.1012)*	.52 (.1880)*	-.11 (.0763)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.53 (.1101)*	.98 (.0905)*	.51 (.1526)*	.30 (.0827)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.29 (.1093)*	.62 (.1188)*	.57 (.2113)*	-.11 (.1010)
Wald test joint signif.	48.8 [.000]	164 [.000]	45.6 [.000]	956 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	38.4 [.000]	63.2 [.000]	19.3 [.001]	17.4 [.002]
Wald test for CF	29.9 [.000]	18.5 [.000]	21.9 [.000]	90.6 [.000]
Sargan test			20.7 [.840]	39.0 [.605]
Test M1	-1.7 [.082]	2.1 [.033]	-1.8 [.068]	-3.2 [.001]
Test M2	-1.5 [.123]	.62 [.536]	-1.4 [.163]	-1.7 [.097]
# of obs. (firms)	375 (160)			

APPENDIX 8. Accelerator model for physical and R&D capital

Accelerator model for investments in physical capital

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.01 (.0168)	-.01 (.0233)	.03 (.0228)	.13 (.0476)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.25 (.0841)*	-.45 (.0857)*	-.17 (.1921)	-.31 (.1484)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.20 (.0668)*	.22 (.0669)*	.55 (.1256)*	.42 (.1026)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.15 (.0487)*	.16 (.0576)*	.18 (.0872)*	.17 (.0605)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.03 (.0533)	.02 (.0521)	-.11 (.1265)	-.15 (.0837)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	-.02 (.0488)	-.01 (.0480)	-.07 (.0530)	.00 (.0306)
Wald test joint signif.	34.1 [.000]	51.5 [.000]	72.1 [.000]	131.6 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	5.7 [.224]	4.8 [.000]	13.7 [.008]	12.8 [.012]
Wald test for CF	18.6 [.000]	15.2 [.000]	32.3 [.000]	37.7 [.000]
Sargan test			13.9 [.837]	27.9 [.576]
Test M1	-2.5 [.012]	-2.7 [.006]	-6.4 [.000]	-2.3 [.021]
Test M2	-1.9 [.052]	-2.3 [.020]	-2.5 [.013]	-1.7 [.083]
# of obs. (firms)	303 (143)			

Accelerator model for investments in R&D capital

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.08 (.0300)*	-.02 (.0158)	-.03 (.0265)	.12 (.0186)*
R_{t-1}/K_{t-2}	-.22 (.0693)*	-.40 (.0416)*	.41 (.0343)*	.41 (.0100)*
CF_t/K_{t-1}	.02 (.0081)*	.01 (.0059)	.00 (.0012)	.00 (.0003)*
CF_{t-1}/K_{t-2}	.03 (.0127)*	.02 (.0082)	.01 (.0009)*	.01 (.0003)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.08 (.0577)	.03 (.0277)	.13 (.1020)	.20 (.0286)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.04 (.0437)	.01 (.0278)	-.01 (.0293)	-.02 (.0141)
Wald test joint signif.	13.8 [.017]	129.5 [.000]	211.6 [.000]	18498 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	16.9 [.002]	17.5 [.000]	40.2 [.008]	57.8 [.012]
Wald test for CF	5.6 [.062]	3.9 [.142]	41.0 [.000]	530 [.000]
Sargan test			21.9 [.344]	35.0 [.881]
Test M1	1.0 [.312]	1.2 [.215]	-1.3 [.204]	-1.4 [.174]
Test M2	.32 [.789]	.84 [.426]	1.1 [.253]	1.2 [.249]
# of obs. (firms)	375 (160)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 9. Physical investment error correction model by firm size

small size firms

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.27 (.0100)*	-.27 (.0077)*	.00 (.0132)	.22 (.1146)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.13 (.0095)*	-.37 (.0086)*	.05 (.0184)*	.04 (.0159)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.27 (.0275)*	.25 (.0241)*	.30 (.0500)*	.33 (.0428)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.14 (.0181)*	.21 (.0158)*	.00 (.0186)	.00 (.0161)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.35 (.0200)*	.91 (.0252)*	-.10 (.0975)	-.13 (.0738)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.15 (.0186)*	.61 (.0286)*	.04 (.1170)	.01 (.0297)
$\log(C_{t-2})-\log(Y_{t-2})$	.48 (.0144)*	1.2 (.0202)*	-.08 (.0536)	.00 (.0162)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.12 (.0198)*	.56 (.0324)*	.03 (.1295)	-.02 (.0318)
Wald test of joint signif.	1227 [.000]	5183 [.000]	132 [.000]	301 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	1331 [.000]	2674 [.000]	9.1 [.244]	65.7 [.000]
Wald test for CF	184 [.000]	207 [.000]	49.1 [.000]	80.1 [.000]
Sargan test			134 [.621]	166 [.246]
Test M1	-18.0 [.000]	18.4 [.000]	-5.3 [.000]	-21.2 [.000]
Test M2	-8.1 [.000]	-6.9 [.000]	-2.7 [.483]	-1.1 [.265]
# of obs. (firms)	3133 (1039)			

medium size firms

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.22 (.0081)*	-.25 (.0082)*	-.02 (.0116)	-.07 (.1004)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.12 (.0079)*	-.34 (.0087)*	.06 (.0173)*	.06 (.0155)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.25 (.0192)*	.27 (.0166)*	.14 (.0368)*	.13 (.0365)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.12 (.0138)*	.19 (.0138)*	.00 (.0188)	.00 (.0177)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.33 (.0159)*	.83 (.0320)*	-.20 (.0839)*	-.07 (.0684)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.17 (.0156)*	.57 (.0320)*	-.01 (.0830)	.06 (.0349)
$\log(C_{t-2})-\log(Y_{t-2})$	.42 (.0147)*	1.1 (.0357)*	-.04 (.0465)	.01 (.0171)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.13 (.0167)*	.52 (.0361)*	-.05 (.0890)	.02 (.0364)
Wald test of joint signif.	1026 [.000]	2709 [.000]	106 [.000]	370 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	1025 [.000]	1156 [.000]	27.0 [.000]	93.3 [.000]
Wald test for CF	224 [.000]	309 [.000]	26.1 [.000]	25.9 [.000]
Sargan test			117 [.915]	158 [.402]
Test M1	-19.5 [.000]	13.4 [.000]	-19.1 [.000]	-19.5 [.000]
Test M2	-7.0 [.000]	-4.6 [.000]	-.20 [.845]	-.01 [.992]
# of obs. (firms)	23720 (5053)			

large size firms

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.19 (.0155)*	-.26 (.0131)*	-.07 (.0115)*	-.28 (.1099)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.07 (.0243)*	-.35 (.0302)*	.04 (.0075)*	.05 (.0106)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.13 (.0259)*	.12 (.0231)*	.09 (.0143)*	.09 (.0100)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.07 (.0343)	.10 (.0235)*	.04 (.0058)*	.02 (.0044)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.29 (.0463)*	.78 (.0784)*	.08 (.0228)*	.02 (.0215)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.20 (.0394)*	.62 (.0687)*	.03 (.0133)*	.01 (.0146)
$\log(C_{t-2})-\log(Y_{t-2})$	.31 (.0372)*	1.0 (.0623)*	.14 (.0210)*	-.02 (.0118)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.17 (.0449)*	.59 (.0665)*	-.02 (.0158)	-.02 (.0164)
Wald test of joint signif.	104 [.000]	535 [.000]	215 [.000]	929 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	179 [.000]	468 [.000]	216 [.000]	141 [.000]
Wald test for CF	27.2 [.000]	29.1 [.000]	65.2 [.000]	98.7 [.000]
Sargan test			152 [.229]	173 [.136]
Test M1	-6.4 [.000]	5.0 [.000]	-7.1 [.000]	-7.1 [.000]
Test M2	-1.0 [.306]	-.68 [.494]	.59 [.556]	-.37 [.713]
# of obs. (firms)	2753 (622)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 10. Physical investment error correction model: Unquoted vs. quoted firms

non quoted firms

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.24 (.0060)*	-.26 (.0054)*	.00 (.0095)	.17 (.0542)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.12 (.0060)*	-.36 (.0060)*	.06 (.0140)*	.05 (.0123)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.25 (.0155)*	.25 (.0139)*	.15 (.0514)*	.23 (.0399)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.12 (.0110)*	.19 (.0101)*	.01 (.0185)	-.01 (.0150)
$\Delta log(Y_t)$	.34 (.0122)*	.87 (.0204)*	-.18 (.0939)	-.11 (.0681)
$\Delta log(Y_{t-1})$	.17 (.0116)*	.60 (.0212)*	-.15 (.0946)	.02 (.0242)
$log(C_{t-2})- log(Y_{t-2})$	.43 (.0100)*	1.18 (.0205)*	-.17 (.0450)*	-.01 (.0142)
$log(Y_{t-2})$	.13 (.0124)*	.55 (.0239)*	-.19 (.1026)	.00 (.0246)
Wald test joint signif.	2229 [.000]	6630 [.000]	196 [.000]	567 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	2441 [.000]	3169 [.000]	15.8 [.038]	102 [.000]
Wald test for CF	425 [.000]	499 [.000]	24.4 [.000]	57.4 [.000]
Sargan test			105 [.815]	180 [.076]
Test M1	-27.4 [.000]	22.9 [.000]	-26.8 [.000]	-28.6 [.000]
Test M2	-10.6 [.000]	-7.2 [.000]	.35 [.725]	-.58 [.564]
# of obs. (firms)	58616 (10002)			

firms listed on the stock market

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS
C	.17 (.0605)*	-.26 (.0449)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.00 (.0674)	-.41 (.0601)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.09 (.0737)	.07 (.0445)
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.09 (.0504)	.08 (.0351)*
$\Delta log(Y_t)$	.37 (.1224)*	.77 (.1241)*
$\Delta log(Y_{t-1})$	.23 (.1285)	.62 (.1424)*
$log(C_{t-2})- log(Y_{t-2})$	.37 (.1156)*	.95 (.1618)*
$log(Y_{t-2})$	.30 (.1414)*	.70 (.1933)*
Wald test joint signif.	39.0 [.000]	96.1 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	32.4 [.000]	59.7 [.000]
Wald test for CF	3.3 [.195]	5.8 [.055]
Sargan test		
Test M1	-1.7 [.085]	2.0 [.042]
Test M2	1.0 [.304]	-.40 [.687]
# of obs. (firms)	217 (47)	

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 11. Physical investment error correction model: domestic firms vs. subsidiaries

domestic firms

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.24 (.0063)*	-.26 (.0056)*	.00 (.01)	.18 (.0558)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.12 (.0062)*	-.36 (.0062)*	.06 (.0144)*	.05 (.0128)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.29 (.0162)*	.28 (.0138)*	.16 (.0595)*	.24 (.0462)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.12 (.0118)*	.19 (.0111)*	.01 (.0205)	-.01 (.0173)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.33 (.0126)*	.86 (.0211)*	-.17 (.096)	-.12 (.0684)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.16 (.0121)*	.59 (.0221)*	-.09 (.1023)	.03 (.0244)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.44 (.0102)*	1.2 (.0213)*	-.16 (.0488)*	-.01 (.0146)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.12 (.0129)*	.53 (.0248)*	-.13 (.1109)	.01 (.0248)
Wald test joint signif.	2205 [.000]	6379 [.000]	186 [.000]	570 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	2268 [.000]	2880 [.000]	14.3 [.045]	96.1 [.000]
Wald test for CF	440 [.000]	498 [.000]	25.8 [.000]	55.8 [.000]
Sargan test			113 [.642]	178 [.087]
Test M1	-26.7 [.000]	22.2 [.000]	-26.4 [.000]	-28.4 [.000]
Test M2	-10.3 [.000]	-7.2 [.000]	.12 [.902]	-.57 [.572]
# of obs. (firms)	46066 (9408)			

subsidiaries of foreign multinationals

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.21 (.0202)*	-.26 (.0147)*	-.08 (.0171)*	-.10 (.1474)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.13 (.0244)*	-.34 (.025)*	-.05 (.0178)*	-.01 (.0124)
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.08 (.0253)*	.11 (.0261)*	.12 (.0155)*	.10 (.0120)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.11 (.0240)*	.13 (.0192)*	.05 (.0069)*	.04 (.0049)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.35 (.0375)*	.92 (.0428)*	.04 (.0504)	-.08 (.0315)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.22 (.0338)*	.72 (.0423)*	.01 (.0484)	-.10 (.0252)*
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.42 (.0418)*	1.2 (.0469)*	.22 (.0406)*	.09 (.0189)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.19 (.0378)*	.73 (.0518)*	-.03 (.0501)	-.16 (.0245)*
Wald test joint signif.	126 [.000]	725 [.000]	91.2 [.000]	501 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	156 [.000]	432 [.000]	74.8 [.000]	115 [.000]
Wald test for CF	23.8 [.000]	48.8 [.000]	79.1 [.000]	118 [.000]
Sargan test			155 [.015]	187 [.036]
Test M1	-6.5 [.000]	6.3 [.000]	-7.4 [.000]	-7.7 [.000]
Test M2	-2.2 [.031]	-.32 [.751]	-2.0 [.047]	-1.2 [.217]
# of obs. (firms)				

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 12. Physical investment error correction model by firms' age

AGE < 10 years

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.13 (.0255)*	-.12 (.0238)*	-.05 (.0218)*	.09 (.1069)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.23 (.0227)*	-.43 (.0211)*	-.16 (.0334)*	-.11 (.0298)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.35 (.0471)*	.29 (.0439)*	.34 (.0467)*	.35 (.0425)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.17 (.0373)*	.21 (.0311)*	.19 (.0278)*	.15 (.0211)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.37 (.0378)*	.71 (.0521)*	.04 (.0575)	.02 (.0432)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.22 (.0334)*	.48 (.0462)*	-.12 (.0606)*	-.18 (.0457)*
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.60 (.0450)*	1.1 (.0496)*	.28 (.0470)*	.15 (.0302)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.23 (.0372)*	.50 (.0476)*	-.18 (.0661)*	-.25 (.0495)*
Wald test joint signif.	244 [.000]	1004 [.000]	134 [.000]	341 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	157 [.000]	297 [.000]	35.4 [.000]	7.3 [.400]
Wald test for CF	70.7 [.000]	59.8 [.000]	104 [.000]	134 [.000]
Sargan test			135 [.152]	164 [.266]
Test M1	-3.3 [.001]	6.3 [.000]	-5.3 [.000]	-6.7 [.000]
Test M2	-3.7 [.000]	-1.7 [.089]	-2.7 [.008]	-2.2 [.030]
# of obs. (firms)	3133 (1039)			

AGE < 20 years

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.19 (.0092)*	-.20 (.0085)*	-.01 (.0117)	.14 (.0764)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.13 (.0096)*	-.36 (.0109)*	.05 (.0186)*	.03 (.0152)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.23 (.0213)*	.24 (.0190)*	.17 (.0455)*	.17 (.0407)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.11 (.0182)*	.17 (.0156)*	.00 (.0220)	.00 (.0190)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.33 (.0196)*	.82 (.0387)*	-.09 (.0891)	.02 (.0605)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.16 (.0196)*	.55 (.0384)*	-.11 (.1006)	.03 (.0278)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.40 (.0173)*	1.1 (.0434)*	-.10 (.0494)*	-.01 (.0173)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.10 (.0204)*	.48 (.0434)*	-.16 (.1085)	-.02 (.0291)
Wald test joint signif.	703 [.000]	1733 [.000]	78.2 [.000]	340 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	665 [.000]	733 [.000]	11.1 [.134]	64.2 [.000]
Wald test for CF	136 [.000]	185 [.000]	22.5 [.000]	30.5 [.000]
Sargan test			147 [.038]	195 [.014]
Test M1	-3.3 [.001]	10.9 [.000]	-17.1 [.000]	-17.8 [.000]
Test M2	-3.7 [.000]	-4.1 [.000]	-.31 [.760]	-.44 [.663]
# of obs. (firms)	16226 (3200)			

AGE > 19 years

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.27 (.0081)*	-.30 (.0072)*	-.02 (.0124)	.24 (.0614)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.12 (.0079)*	-.35 (.0074)*	.08 (.0141)*	.07 (.0121)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.25 (.0212)*	.24 (.0186)*	.26 (.0459)*	.25 (.0387)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.13 (.0137)*	.19 (.0128)*	-.01 (.0167)	-.01 (.0137)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.35 (.0168)*	.94 (.0254)*	-.07 (.0954)	-.07 (.0737)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.18 (.0157)*	.65 (.0273)*	.16 (.1065)	.05 (.0319)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.46 (.0128)*	1.2 (.0242)*	.02 (.0530)	.03 (.0170)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.13 (.0170)*	.58 (.0299)*	.16 (.1172)	.03 (.0330)
Wald test joint signif.	1475 [.000]	4872 [.000]	153 [.000]	317 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	1661 [.000]	2429 [.000]	20.5 [.005]	108 [.000]
Wald test for CF	281 [.000]	298 [.000]	44.8 [.000]	55.6 [.000]
Sargan test			123 [.372]	164 [.261]
Test M1	-21.1 [.000]	19.3 [.000]	2.0 [.000]	-26.3 [.000]
Test M2	-8.7 [.000]	-6.3 [.000]	1.7 [.000]	-.05 [.961]
# of obs. (firms)	33980 (5587)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.

M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 13. Physical investment error correction model by industry sector

Agriculture (I1)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.21 (.0667)*	-.24 (.0455)*	-.12 (.0170)*	.47 (.2561)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.17 (.0470)*	-.39 (.0430)*	-.16 (.0108)*	-.10 (.0202)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.33 (.1778)	.42 (.1090)*	.66 (.0388)*	.81 (.0522)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.24 (.1356)	.30 (.1098)*	.05 (.0180)*	.04 (.0313)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.15 (.0937)	.50 (.0883)*	.11 (.0328)*	.03 (.0444)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	-.02 (.0769)	.23 (.1229)	.08 (.0304)*	.03 (.0271)
$\log(C_{t-2})- \log(Y_{t-2})$	.41 (.1006)*	.92 (.0733)*	.35 (.0308)*	.24 (.0310)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	-.05 (.0877)	.20 (.1515)	.00 (.0287)	-.08 (.0232)*
Wald test joint signif.	36.8 [.000]	225.1 [.000]	1704.8 [.000]	944.0 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	14.1 [.050]	52.3 [.000]	487.1 [.000]	32.8 [.000]
Wald test for CF	7.7 [.021]	15.7 [.000]	374.3 [.000]	263.5 [.000]
Sargan test			67.3 [1.00]	60.0 [1.00]
Test M1	-1.74 [.081]	1.99 [.047]	-2.25 [.024]	-2.94 [.003]
Test M2	-1.38 [.167]	-0.66 [.512]	-1.31 [.191]	-0.98 [.328]
# of obs. (firms)	424 (82)			

Metals (I3)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.19 (.0169)*	-.21 (.0161)*	-.01 (.0167)	.18 (.1244)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.17 (.0188)*	-.39 (.0188)*	-.02 (.0218)	-.01 (.0169)
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.33 (.0484)*	.33 (.0417)*	.32 (.0538)*	.24 (.0384)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.16 (.0324)*	.24 (.0380)*	.06 (.0217)*	.04 (.0173)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.30 (.0416)*	.80 (.0786)*	.21 (.0849)*	-.01 (.0567)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.15 (.0396)*	.55 (.0861)*	.39 (.0998)*	.01 (.0380)
$\log(C_{t-2})- \log(Y_{t-2})$	.46 (.0344)*	1.1 (.0688)*	.16 (.0515)*	.01 (.0225)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.11 (.0419)*	.48 (.0972)*	.44 (.1170)*	.00 (.0406)
Wald test joint signif.	215 [.000]	834 [.000]	58.7 [.000]	134 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	231 [.000]	306 [.000]	42.7 [.000]	72.4 [.000]
Wald test for CF	66.1 [.000]	65.2 [.000]	39.6 [.000]	38.5 [.000]
Sargan test			120 [.461]	162 [.319]
Test M1	-8.9 [.000]	7.3 [.000]	-9.4 [.000]	-10.9 [.000]
Test M2	-4.1 [.000]	-4.2 [.014]	-.81 [.417]	-.09 [.926]
# of obs. (firms)	4419 (898)			

Chemicals (I4)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS
C	.14 (.0309)*	-.17 (.0245)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.12 (.0369)*	-.36 (.0353)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.36 (.0775)*	.39 (.0652)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.18 (.0402)*	.27 (.0370)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.32 (.0605)*	.83 (.0650)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.14 (.0511)*	.56 (.0712)*
$\log(C_{t-2})- \log(Y_{t-2})$	.50 (.0702)*	1.1 (.0616)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.08 (.0554)	.57 (.0854)*
Wald test joint signif.	85.3 [.000]	378 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	46.7 [.000]	140 [.000]
Wald test for CF	39.5 [.000]	54.8 [.000]
Sargan test		
Test M1	-3.7 [.000]	3.7 [.000]
Test M2	-2.6 [.009]	-1.2 [.237]
# of obs. (firms)	937 (201)	

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 13. Physical investment error correction model by industry sector (con't)

Electrical machinery (I5)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.20 (.0218)*	-.24 (.0171)*	-.03 (.0199)	.01 (.0983)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.12 (.024)*	-.37 (.0268)*	-.02 (.0127)	-.01 (.0108)
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.27 (.0449)*	.22 (.0319)*	.14 (.0395)*	.17 (.0278)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.09 (.0349)*	.15 (.0469)*	.11 (.0172)*	.08 (.0133)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.29 (.0465)*	.93 (.0415)*	.13 (.0611)*	.03 (.0272)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.21 (.0429)*	.72 (.0656)*	-.01 (.0778)	-.06 (.0317)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.43 (.0376)*	1.2 (.0399)*	.10 (.0397)*	.06 (.0238)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.12 (.0518)*	.64 (.0698)*	-.10 (.0812)	-.14 (.0296)*
Wald test joint signif.	181 [.000]	1053 [.000]	186 [.000]	480 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	160 [.000]	378 [.000]	36.6 [.000]	62.1 [.000]
Wald test for CF	54.4 [.000]	49.1 [.000]	88.6 [.000]	146 [.000]
Sargan test			111 [.680]	170 [.178]
Test M1	-6.5 [.000]	5.6 [.000]	-7.0 [.000]	-7.3 [.000]
Test M2	-4.1 [.000]	-1.9 [.062]	-2.5 [.013]	-2.7 [.007]
# of obs. (firms)	2211 (444)			

Motor vehicles (I6)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.13 (.0422)*	-.17 (.0315)*	-.08 (.0163)*	.21 (.0876)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.23 (.0435)*	-.41 (.0388)*	-.12 (.0066)*	-.04 (.0157)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.24 (.0632)*	.25 (.0462)*	.65 (.0117)*	.56 (.0292)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.42 (.0827)*	.37 (.0679)*	.12 (.0084)*	.10 (.0201)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.41 (.0839)*	.74 (.0928)*	.31 (.0084)*	.24 (.0315)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.05 (.0762)	.33 (.0926)*	.25 (.0066)*	.11 (.0269)*
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.63 (.1202)*	1.2 (.1219)*	.89 (.0065)*	.75 (.0272)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.05 (.0758)	.31 (.0938)*	.16 (.0076)*	.01 (.0275)
Wald test joint signif.	41.2 [.000]	199 [.000]²	63935 [.000]	3861 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	18.9 [.008]	52.5 [.000]	1252 [.000]	451 [.000]
Wald test for CF	26.0 [.000]	34.5 [.000]	3149 [.000]	384 [.000]
Sargan test			94.6 [.952]	94.3 [1.00]
Test M1	-.76 [.447]	3.3 [.001]	-.06 [.956]	-2.4 [.017]
Test M2	-2.8 [.005]	-.31 [.754]	-2.1 [.034]	-1.7 [.095]
# of obs. (firms)	525 (114)			

Food (I7)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.19 (.0246)*	-.21 (.0231)*	-.10 (.0208)*	.22 (.0635)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.06 (.0309)	-.32 (.0311)*	.06 (.0209)*	.08 (.0169)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.38 (.1108)*	.45 (.0908)*	.48 (.0679)*	.40 (.0482)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.21 (.0409)*	.30 (.0514)*	.01 (.0138)	.00 (.0116)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.30 (.0483)*	.70 (.0709)*	.12 (.0401)*	.04 (.0281)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.12 (.0484)*	.41 (.0742)*	.05 (.0428)	-.08 (.0279)*
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.44 (.0454)*	1.0 (.0714)*	.21 (.0421)*	.04 (.0190)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.11 (.0444)*	.39 (.0775)*	.04 (.0453)	-.11 (.0295)*
Wald test joint signif.	119 [.000]	314 [.000]	117 [.000]	522 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	102 [.000]	164 [.000]	63.3 [.000]	92.4 [.000]
Wald test for CF	29.6 [.000]	35.1 [.000]	51.2 [.000]	78.2 [.000]
Sargan test			137 [.125]	168 [.211]
Test M1	-5.1 [.000]	3.3 [.001]	-7.6 [.000]	-8.0 [.000]
Test M2	-1.8 [.080]	-2.2 [.026]	-1.7 [.095]	-1.4 [.155]
# of obs. (firms)	2307 (483)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 13. Physical investment error correction model by industry sector (con't)

Textile (I8)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.20 (.0240)*	-.26 (.0233)*	-.06 (.0233)*	.43 (.1182)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.07 (.0285)*	-.29 (.0377)*	.02 (.0240)	.08 (.0161)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.51 (.0754)*	.47 (.0598)*	.42 (.0701)*	.50 (.0516)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.02 (.0627)	.11 (.0731)	.03 (.0335)	-.06 (.0228)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.22 (.0544)*	.73 (.0905)*	.35 (.0689)*	.04 (.0393)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.16 (.0409)*	.53 (.0813)*	.46 (.0634)*	.18 (.0277)*
$\log(C_{t-2})-\log(Y_{t-2})$	.39 (.0420)*	1.1 (.0939)*	.32 (.0537)*	.08 (.0261)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.10 (.0489)*	.46 (.0876)*	.45 (.0721)*	.13 (.0273)*
Wald test joint signif.	168 [.000]	387 [.000]	153 [.000]	392 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	100 [.000]	155 [.000]	99.6 [.000]	151 [.000]
Wald test for CF	52.3 [.000]	61.2 [.000]	55.4 [.000]	103 [.000]
Sargan test			117 [.528]	154 [.496]
Test M1	-5.9 [.000]	2.2 [.025]	-5.7 [.000]	-6.9 [.000]
Test M2	-3.2 [.002]	-1.8 [.066]	-2.1 [.036]	-1.6 [.101]
# of obs. (firms)	2206 (469)			

Paper (I9)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.30 (.0383)*	-.27 (.0404)*	-.13 (.0225)*	.20 (.1038)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.13 (.0396)*	-.38 (.0207)*	-.12 (.0143)*	-.10 (.0111)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.32 (.0642)*	.26 (.0649)*	.29 (.0149)*	.24 (.0135)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.10 (.0390)*	.17 (.0359)*	.05 (.0090)*	.05 (.0071)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.39 (.0750)*	.86 (.1619)*	.02 (.0573)	-.07 (.0328)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.15 (.0661)*	.54 (.1612)*	.18 (.0652)*	.03 (.0388)
$\log(C_{t-2})-\log(Y_{t-2})$	.51 (.0601)*	1.2 (.1719)*	.36 (.0342)*	.15 (.0164)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.19 (.0641)*	.53 (.1722)*	.16 (.0687)*	.00 (.0383)
Wald test joint signif.	110 [.000]	451 [.000]	573 [.000]	652 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	92.8 [.000]	180 [.000]	177 [.000]	293 [.000]
Wald test for CF	31.8 [.000]	24.1 [.000]	423 [.000]	400 [.000]
Sargan test			132 [.189]	165 [.252]
Test M1	-5.7 [.000]	5.3 [.000]	-7.2 [.000]	-7.9 [.000]
Test M2	-2.1 [.038]	-2.5 [.013]	-2.4 [.016]	-1.7 [.082]
# of obs. (firms)	1741 (357)			

Rubber (I10)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.21 (.0373)*	-.19 (.0283)*	-.16 (.0138)*	.03 (.0324)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.13 (.0383)*	-.40 (.0399)*	-.20 (.0035)*	-.12 (.0019)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.28 (.1345)*	.28 (.0937)*	.12 (.0064)*	.08 (.0025)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.23 (.0601)*	.33 (.0735)*	.21 (.0104)*	.20 (.0036)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.34 (.0909)*	.89 (.0874)*	.61 (.0100)*	.09 (.0039)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.17 (.0810)*	.58 (.1013)*	.57 (.0090)*	-.06 (.0054)*
$\log(C_{t-2})-\log(Y_{t-2})$	.52 (.0820)*	1.2 (.0762)*	.81 (.0079)*	.29 (.0034)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.07 (.0798)	.52 (.1087)*	.48 (.0125)*	-.22 (.0062)*
Wald test joint signif.	50.3 [.000]	340 [.000]	105144 [.000]	111781 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	53.3 [.000]	141 [.000]	4099 [.000]	3836 [.000]
Wald test for CF	20.7 [.000]	20.7 [.000]	486 [.000]	3031 [.000]
Sargan test			123 [.392]	171 [.163]
Test M1	-3.8 [.000]	4.5 [.000]	-1.9 [.055]	-4.2 [.000]
Test M2	-1.6 [.106]	-.46 [.644]	-1.6 [.111]	-2.0 [.049]
# of obs. (firms)	929 (191)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 13. Physical investment error correction model by industry sector (con't)

Other manufacturing (I11)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.24 (.0256)*	-.23 (.0168)*	-.10 (.0171)*	.30 (.1102)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.13 (.0231)*	-.40 (.0178)*	-.08 (.0175)*	-.02 (.0140)
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.41 (.0932)*	.39 (.0525)*	.25 (.0141)*	.27 (.0125)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.12 (.0389)*	.31 (.0353)*	.12 (.0127)*	.04 (.0100)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.36 (.0586)*	.90 (.0445)*	.31 (.0534)*	-.07 (.0386)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.14 (.0571)*	.58 (.0575)*	.27 (.0603)*	-.14 (.0445)*
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.53 (.0433)*	1.2 (.0394)*	.43 (.0350)*	.07 (.0173)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.11 (.0559)*	.53 (.0659)*	.24 (.0663)*	-.21 (.0484)*
Wald test joint signif.	197 [.000]	1534 [.000]	642 [.000]	879 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	157 [.000]	363 [.000]	144 [.000]	137 [.000]
Wald test for CF	20.5 [.000]	75.8 [.000]	310 [.000]	523 [.000]
Sargan test			136 [.142]	169 [.190]
Test M1	-5.2 [.000]	7.3 [.000]	-5.6 [.000]	-6.9 [.000]
Test M2	-2.6 [.009]	-1.4 [.168]	-2.1 [.041]	-1.7 [.082]
# of obs. (firms)	1998 (394)			

Construction (I12)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.27 (.0155)*	-.27 (.0169)*	-.03 (.0172)	.32 (.1029)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.14 (.0110)*	-.36 (.0120)*	.00 (.0188)	.00 (.0160)
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.31 (.0425)*	.30 (.0258)*	.48 (.0878)*	.40 (.0686)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.15 (.0186)*	.23 (.0176)*	-.01 (.0342)	-.01 (.0279)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.40 (.0265)*	.91 (.0611)*	.11 (.0968)	.02 (.0647)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.19 (.0260)*	.61 (.0561)*	.25 (.0923)*	.12 (.0352)*
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.46 (.0230)*	1.2 (.0742)*	.12 (.0594)*	.05 (.0186)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.14 (.0275)*	.53 (.0612)*	.23 (.1031)*	.08 (.0395)*
Wald test joint signif.	571 [.000]	1312 [.000]	120 [.000]	202 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	492 [.000]	487 [.000]	28.5 [.000]	77.6 [.000]
Wald test for CF	91.7 [.000]	193 [.000]	60.4 [.000]	73.2 [.000]
Sargan test			123 [.384]	167 [.217]
Test M1	-12.4 [.000]	10.5 [.000]	-12.4 [.000]	-14.1 [.000]
Test M2	-4.9 [.000]	-3.9 [.014]	-1.4 [.162]	-1.3 [.212]
# of obs. (firms)	8673 (1624)			

Retail and wholesale (I13)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.25 (.0125)*	-.26 (.0095)*	-.02 (.015)	.19 (.0980)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.13 (.0111)*	-.37 (.0099)*	.08 (.021)*	.07 (.0163)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.25 (.0213)*	.26 (.0212)*	.20 (.044)*	.22 (.0353)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.14 (.0178)*	.20 (.0154)*	-.01 (.0194)	-.01 (.0155)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.33 (.0271)*	.89 (.0328)*	-.32 (.1008)*	-.17 (.0784)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.15 (.0291)*	.60 (.0365)*	-.20 (.1300)	-.06 (.0541)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.48 (.0205)*	1.2 (.0322)*	-.07 (.0555)	.00 (.0210)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.15 (.0327)*	.60 (.0405)*	-.23 (.1449)	-.07 (.0584)
Wald test joint signif.	646 [.000]	2402 [.000]	91.6 [.000]	227 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	657 [.000]	1302 [.000]	22.1 [.002]	58.4 [.000]
Wald test for CF	171 [.000]	201 [.000]	26.0 [.000]	43.6 [.000]
Sargan test			122 [.412]	166 [.245]
Test M1	-13.8 [.000]	13.9 [.000]	-15.8 [.000]	-17.4 [.000]
Test M2	-4.5 [.000]	-3.1 [.002]	1.1 [.280]	.83 [.406]
# of obs. (firms)	13090 (2804)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 13. Physical investment error correction model by industry sector (con't)

Hotels and restaurants (I14)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.17 (.0326)*	-.18 (.0258)*	-.08 (.0176)*	.42 (.0266)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.05 (.0428)	-.30 (.0448)*	-.14 (.0099)*	-.12 (.0061)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.30 (.0975)*	.36 (.1030)*	.32 (.0221)*	.28 (.0122)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.23 (.0737)*	.32 (.0620)*	.15 (.0105)*	.13 (.0055)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.22 (.0804)*	.81 (.068)*	.30 (.0448)*	.29 (.0222)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.05 (.1016)	.55 (.1032)*	.37 (.0561)*	.43 (.0260)*
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.36 (.0576)*	1.2 (.0687)*	.20 (.0303)*	.15 (.0140)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.04 (.1147)	.58 (.1176)*	.28 (.0487)*	.35 (.0221)*
Wald test joint signif.	49.9 [.000]	300 [.000]	938 [.000]	3739 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	39.1 [.000]	87.6 [.000]	82.8 [.000]	73.6 [.000]
Wald test for CF	12.1 [.002]	28.7 [.000]	230 [.000]	655 [.000]
Sargan test			134 [.166]	162 [.306]
Test M1	-4.6 [.000]	4.0 [.000]	-4.9 [.000]	-4.9 [.000]
Test M2	-1.4 [.175]	-.76 [.448]	-2.8 [.005]	-2.5 [.013]
# of obs. (firms)	1178 (261)			

Transport and communications (I15)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.25 (.0201)*	-.30 (.0169)*	-.11 (.0185)*	.07 (.1253)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.13 (.0191)*	-.35 (.0185)*	-.03 (.0192)	.02 (.0143)
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.34 (.0674)*	.29 (.0673)*	.26 (.0461)*	.22 (.0442)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.20 (.0346)*	.26 (.0404)*	.05 (.0201)*	-.01 (.0163)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.31 (.0316)*	.90 (.0411)*	.14 (.0686)*	.07 (.0485)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.14 (.0306)*	.60 (.0457)*	-.01 (.0638)	.05 (.0277)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.42 (.0306)*	1.2 (.0368)*	.34 (.0559)*	-.02 (.0193)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.09 (.0333)*	.53 (.0498)*	-.06 (.0666)	.00 (.0286)
Wald test joint signif.	221 [.000]	1282 [.000]	77.5 [.000]	170 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	253 [.000]	645 [.000]	90.9 [.000]	82.5 [.000]
Wald test for CF	41.8 [.000]	43.6 [.000]	49.0 [.000]	27.7 [.000]
Sargan test			130 [.234]	176 [.113]
Test M1	-8.4 [.000]	6.8 [.000]	-8.7 [.000]	-10.7 [.000]
Test M2	-4.4 [.000]	-3.6 [.014]	-3.1 [.002]	-2.2 [.029]
# of obs. (firms)	4588 (909)			

Financial services (I16)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS
C	.35 (.0898)*	-.37 (.0678)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.19 (.0651)*	-.40 (.0358)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.08 (.0471)	.07 (.0375)
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.08 (.0391)*	.07 (.0367)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.82 (.1735)*	1.2 (.1293)*
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.41 (.1243)*	.87 (.0841)*
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.54 (.1273)*	1.4 (.1667)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.46 (.1471)*	.98 (.1513)*
Wald test joint signif.	43.3 [.000]	263 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	23.4 [.001]	77.2 [.000]
Wald test for CF	11.2 [.004]	7.1 [.029]
Sargan test		
Test M1	-2.7 [.007]	2.5 [.012]
Test M2	.17 [.867]	-.62 [.533]
# of obs. (firms)	296 (74)	

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 13. Physical investment error correction model by industry sector (con't)

Other services (I17)

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.26 (.0243)*	-.30 (.0186)*	-.14 (.0203)*	-.56 (.1695)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.14 (.0175)*	-.33 (.0241)*	-.12 (.0236)*	-.05 (.0182)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.11 (.0241)*	.14 (.0190)*	.13 (.0232)*	.12 (.0230)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.07 (.0188)*	.11 (.0179)*	.06 (.0150)*	.04 (.0103)*
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.33 (.0385)*	.85 (.0699)*	.20 (.0530)*	-.07 (.0541)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.20 (.0402)*	.60 (.0737)*	.13 (.0643)*	-.09 (.0419)*
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.40 (.0351)*	1.2 (.0563)*	.45 (.0580)*	.10 (.0283)*
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.14 (.0418)*	.56 (.0877)*	.02 (.0680)	-.19 (.0438)*
Wald test joint signif.	163 [.000]	734 [.000]	159 [.000]	300 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	187 [.000]	419 [.000]	111 [.000]	86.4 [.000]
Wald test for CF	39.8 [.000]	67.3 [.000]	55.5 [.000]	98.9 [.000]
Sargan test			132 [.199]	164 [.279]
Test M1	-7.2 [.000]	4.6 [.000]	-6.4 [.000]	-8.9 [.000]
Test M2	-3.4 [.001]	-2.4 [.018]	-2.5 [.013]	-1.5 [.145]
# of obs. (firms)	3232 (728)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).

APPENDIX 14. Physical investment error correction model by firms' region

Brussels Capital region

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.25 (.0158)*	-.28 (.0128)*	-.07 (.0194)*	.11 (.1043)
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.13 (.0161)*	-.35 (.0161)*	-.04 (.0216)	-.05 (.0181)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.16 (.0254)*	.17 (.0256)*	.15 (.0289)*	.16 (.0267)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.08 (.0146)*	.12 (.0126)*	.02 (.0183)	-.01 (.0164)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.33 (.032)*	.89 (.0530)*	.00 (.0812)	.01 (.0591)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.21 (.0329)*	.64 (.0648)*	-.11 (.0834)	-.04 (.0517)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.43 (.0246)*	1.2 (.0389)*	.04 (.064)	-.03 (.0207)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.18 (.0352)*	.61 (.0788)*	-.13 (.0853)	-.08 (.0532)
Wald test joint signif.	353 [.000]	1488 [.000]	59.3 [.000]	287 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	365 [.000]	811 [.000]	53.1 [.000]	67.8 [.000]
Wald test for CF	94.1 [.000]	119 [.000]	43.9 [.000]	48.2 [.000]
Sargan test			141 [.080]	173 [.136]
Test M1	-9.8 [.000]	7.8 [.000]	-10.6 [.000]	-10.7 [.000]
Test M2	-3.2 [.001]	-3.1 [.002]	-1.2 [.241]	-1.5 [.129]
# of obs. (firms)	5805 (1301)			

Flemmish region

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.23 (.0074)*	-.25 (.0071)*	.01 (.0112)	.20 (.0629)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.11 (.0070)*	-.35 (.0073)*	.07 (.0158)*	.05 (.0134)*
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.29 (.0193)*	.28 (.017)*	.17 (.0600)*	.23 (.0449)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.12 (.0151)*	.20 (.015)*	.02 (.0204)	.01 (.0162)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.32 (.0148)*	.84 (.027)*	-.11 (.0942)	-.01 (.0681)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.16 (.0141)*	.56 (.0271)*	-.21 (.1053)*	.03 (.0268)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.43 (.0127)*	1.16 (.0286)*	-.18 (.0502)*	.00 (.0165)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.11 (.0148)*	.51 (.0294)*	-.27 (.1160)*	.00 (.0278)
Wald test joint signif.	1449 [.000]	3970 [.000]	157 [.000]	417 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	1580 [.000]	1655 [.000]	7.4 [.385]	77.9 [.000]
Wald test for CF	258 [.000]	294 [.000]	24.8 [.000]	55.3 [.000]
Sargan test			131 [.213]	191 [.024]
Test M1	-22.9 [.000]	17.3 [.000]	-23.3 [.000]	-25.5 [.000]
Test M2	-9.1 [.000]	-6.4 [.000]	.24 [.811]	-.79 [.431]
# of obs. (firms)	32746 (6633)			

Walloon region

Model	WITHIN	F.D. OLS	F.D. GMM	GMM SYS
C	.24 (.0126)*	-.25 (.0093)*	-.08 (.0155)*	.22 (.0803)*
I_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	-.14 (.016)*	-.38 (.0137)*	.01 (.0235)	.04 (.0199)
CF_t/C_{t-1}	.27 (.0408)*	.29 (.0320)*	.35 (.0627)*	.27 (.056)*
CF_{t-1}/C_{t-2}	.18 (.0268)*	.25 (.0225)*	.03 (.0256)	.03 (.021)
$\Delta\log(Y_t)$	.37 (.0264)*	.94 (.0228)*	.29 (.1071)*	-.06 (.072)
$\Delta\log(Y_{t-1})$	.17 (.0258)*	.68 (.0284)*	.51 (.1274)*	.05 (.0458)
$\log(C_{t-2})$- $\log(Y_{t-2})$	.46 (.0218)*	1.2 (.0200)*	.31 (.0634)*	.01 (.0195)
$\log(Y_{t-2})$	.15 (.0279)*	.65 (.0325)*	.53 (.142)*	.00 (.0491)
Wald test joint signif.	520 [.000]	3975 [.000]	79.6 [.000]	251 [.000]
Wald test time dummies	547 [.000]	1626 [.000]	44.7 [.000]	46.3 [.000]
Wald test for CF	98.1 [.000]	143 [.000]	44.8 [.000]	36.7 [.000]
Sargan test			124 [.354]	178 [.084]
Test M1	-11.3 [.000]	13.0 [.000]	-11.1 [.000]	-14.2 [.000]
Test M2	-4.1 [.000]	-2.5 [.014]	-1.2 [.231]	-.43 [.666]
# of obs. (firms)	10280 (2115)			

Notes:

a) Estimation performed using the DPD98 software (Arellano and Bond, 1998); all equations include time dummies; Heteroskedastic-consistent standard errors in bracket; P values in square brackets.
M1 and M2: tests for first order and second order serial correlation in the first difference residuals.

b) Two-step estimates; instruments used: observations dated t-2, t-3, t-4 and t-5 for X_t (GMM F.D. and GMM SYS) and t-1 for ΔX_t (GMM SYS).