



Université de Montréal
Faculté des arts et des sciences
Département de sciences économiques

CAHIER 9515

**THE RISKY SPREAD, INVESTMENT, AND
MONETARY POLICY TRANSMISSION: EVIDENCE ON THE ROLE
OF ASYMMETRIC INFORMATION**

Serena NG¹ and Huntley SCHALLER²

¹ Département de sciences économiques and Centre de recherche et développement en économique (C.R.D.E.), Université de Montréal.

² Department of Economics, Carleton University and Princeton University.

March 1995

The authors would like to thank R. Chirinko, C. Freedman, S. van Norden, seminar participants at the University of Toronto, the Bank of Canada, and two anonymous referees for useful comments. Both authors thank the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC) for financial support. The second author would also like to thank the OR Center at MIT for providing a pleasant environment in which to complete this research. Any errors are our own.

C.P. 6128, succursale Centre-ville
Montréal (Québec) H3C 3J7

Télécopieur (FAX): (514) 343-5831
Courrier électronique (E-Mail): econo@tornado.ERE.Umontral.CA

Ce cahier a également été publié au Centre de recherche et développement en économique
(C.R.D.E.) (publication no 1695).

Dépôt légal - 1995
Bibliothèque nationale du Québec
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

ISSN 0709-9231

RÉSUMÉ

Des contraintes de financement peuvent se produire lorsqu'il existe d'importantes asymétries d'information sur les marchés financiers. À l'aide de données longitudinales, nous rejetons un comportement de l'investissement fondé sur une hypothèse d'information symétrique en faveur d'une spécification dans laquelle le coût implicite du financement peut différer du taux d'intérêt du marché. Nos estimations suggèrent que les chocs sur la richesse nette, mesurés par la prime de risque et les variables de bilan propres à la firme peuvent faire augmenter considérablement ce coût implicite du financement. Des tests fondés sur des caractéristiques institutionnelles particulières de l'économie canadienne montrent que ce sont les firmes les plus susceptibles de souffrir d'asymétries d'information qui tendent à produire ce résultat.

Mots-clés: information asymétrique, contraintes de liquidité, investissement.

ABSTRACT

Financing constraints can arise when there are important information asymmetries in financial markets. Using Canadian panel data, we reject a symmetric information specification of investment behaviour in favour of an agency cost specification in which the shadow cost of finance can diverge from the market interest rate. Our empirical estimates suggest that shocks to net worth, as reflected in the risky spread and firm-specific balance sheet variables, can dramatically increase the shadow cost of finance. Tests which draw on distinctive institutional features of the Canadian economy show that it is firms in a weak informational position which tend to be responsible for this result.

Key words: asymmetric information, credit constraints, investment.



1. Introduction.

The question of whether firms face finance constraints has important implications for macroeconomics. The issues have been discussed in recent work by Fazzari, Hubbard and Petersen (1988) among others. Finance constraints induced by capital market and information imperfections can raise the external cost of borrowing above the risk-free market interest rate. As discussed in Bernanke and Gertler (1990), Bernanke and Blinder (1988), and Kashyap, Stein and Wilcox (1993), this may provide an additional transmission mechanism for monetary policy which is not present under perfect capital markets. Monetary policy may affect output not just through the standard channel of the interest rate, but also through the wedge between the market and the shadow cost of finance. Furthermore, if the likelihood that finance constraints bind is cyclical, monetary policy may have asymmetric effects on output over the business cycle.

A number of recent papers have used Q investment equations to test for the importance of finance constraints on firms' investment spending¹, but the approach has some drawbacks.² One problem is that Q equations relate investment to the expected stream of future marginal products of capital which are unobserved to econometricians. Liquidity variables like cash flow may be significant in Q equations simply because they capture information about investment opportunities that are omitted from the econometrician's information set. An alternative is to estimate Euler equations. Euler equations emphasize the period-to-period "arbitrage" decision as to whether to invest today or tomorrow and do not require the econometrician to form precise expectations of the distant future. The Euler equation approach has been extensively used in empirical studies of consumption and has recently been used by Hubbard and Kashyap (1992) and Whited (1992) in empirical investment work.

This paper uses Euler equations to analyze the importance of finance constraints from three angles. The first is based on the idea that the error term in the Euler equation reflects expectational errors and should be orthogonal to information available in period t under the null hypothesis of symmetric information and rational expectations. If finance constraints bind, the Euler equation should depend on the shadow cost of external financing. The symmetric information model which omits this information would be misspecified and the error term from estimating the symmetric information model will not be orthogonal to variables in the information set in period t .

While a rejection of the orthogonality conditions implied by the symmetric information

¹This literature includes Chirinko and Schaller (1994), Devereux and Schiantarelli (1990), Fazzari et al. (1988), Hoshi, Kashyap and Scharfstein (1991), Schaller (1993), and Whited (1991).

²Abel and Blanchard (1986) list some of the problems in aggregate time series estimates.

model would be consistent with the finance constraints view, other forms of misspecification might also lead to a rejection. A more direct test for finance constraints would be to see if the shadow cost of finance is equal to the market interest rate. However, shadow costs are typically unobserved. Nevertheless, Gertler, Hubbard and Kashyap (1991) and Whited (1992) suggest estimating the Euler equation which takes into account finance constraints by parameterizing the shadow cost of finance. Our second test for the importance of finance constraints follows this route. We extend the work of Whited (1992) and Gertler et al. (1991) by allowing both aggregate and firm-specific balance sheet variables to affect the shadow cost of finance. Bernanke (1983) and Bernanke and Gertler (1989) suggest that the risky spread (defined as the difference between a risky interest rate and a riskless interest rate on securities of the same maturity) may affect agency costs of financial intermediation. Gertler et al. (1991) build a simple optimal contracting model which shows why the wedge between the costs of internal and external finance might be linked to the risky spread. We therefore use the risky spread as an aggregate measure of agency costs. As surveyed in Gertler (1988), a number of authors have also suggested that balance sheet variables might be linked to agency costs. We follow Whited (1992) and focus on the debt-equity and interest coverage ratios as firm-specific measures of agency costs.

Our third set of tests takes explicit account that firms are heterogeneous. Firms which are more capable of credibly communicating private information to the capital market should be less affected by problems of asymmetric information. This implies that if agency costs are important, we should find stronger evidence against the symmetric information model for firms in a weak informational position. To test this hypothesis, we estimate Euler equations on samples separated according to variables which reveal firms' informational positions.

Our empirical analysis is based on a panel of Canadian data. The use of panel data reduces the severity of aggregation issues that typically arise with time series aggregate data,³ and distinctive institutional features of the Canadian economy allow comparisons between firms which are differentially positioned to credibly communicate private information to outsiders. Most of the Euler equation tests for credit constraints on investment have been conducted on U.S. data. The Canadian evidence provides a check on the robustness of the U.S. results in a country that is broadly similar but in which the details of capital market structures differ.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 presents the derivation of the Euler equation for the symmetric and asymmetric information models. In Section 3, we estimate and test

³Schaller (1990) shows that some, although not all, of the problems of empirical investment equations are due to aggregation.

the models on a panel of 199 publicly-traded Canadian firms over the period 1973-1986. Section 4 concludes.

2. Derivation of the Empirical Specifications.

We first consider the problem for a representative firm when there are no borrowing constraints. Firm-specific subscripts will be suppressed to avoid unnecessary notation. The objective of the firm is to maximize its value, V_0 , as of period 0:

$$V_0 = E_0 \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} \left(\prod_{j=0}^{t-1} \beta_j \right) d_t.$$

where E_0 is the expectations operator conditional on information available at time 0, β_t is the discount factor at time t , or the inverse of one plus the appropriate discount rate, and d_t is dividends. The firm faces a capital accumulation constraint that

$$K_t = (1 - \delta)K_{t-1} + I_t,$$

where K_t is the capital stock at the end of period t , δ is the depreciation rate, I_t is investment. The firm also faces a non-negativity constraint on dividends,

$$d_t \geq 0 \quad \forall t,$$

with d_t defined as

$$(1 - \tau_t) \left(\Pi(K_t, L_t) - G(I_t, K_t) - w_t L_t \right) - p_t^I I_t + B_t - (1 + r_{t-1})B_{t-1},$$

where $\Pi(K_t, L_t)$ is the revenue function, L_t is variable inputs, τ_t is the corporate tax rate, and w_t and p_t^I are the real price of variable inputs and investment respectively. It is assumed that capital is costly to adjust, and $G(I_t, K_t)$ is a linear homogeneous function in I and K . The firm pays r_{t-1} , the after-tax real interest rate, on the stock of one-period debt outstanding at the end of period $t-1$ and issues an amount B_t of new debt each period, subject to the transversality condition of a no Ponzi game that

$$\lim_{T \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{i=0}^{T-1} \beta_i \right) B_T = 0.$$

Let λ_t^K and λ_t^d be the Lagrange multipliers on capital accumulation and the non-negativity constraint on dividends respectively. Also, let H_x denote the partial derivative of the function H with respect to x . The first order conditions for capital, investment, and debt are, respectively:

$$(1 + \lambda_t^d)(1 - \tau_t) \left(\Pi_K(K_t, L_t) - G_K(J_t, K_t) \right) - \lambda_t^K + E_t \beta_t (1 - \delta) \lambda_{t+1}^K = 0, \quad (1)$$

$$\lambda_t^K = (1 + \lambda_t^d) \left(p_t^I + (1 - \tau_t) G_I(J_t, K_t) \right), \quad (2)$$

$$(1 + \lambda_t^d) - E_t \left[(1 + \lambda_{t+1}^d) \beta_t (1 + \tau_t) \right] = 0. \quad (3)$$

For future reference, we define

$$\tilde{\beta}_t = 1 / (1 + \tau_t).$$

The first order conditions (1) to (3) imply

$$E_t \left((1 - \tau_t) (\Pi_K(K_t, L_t) - G_K(J_t, K_t) - G_I(J_t, K_t)) - p_t^I + (1 - \delta) \tilde{\beta}_t \left((1 - \tau_{t+1}) G_I(J_{t+1}, K_{t+1}) + p_{t+1}^I \right) \right) = 0.$$

In order to test the model, we must make assumptions about the functional forms. The revenue function is $\Pi(K_t, L_t) = P(Y_t)F(K_t, L_t)$, where $P(Y)$ is the inverse demand function, and $F(K_t, L_t)$ is the production function. We assume that the latter is homogeneous of degree $\eta = \alpha_L + \alpha_K$, viz:

$$F(K, L) = K^{\alpha_K} L^{\alpha_L} \quad (4)$$

with $F_i > 0$ and $F_{ii} < 0$, $i = K, L$, and $F_K K + F_L L = \eta F$. If the firm is a price taker, $\Pi_i = P F_i = F_i$, $i = K, L$, with the price of output as the numeraire. But if the firm faces a downward sloping demand curve, then $\Pi_i = (1 + 1/\epsilon) F_i$, where ϵ is the price elasticity of demand. Allowing for both non-constant returns to scale and imperfect competition, we have

$$\Pi_K = (1 + 1/\epsilon) \eta \frac{F}{K} - \frac{wL}{K} = \psi \frac{F}{K} - \frac{C}{K}$$

where C is the total cost of the variable factors of production, and $\psi = (1 + 1/\epsilon)\eta$. In the estimation, Π_K is replaced by the above expression. Note, however, that ϵ is not separately identifiable from η . Effects due to non-constant returns to scale and imperfect competition are all subsumed in the parameter ψ .

As is standard in the investment literature, the adjustment cost function is given by

$$G(J, K) = \frac{\phi}{2} \left(\frac{J}{K} \right)^2 K_t, \quad (5)$$

where ϕ is the marginal adjustment cost parameter. This implies $G_I = \phi I_t / K_t$, and $G_K = -(\phi/2)(I_t / K_t)^2$. Substituting in G_K and G_I , and assuming a rational expectations error of e_t satisfying $E_t(e_{t+1}) = 0$, we have

$$(1 - \tau_t) \left(\psi \frac{Y_t}{K_t} - \frac{C_t}{K_t} + \frac{\phi}{2} \left(\frac{I_t}{K_t} \right)^2 - \phi \left(\frac{I_t}{K_t} \right) \right) - p_t' \\ + (1 - \delta) \hat{\beta}_t \left((1 - \tau_{t+1}) \phi \frac{I_{t+1}}{K_{t+1}} + p_{t+1}' \right) = e_{t+1} \quad (6)$$

Under the null hypothesis of rational expectations and that firms do not face borrowing constraints (i.e. under symmetric information), the error term e_{t+1} should be orthogonal to variables dated t . The Modigliani-Miller theorem applies in this case, and investment spending should be independent of the structure of financial claims on firms. This will not be the case in an asymmetric information model.

Under imperfect information, insiders within the firm can either invest or divert resources and appropriate the proceeds, but the lender can never be sure whether low output is the result of a negative shock or mismanagement. The optimal financial contract is structured to minimize the gap between repayment when the project fails and when it succeeds, and thus the extent to which investment falls below its first-best level. The features of asymmetric information can be modeled as a debt capacity constraint on the firm. If B_t^* is the maximum amount of debt that the firm is allowed to issue, then

$$B_t \leq B_t^* \quad (7)$$

Let ω_t be the Lagrange multiplier on the borrowing constraint. In place of (3), the first order condition for B_t now becomes:

$$(1 + \lambda_t^d) - E \left[\beta_t (1 + \lambda_{t+1}^d) (1 + r_t) \right] - \omega_t = 0 \quad (8)$$

It is easy to see that when the debt capacity constraint does not bind, $\omega_t = 0$, then (8) reduces to (3), the case of symmetric information. Define $\tilde{\omega}_t = \omega_t / (1 + \lambda_t^d)$ and $\beta_t = E_t \left[\left((1 + \lambda_t^d) (1 - \tilde{\omega}_t) \right) \left((1 + \lambda_{t+1}^d) (1 + r_t) \right)^{-1} \right]$. It follows that when the constraint binds, the discount factor is smaller under asymmetric information than under symmetric information, *ceteris paribus*.

One way to think about the impact of financing constraints on investment behavior is that when a firm finds it difficult to obtain external financing, the market interest rate is a poor proxy for the shadow cost of external financing. The relevant cost to the firm may be much higher than the market interest rate, and the firm uses this higher rate to discount its net cash flows. A firm with lower net worth has less collateral and therefore a lower

borrowing capacity. As suggested by Gertler et al. (1991), negative shocks to net worth may arise as a result of a decrease in the collateral firms can offer, or a disruption in credit markets which contaminate the information about firms gathered by financial intermediaries. Negative shocks to net worth can influence investment spending of finance-constrained firms by tightening the borrowing constraint. As the constraint is tightened, the shadow cost of finance rises and drives a wedge between the market interest rate and this shadow cost. As a result, the effective discount rate will be higher and may vary more than the market interest rate.

The Euler equation under asymmetric information is

$$(1 - \tau_t) \left(\psi \frac{Y_t}{K_t} - \frac{C_t}{K_t} + \frac{\phi}{2} \left(\frac{I_t}{K_t} \right)^2 - \phi \frac{I_t}{K_t} \right) - p_t^I + \tilde{\beta}_t (1 - \tilde{\omega}_t) (1 - \delta) \left((1 - \tau_{t+1}) \phi \frac{I_{t+1}}{K_{t+1}} + p_{t+1}^I \right) = \epsilon_{t+1},$$

which it is instructive to rewrite as:

$$(1 - \tau_t) \left(\psi \frac{Y_t}{K_t} - \frac{C_t}{K_t} + \frac{\phi}{2} \left(\frac{I_t}{K_t} \right)^2 - \phi \frac{I_t}{K_t} \right) - p_t^I + \tilde{\beta}_t (1 - \delta) \left((1 - \tau_{t+1}) \phi \left(\frac{I_{t+1}}{K_{t+1}} \right) + p_{t+1}^I \right) = \epsilon_{t+1} + \tilde{\beta}_t \tilde{\omega}_t (1 - \delta) \left((1 - \tau_{t+1}) \phi \frac{I_{t+1}}{K_{t+1}} + p_{t+1}^I \right). \quad (9)$$

The econometric implication of financing constraints is that if the asymmetric information model is the correct model, the Euler equation given by (6) will be misspecified. When $\tilde{\omega}_t \neq 0$, the borrowing constraint will induce an additional term in the Euler equation. Variables dated t will be correlated with the error term of the symmetric information model, and the data will reject the orthogonality restrictions. However, the Euler equation which takes the debt capacity constraint into account should hold if the asymmetric information model is correct.

To test these competing models, we need to parameterize $\tilde{\omega}_t$ since it is unobserved. We consider two specifications. The first is based on the risky spread, defined as the difference between a risky interest rate and a riskless interest rate on securities of the same maturity. The idea that the risky spread might capture agency costs of financial intermediation had earlier been suggested by Bernanke (1983) and Bernanke and Gertler (1989). Gertler et al. (1991) used it to parameterize the shadow cost of finance constraints in the Euler equation for the asymmetric information model and found a statistically significant relationship between the the risky spread and aggregate investment in the U.S. In our panel data context, the risky spread can be thought of as capturing the effect of aggregate shocks to internal net worth which might affect the shadow cost of finance. This suggests:

$$\tilde{\omega}_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 S_{t-1}, \quad (10)$$

where S_{t-1} is the risky spread.

The second specification is motivated by the link between agency costs and balance sheet variables. Using panel data, Whited (1992) found balance sheet variables to be statistically significant when used to parameterize the shadow cost of finance constraints. Recent work has found the risky spread to have considerable predictive power for aggregate output even in the presence of other economic leading indicators.⁴ It is therefore of interest to see if the risky spread still has additional explanatory power for investment when firm-specific balance sheet information is also present. This suggests

$$\hat{\omega}_t = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 S_{t-1} + \gamma_2 X_{t-1}, \quad (11)$$

where X_{t-1} is a balance sheet variable such as the debt-equity ratio. The possibility that both aggregate and firm-specific factors might affect the severity of finance constraints has not been considered in previous studies. The above specification which adds $\gamma_2 X_{t-1}$ to the parameterization of $\hat{\omega}_t$ is unique in relation to existing work in the literature.

Substituting (11) into (9) and rearranging terms gives the general specification for the agency cost model:

$$\hat{\beta}_t(1-\delta)(1-\gamma_0-\gamma_1 S_{t-1}-\gamma_2 X_{t-1})\left((1-\tau_t)\phi\left(\frac{I_{t+1}}{K_{t+1}}\right)+p'_{t+1}\right) = \epsilon_{t+1}. \quad (12)$$

Equation (12) says that, after controlling for borrowing constraints, the error term in the Euler equation of the asymmetric information model should be orthogonal to variables dated t . A rejection of the orthogonality conditions for (6) in favour of those for (12) would be seen as support for the asymmetric information model.

3. Results.

Our analysis is based on a panel of 199 Canadian firms over the sample 1973 to 1986. At the macro level, the cyclical properties of the risky spread in Canada are similar to those of the U.S., with the spread being largest during the recessions in the mid-1970's and early 1980's in both countries.⁵ At the micro level, there are substantial variations in the characteristics of firms in Canada, just as in the U.S. In spite of these similarities, there are institutional

⁴On the predictive power of the risky spread, see Stock and Watson (1989), Friedman and Kuttner (1992), Friedman and Kuttner (1993).

⁵The risky spread does not seem to have been as useful a leading indicator for the 1990-91 recession in the U.S. as it has been for previous recessions. In Canada, there was an increase in the spread before the 1990-1991 recession, but it was modest compared to the increases in the mid-1970's and early 1980's.

and structural differences which may cause firms in the two countries to behave differently. These will be analyzed in more detail below.

Our empirical analysis is based on the Generalized Method of Moments (GMM) approach of Hansen and Singleton (1982). Let N be the number of firms and T be the span of the data. The parameters are obtained by minimizing the objective function $g'\Omega g$, where $g = 1/(NT) \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{t=1}^T h_{it}$, and h_{it} is the moment condition for firm i at time t . The weighting matrix, Ω , is the heteroskedastic-consistent long-run variance matrix constructed according to the method discussed in Newey and West (1987a).

Under the null hypothesis of rational expectations, the error term in (6) and (12) are pure expectational errors and should be orthogonal to variables in the information set at t . These moment conditions are tested via the J statistic for the overidentifying restrictions between a suitable set of instruments and the regression residuals. The data are first differenced prior to the estimation to remove fixed effects. First differencing induces a moving average component in the error term, but this serial correlation is accounted for in the construction of the weighting matrix. In view of this serial correlation, the instruments we use are values of the variables that appear in the Euler equation lagged two periods. For the base case, we use the $t - 2$ values of Y/K , C/K , p^l , τ , δ , I/K , $(I/K)^2$, and S as instruments. Note that S is included as an instrument when estimating the symmetric information model to ensure that the instrument set is the same under both the null and alternative specifications. The weighting matrix for the symmetric information specification and the agency-cost specification is not identical. Unless otherwise stated, the t and J statistics are based on the weighting matrix of the model being estimated.

3.1 Testing the Symmetric vs. the Asymmetric Information Model: Full Sample Estimates.

The first row of Table 1 presents estimates of the Euler equation under symmetric information. The estimates of ψ , which are less than one, are consistent with either perfect competition and mildly decreasing returns to scale, or imperfect competition and more strongly decreasing returns. The adjustment cost coefficient is positive. The J statistic for the symmetric information specification is 39.2, which implies a rejection at a marginal significance level of .0001. This rejection of the symmetric information specification parallels the findings of Gertler et al. (1991) and Whited (1992) on U.S. aggregate and firm level data respectively.

We checked the robustness of the results in several ways. First, the results just presented are based on a risk-free interest rate (the 1 month T-bill rate) as our measure of r . It is possible that the symmetric information specification is rejected because the risk-free interest

rate does not incorporate variations in risk. To test this, we use a corporate bond rate to construct the discount factor in row 2 of Table 1.⁶ The use of an interest rate that includes a risk premium makes very little difference in the J statistic, which still rejects the symmetric information model at the .0001 level. Second, instead of using the weighting matrix for the symmetric information model, we construct the weighting matrix for the agency cost model and use it in estimating the symmetric information specification. The results, reported in the third row, show a J statistic of 43.2. Third, we eliminate outlier firms (based on I/K).⁷ The results, presented in the fourth row, show a J statistic of 41.4.

We also checked the robustness of the results to the choice of instruments. The spread is included in our base instrument set because it may be linked to agency costs. However, it is possible that it is associated with other sources of misspecification. One way to check this is to replace the spread with other instruments such as balance sheet variables which have been linked to finance constraints in previous work. See, for example, Whited (1992). In the first row of Table 2, we replace the risky spread in the instrument set with the debt-equity ratio. In the second row, we use both the debt-equity ratio and the risky spread as instruments. The final two rows are based on the interest-coverage ratio. This ratio, defined as the ratio of interest payments to the sum of interest payments and cash flow, will typically be higher for a firm which has encountered negative shocks that reduce cash flow and/or increase interest payments. But if a firm faces sufficiently negative shocks, the ratio can become negative (e.g., if cash flow becomes negative). We therefore consider the full sample and the subset of firms for which the interest-coverage ratio is never negative. For all of these instrument sets, the J test strongly rejects the symmetric information model.

Results for the agency cost model are reported in Table 3. The coefficient on the spread, $\hat{\gamma}_1$, gives an indication of the importance of financing constraints. In the first row of Table 3, the point estimate of γ_1 is 7.2 with a standard error of 1.6. This suggests that the impact of financing constraints is not only statistically significant but economically important. To give a sense of how large the effect is, we consider a one standard deviation increase in the spread. For our time sample, this is equal to an increase of 65 basis points. Such an increase in the spread has the same effect on the shadow cost of finance as a 468 basis point increase in real interest rates. This increase in shadow cost is roughly equal to the mean real interest rate of 4 per cent. Gertler et al. (1991) and Whited (1992) also find evidence of a

⁶We also considered a 30-day banker's acceptance as a measure of r . This yielded a J statistic of 36.0 and similar parameter estimates.

⁷We define outliers as those firms with I/K negative or greater than two in any year. This removes seven firms from the sample. The estimates in rows three and four use the corporate bond rate to construct r . The results based on the risk-free rate were similar.

statistically significant and economically important wedge between the market interest rate and the shadow cost of finance.

A further and more formal test of the symmetric information model against the agency cost model is to construct the χ^2 statistic suggested by Newey and West (1987b). The intuition for the test is that if a model is incorrectly specified, the J statistic for the misspecified model will tend to be large. The difference in J statistics between two models holding the weighting matrix fixed at the unrestricted model provides a test of whether the improvement in specification is statistically significant. This difference of two J statistics is distributed as χ^2 with degrees of freedom equal to the number of omitted parameters. The unrestricted model in this context is the agency cost specification since it places no restrictions on the γ parameters. Its weighting matrix is therefore used to construct the NW tests. The symmetric information model involves two fewer parameters, so all the statistics labelled NW in the tables have two degrees of freedom. The NW statistic is 25.3, which is significant at the .0001 level, showing an improvement moving from the symmetric information to the agency cost model.

The remaining rows of Table 3 check the robustness of the NW tests. The first row uses a risk-free rate to construct r . When risk is incorporated into the discount rate, the NW statistic continues to reject the symmetric information specification in favour of the agency cost specification. In addition, the estimate of γ_1 in the agency cost model increases slightly from 7.2 to 8.6. Using the weighting matrix from the symmetric information specification to estimate the agency cost model and eliminating outliers from the sample have no substantial effect on the results, as shown in rows three and four.

Table 4 reports results which add balance sheet variables to the parameterization of the shadow cost of financing constraints. In the first row when we add the debt-equity ratio, the estimate of γ_1 rises. Hence the inclusion of firm-specific measures does not seem to reduce the importance of aggregate shocks to net worth, as summarized by the risky-spread. There is also evidence that firm-specific shocks matter since $\hat{\gamma}_2$ is significantly different from zero. The point estimate of γ_2 implies that a one standard deviation shock to the debt-equity ratio would increase the shadow cost of finance by 78 basis points. The Newey-West test again strongly rejects the symmetric information model in favour of the agency cost specification. The results for the interest-coverage ratio are similar, except that γ_2 is imprecisely estimated.

3.2 Identifying Firms in Different Informational Positions.

A distinctive feature of our work is that we identify firms which face different degrees of informational asymmetry with respect to sources of financing and test whether their invest-

ment behavior differs in the way predicted by the agency cost interpretation. To do this, we have gathered additional information about the firms in our sample which is typically not available in the firms' financial statements. We have then classified firms in three different ways which are intended to capture the firms' informational positions.

One way to mitigate informational problems is through groupings of firms. By entering into long-term relationships, firms introduce reputational effects which allow members to credibly communicate private information about the quality of individual projects to other members of the group. Hoshi et al. (1991) have previously used a similar approach to classify firms. They find that firms which are members of Japanese groups (keiritsu) show less sensitivity of investment to cash flow than independent firms. While Canada does not have a direct analog of the Japanese keiritsu, there are several major Canadian conglomerates which are closer in some respects to the Japanese groups than to organizations in the U.S. Many Canadian conglomerates group distinct enterprises. Others combine their own publicly-traded shares with equity holdings of outsiders. Many of these groups have been associated with a particular family or individual (e.g., the Belzberg, Black, Bronfman, Desmarais, and Reichman groups), although there are exceptions (e.g., the Canadian Pacific group).

Data on firm affiliations were obtained from *Intercorporate Ownership 1984* (published by Statistics Canada), which contains a list of the firms associated with groups and the nature of the connection, i.e., whether it is based on share ownership or some other relationship. We classify a firm as a group member if the firm is majority-owned or effectively controlled by one of the Canadian industrial groups, or if one of the Canadian industrial groups is the largest shareholder. The remaining firms are classified as independent. Regression results for group and independent firms are presented in Table 5. There is no evidence that the investment behavior of group firms violates the symmetric information hypothesis; the marginal significance level of the J test is .1561. There is strong evidence, however, that the behavior of independent firms is inconsistent with symmetric information. The J test is significant at the .0001. level.

The second classification we examine separates firms with concentrated ownership from those with dispersed ownership. Data on ownership concentration were also obtained from Statistics Canada's *Intercorporate Ownership 1984*. A firm is classified as concentrated if either one shareholder holds 50 percent or more of the shares, or the firm is effectively controlled by another firm.⁸ The remaining firms are classified as having dispersed ownership. The more concentrated the ownership of the firm, the more closely managers' interests should

⁸For example, Brascan is effectively controlled by the Bronfman family, although they only own 43 of the shares.

coincide with those of shareholders since the shareholders' free-rider problem associated with monitoring management performance is reduced. Thus the more concentrated the ownership of the firm, the smaller the risk faced by a potential investor or lender that the firm will misrepresent the quality of its investment project, and thus the smaller the agency problem. As Table 5 shows, the data fail to reject the symmetric information specification for firms with concentrated ownership. The symmetric information specification is strongly rejected for firms with dispersed ownership.

The third classification separates mature firms from young firms. Mature firms are less likely to face informational problems, both because lenders will tend to know more about firms that have been visible for an extended period of time, and because mature firms can credibly enter into repeated relationships with lenders. We classify those firms which have been tracked by Laval (the Canadian equivalent of CRSP) since its inception in 1963 as mature; the remaining firms are classified as young.⁹ Separate estimates for mature and young firms are also presented in Table 5. This is probably the weakest of our classifications because all of the firms classified as "young" will have been in existence for at least thirteen years by the end of our sample period. Nonetheless, there is some evidence of a difference between the firms we classify as young and mature. As predicted by the agency cost model, the *J* test rejects the symmetric information specification more strongly for young firms than for mature firms.

It is of interest to note that the characteristics that we consider are not highly correlated. The correlation between mature firms and those with concentrated ownership is .16, between mature firms and members of an industrial group is .23, and between group members and firms with concentrated ownership is .27. Moreover, the classes do not seem to be simply proxies for the size of the firm. We divided the firms in our sample into two equal classes based on their size as measured by the market value of equity in 1973. The *J* statistic was actually slightly greater for large firms but the difference was negligible, with the marginal significance level being .0001 for large firms and .0006 for small firms.

To assess the sensitivity of the results to the choice of instruments, we replace the risky spread by balance sheet variables in the instrument set. The results are reported in Table 6. In the majority of cases, the data fail to reject the symmetric information model for group firms, firms with concentrated ownership, and mature firms. In all cases, the symmetric information model is rejected for independent firms, firms with dispersed ownership, and young firms.

⁹Firms for which this information is not available have been retained in the sample but excluded from comparisons of young and mature firms.

To summarize, the tests of overidentifying restrictions tend not to reject the symmetric information model for firms which are in a strong informational position with respect to capital markets. The symmetric information model is rejected for each class of firms which is in a weak informational position. More generally, the marginal significance levels are lower for firms which are in a weak informational position.

Table 7 provides disaggregated estimates of the agency cost specification. For most classes of firms, the magnitude of $\hat{\gamma}_1$ is greater than 5.0 and the t -statistic is more than two. The exception is group firms, for which the point estimate of γ_1 is 2.7 and is insignificantly different from zero. Thus, for group firms, the results in Table 7 show no significant evidence of a wedge between the shadow cost of finance and the market interest rate. But for independent firms, shocks to net worth can cause a divergence between the market interest rate and the shadow cost of finance. Table 7 also indicates that for all three classes of firms in a weak informational position (independent, dispersed ownership, and young), the NW test is highly significant and favors the agency cost specification. For two of the three classes of firms in a strong informational position, the NW statistic favors the symmetric information specification.

Table 8 presents estimates of the agency cost model using both the risky spread and the debt-equity ratio to parameterize the Lagrange multiplier. For group firms, firms with concentrated ownership, and mature firms, the estimate of γ_1 falls relative to Table 7. For independent firms, firms with dispersed ownership, and young firms, the opposite is true. For group firms, $\hat{\gamma}_2$ is approximately zero, implying an insensitivity of the shadow cost of finance to the debt-equity ratio. For independent firms, $\hat{\gamma}_2$ is positive and statistically significant. This provides evidence that firm specific shocks to net worth are important even after controlling for aggregate shocks. For all classes of firms, the agency cost model is preferred over the symmetric information model.

We took several steps to check the robustness of the results. First, we examined whether the results are sensitive to whether the firm has public debt outstanding. Results from estimations which exclude firms that do not have public debt are similar. Second, we estimated a specification using the interest-coverage ratio instead of the debt-equity ratio as X_{t-1} . Many of the patterns are similar. The estimates for γ_1 are small and insignificantly different from zero for group firms, but large and highly significant for independent firms. Relative to Table 7, $\hat{\gamma}_1$ rises for all classes in a weak informational position, but falls for all classes in a strong informational position. The agency cost model is preferred for all classes of firms. One difference is that $\hat{\gamma}_2$ is less precisely estimated as all the t -statistics are less than two.

4. Conclusion

Using Canadian panel data, we compare a symmetric information specification of investment to one in which agency costs play an important role. For the full panel of 199 firms, we strongly reject the symmetric information specification. Results for the full panel are more supportive of an agency cost specification in which firms sometimes face finance constraints. Coefficient estimates suggest that shocks to net worth, as reflected in the risky spread and firm-specific balance sheet variables, have economically important and statistically significant effects on the shadow cost of finance.

Using distinctive Canadian institutional features to classify firms, we find important differences between firms which are in a strong position to credibly communicate private information and firms in a weak informational position. The symmetric information specification is always more strongly rejected by firms in a weak informational position. For these firms, the agency cost specification is favored.

5. Data Appendix

Firm-specific depreciation rates are constructed from firms' reported depreciation based on the procedure discussed in Salinger and Summers (1983). A recursive formula is used to calculate the capital stock, which evolves as $K_t = K_{t-1}p'_{t-1}/p'_t(1 - \delta) + I_t$, where p'_t is the relative price of investment, the implicit price index for business investment in machinery and equipment (CANSIM series D11123) relative to the implicit price index for final domestic demand (CANSIM series D11130).

We use the difference in the annual averages of the 30-day bankers' acceptance rate and the 30-day T-bill rate as our base measure of the risky spread. The quantity Y/K in the Euler equations is substituted by the value of sales from the firm's balance sheets. The balance sheets do not directly report variable costs, but they do report operating income, which is revenue less variable costs. We can therefore construct variable costs by subtracting operating income from revenue. The investment data also come directly from the firm's balance sheets. For τ , we use the statutory corporate tax rate; since Canada has a separate corporate tax rate for manufacturing and mining, we choose the appropriate tax rate for each firm, which means that there is some cross-sectional variation in tax rates. We use the statutory investment tax credit rate. The present value of depreciation allowances for tax purposes is calculated using the method suggested by Salinger and Summers (1983), a method which has been widely used in investment studies on panel data.

References

- Abel, A. and Blanchard, O. (1986), The Present Value of Profits and Cyclical Movements in Investment, *Econometrica* 54, 249-273.
- Bernanke, B. (1983), Nonmonetary Effects of the Financial Crisis in the Propagation of the Great Depression, *American Economic Review* 73, 257-276.
- Bernanke, B. and Blinder, A. (1988), Credit, Money, and Aggregate Demand, *American Economic Review* May, 435-439.
- Bernanke, B. and Gertler, M. (1989), Agency Costs, Collateral, and Business Fluctuations, *American Economic Review* 79, 14-31.
- Bernanke, B. and Gertler, M. (1990), Financial Fragility and Economic Performance, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 2, 87-114.
- Chirinko, R. and Schaller, H. (1994), Why does Liquidity Matter in Investment Equations?, *Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking*. forthcoming.
- Devereux, M. and Schiantarelli, F. (1990), Investment, Financial Factors and Cash Flow: Evidence from U. K. Panel data, in G. Hubbard (ed.), *Asymmetric Information, Corporate Finance and Investment*, University of Chicago Press, pp. 279-306.
- Fazzari, S., Hubbard, G. and Petersen, B. (1988), Financing Constraints and Corporate Investment, *Brookings Paper on Economic Activity* pp. 141-95.
- Friedman, B. and Kuttner, K. (1992), Why Does the Paper Bill Spread Predict Real Economic Activity, in J. Stock and M. Watson (eds), *New Research in Business Cycles, Theory and Practice of Econometrics*, Wiley, New York.
- Friedman, B. and Kuttner, K. (1993), Another Look at the Evidence on Money-Income Causality, *Journal of Econometrics* 57, 189-203.
- Gertler, M. (1988), Financial Structure and Aggregate Activity, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* August, 559-88.
- Gertler, M., Hubbard, G. and Kashyap, A. (1991), Interest Rate Spreads, Credit Constraints, and Investment Fluctuations: An Empirical Investigation, in R. G. Hubbard (ed.), *Financial Markets and Financial Crises*, University of Chicago Press for NBER.
- Hansen, L. and Singleton, K. (1982), Generalized Instrumental Variable Estimation of Non-linear Rational Expectations Models, *Econometrica* 50, 1269-1286.
- Hoshi, T., Kashyap, A. and Scharfstein, D. (1991), Corporate Structure, Liquidity, and Investment; Evidence from Japanese Industrial Groups, *Quarterly Journal of Economics* CVI, 33-60.
- Hubbard, R. and Kashyap, A. (1992), Internal Net Worth and the Investment Process: An Application to U.S. Agriculture, *Journal of Political Economy* 100, 506-534.
- Kashyap, A., Stein, J. and Wilcox, D. (1993), Monetary Policy and Credit Conditions: Evidence from the Composition of External Finance, *American Economic Review* 83, 78-98.

- Newey, W. and West, K. (1987a), A Simple, Positive Semi-Definite, Heteroskedasticity and Autocorrelation Consistent Covariance Matrix, *Econometrica* 55, 703-708.
- Newey, W. and West, K. (1987b), Hypothesis Testing with Efficient Method of Moments Estimation, *International Economic Review* 28, 777-787.
- Salinger, M. and Summers, L. (1983), Tax Reform and Corporate Investment: A Microeconomic Simulation Study, in M. Feldstein (ed.), *Behavioral Simulation Methods in Tax Policy Analysis*, University of Chicago Press.
- Schaller, H. (1990), A Re-examination of the Q Theory of Investment Using U.S. Firm Data, *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 5, 309-325.
- Schaller, H. (1993), Asymmetric Information, Liquidity Constraints, and Canadian Investment, *Canadian Journal of Economics* 26, 552-754.
- Stock, J. and Watson, M. (1989), New Indexes of Coincident and Leading Economic Indications, in O. J. Blanchard and S. Fischer (eds), *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 1989*, M. I. T. Press, Cambridge.
- Whited, T. (1991), Investment and Financial Asset Accumulation, *Journal of Financial Intermediation* pp. 307-334.
- Whited, T. (1992), Debt, liquidity constraints and corporate investment: Evidence from Panel Data, *Journal of Finance* 47, 1425-1460.

Table 1 Full Panel Symmetric Information Specification			
	ϕ	ψ	J
Risk-free rate	.682 (.212)	.884 (.019)	39.2 [.0000]
Risky rate	.712 (.215)	.881 (.019)	43.3 [.0000]
Alternative weighting matrix	.733 (.222)	.888 (.017)	43.2 [.0000]
Eliminating outliers	.893 (.309)	.890 (.024)	41.4 [.0000]

Standard errors are in parentheses and p-values in square brackets. A large J statistic implies a rejection of the symmetric information specification which is presented in equation (6). The estimation method is GMM. To correct for firm fixed effects, we first-difference the equation. The weighting matrix is adjusted for heteroskedasticity and the MA(1) serial correlation introduced by first-differencing. The instruments are a constant and the t-2 values of Y/K , C/K , p^j , S , τ , δ , I/K , and $(I/K)^2$. The J-test, which is described in Hansen (1982), is distributed χ^2 with degrees of freedom equal to the number of overidentifying restrictions (i.e., $g-k$, where g is the number of instruments and k is the number of parameters).

Table 2
Full Panel
Symmetric Information Specification
Alternative Instrument Sets

	ϕ	ψ	J
Debt-equity ratio	.345 (.268)	.913 (.014)	31.9 [.0000]
Debt-equity ratio and spread	.739 (.220)	.909 (.016)	38.7 [.0000]
Interest Coverage Ratio	.157 (.139)	.912 (.014)	31.2 [.0001]
Interest Coverage Ratio (Positive Only)	.217 (.119)	.917 (.015)	23.2 [.0016]

Standard errors are in parentheses and p-values in square brackets. A large J statistic implies rejection of the symmetric information specification which is presented in equation (6). The instruments are a constant and the t-2 values of Y/K , C/K , p' , τ , δ , I/K , $(I/K)^2$, and the variable(s) listed in the first column. In the last row, the sample is restricted to firms for which the interest coverage ratio is never negative. See the notes to Table 1 for other details of estimation and testing.

Table 3
Full Panel
Agency Cost Specification

	γ_0	γ_1	J	NW	Favoured Specification
Risk-free rate	-.112 (.075)	7.2 (1.6)	14.4 [.0255]	25.3 [.0000]	Agency Cost
Risky rate	-.152 (.007)	8.6 (1.7)	10.5 [.1069]	32.7 [.0000]	Agency Cost
Alternative weighting matrix	-.147 (.077)	8.3 (1.7)	10.6 [.0602]	32.7 [.0000]	Agency Cost
Eliminating outliers	-.085 (.085)	7.7 (2.6)	18.4 [.0025]	15.4 [.0005]	Agency Cost

Standard errors are in parentheses and p-values in square brackets. γ_1 measures the effect of shocks to internal net worth on the shadow cost of finance. A large NW statistic implies a rejection of the symmetric information specification [equation (6)] in favor of the agency cost specification [equation (11)], if the favoured specification listed in the last column is "agency cost." The NW statistic is described in Newey and West (1987b). See the notes to Table 1 for other details of estimation and testing.

Table 4
Full Panel
Agency Cost Specification
Including Firm-Specific Measures of Shocks to Net Worth

	γ_0	γ_1	γ_2	J	NW	Favoured Specification
Debt-Equity Ratio	-.209 (.146)	10.2 (2.3)	.132 (.061)	24.6 [.0002]	11.0 [.0039]	Agency Cost
Interest Coverage Ratio	-.118 (.118)	14.6 (2.5)	-.098 (.056)	19.1 [.0018]	26.1 [.0000]	Agency Cost

Standard errors are in parentheses and p-values in square brackets. γ_1 and γ_2 measure the effect of shocks to internal net worth on the shadow cost of finance. A large NW statistic implies a rejection of the symmetric information specification [equation (6)] in favor of the agency cost specification [equation (11)], if the favoured specification listed in the last column is "agency cost." The NW statistic is described in Newey and West (1987b). See the notes to Table 1 for other details of estimation and testing.

Table 5 Informational Classes Symmetric Information Specification			
Class	ϕ	ψ	J
Group	.508 (.258)	.793 (.055)	11.9 [.1561]
Independent	.671 (.237)	.911 (.016)	34.7 [.0000]
Concentrated	.625 (.421)	.814 (.030)	15.4 [.0516]
Dispersed	.678 (.228)	.930 (.013)	22.0 [.0050]
Mature	.726 (.332)	.893 (.018)	20.4 [.0048]
Young	.481 (.253)	.923 (.018)	25.7 [.0012]

Standard errors are in parentheses and p-values in square brackets. Classes of firms are arranged in contrasting pairs; we expect firms which are members of industrial groups to find it easier to credibly communicate private information than independent firms (and similarly for the first class in the other pairs). A large J statistic implies rejection of the symmetric information specification which is presented in equation (6). The instruments are a constant and the t-2 values of Y/K , C/K , p , τ , δ , I/K , $(I/K)^2$, and S . In the last row, the sample is restricted to firms for which the interest coverage ratio is never negative. See the notes to Table 1 for other details of estimation and testing.

Table 6
Informational Classes
Symmetric Information Specification
Alternative Instrument Sets

Class	Debt-Equity Ratio	Debt-Equity Ratio and Spread	Interest Coverage Ratio	Interest Coverage Ratio (Positive Only)
Group	12.6 [.0822]	11.9 [.1544]	12.9 [.0743]	12.1 [.0960]
Independent	28.8 [.0002]	34.6 [.0000]	28.4 [.0002]	20.8 [.0041]
Concentrated	14.8 [.0387]	17.8 [.0231]	14.6 [.0414]	12.4 [.0880]
Dispersed	20.0 [.0055]	22.0 [.0049]	19.5 [.0068]	17.3 [.0155]
Mature	12.8 [.0781]	21.1 [.0069]	13.0 [.0712]	10.3 [.1729]
Young	25.2 [.0007]	25.9 [.0011]	27.4 [.0003]	31.7 [.0001]

Classes of firms are arranged in contrasting pairs; we expect firms which are members of industrial groups to find it easier to credibly communicate private information than independent firms (and similarly for the first class in the other pairs). The entries in the table are J statistics (with p-values in square brackets); a large J statistic implies rejection of the symmetric information specification which is presented in equation (6). The instruments are a constant and the t-2 values of Y/K , C/K , \bar{p} , τ , δ , $1/K$, $(1/K)^2$, and the variable(s) listed in the first column. In the last row, the sample is restricted to firms for which the interest coverage ratio is never negative. See the notes to Table 1 for other details of estimation and testing.

Table 7
Informational Classes
Agency Cost Specification

Class	γ_0	γ_1	J	NW	Favoured Specification
Group	.139 (.101)	2.7 (2.0)	2.3 [.8927]	12.3 [.0021]	Agency Cost
Independent	-.158 (.095)	8.0 (2.0)	17.5 [.0075]	19.4 [.0000]	Agency Cost
Concentrated	.020 (.085)	9.3 (2.3)	23.0 [.0008]	6.3 [.0429]	Symmetric Information
Dispersed	-.126 (.126)	7.5 (2.5)	11.2 [.0816]	11.4 [.0034]	Agency Cost
Mature	.048 (.092)	10.8 (2.4)	23.6 [.0003]	2.2 [.3381]	Symmetric Information
Young	.007 (.121)	5.5 (2.4)	12.9 [.0452]	12.4 [.0020]	Agency Cost

Standard errors are in parentheses and p-values in square brackets. Classes of firms are arranged in contrasting pairs; we expect firms which are members of industrial groups to find it easier to credibly communicate private information than independent firms (and similarly for the first class in the other pairs). γ_1 measures the effect of shocks to internal net worth on the shadow cost of finance. The final column of the table indicates which specification is favoured by the NW test. See the notes to previous tables for other details of estimation and testing.

Table 8
 Informational Classes
 Agency Cost Specification
 Including Firm-Specific Measures of
 Shocks to Net Worth

Class	γ_0	γ_1	γ_2	J	NW	Favored specif
Group	.143 (.153)	2.6 (2.4)	.001 (.037)	2.52 [.7739]	12.3 [.0021]	Agency Cost
Independent	-.175 (.152)	10.1 (2.4)	.126 (.060)	23.0 [.0003]	4.59 [.1007]	Agency Cost
Concentrated	.179 (.099)	8.0 (2.5)	-.053 (.017)	18.3 [.0025]	.246 [.8841]	Agency Cost
Dispersed	-.162 (.164)	11.1 (3.1)	.092 (.054)	18.3 [.0026]	.142 [.9312]	Agency Cost
Mature	.257 (.127)	9.8 (2.4)	-.077 (.028)	16.1 [.0067]	4.75 [.0929]	Agency Cost
Young	-.093 (.162)	9.8 (3.0)	.091 (.052)	10.8 [.0564]	6.86 [.0323]	Agency Cost

Standard errors are in parentheses and p-values in square brackets. Classes of firms are arranged in contrasting pairs; we expect firms which are members of industrial groups to find it easier to credibly communicate private information than independent firms (and similarly for the first class in the other pairs). γ_1 and γ_2 measure the effect of shocks to internal net worth on the shadow cost of finance. The final column of the table indicates which specification is favoured by the NW test. See the notes to previous tables for other details of estimation and testing.

Université de Montréal
Département de sciences économiques
Centre de documentation
C.P. 6128, succursale Centre-ville
Montréal (Québec)
H3C 3J7

Cahiers de recherche (Discussion papers)
1994 à aujourd'hui (1994 to date)

Si vous désirez obtenir un exemplaire, vous n'avez qu'à faire parvenir votre demande et votre paiement (\$ 5 l'unité) à l'adresse ci-haut mentionnée. / To obtain a copy (\$ 5 each), please send your request and prepayment to the above-mentioned address.

- 9401 : Mercenier, Jean et Bernardin Akitoby, "On Intertemporal General-Equilibrium Reallocation Effects of Europe's Move to a Single Market", janvier 1994, 41 pages.
- 9402 : Gauthier, Céline et Michel Poitevin, "Using Ex Ante Payments in Self-Enforcing Risk-Sharing Contracts", février 1994, 38 pages.
- 9403 : Ghysels, Eric et Joanna Jasiak, "Stochastic Volatility and Time Deformation : an Application of Trading Volume and Leverage Effects", février 1994, 37 pages.
- 9404 : Dagenais, Marcel G. et Denyse L. Dagenais, "GMM Estimators for Linear Regression Models with Errors in the Variables", avril 1994, 33 pages.
- 9405 : Bronsard, C., Fabienne Rosenwald et Lise Salvas-Bronsard, "Evidence on Corporate Private Debt Finance and the Term Structure of Interest Rates", avril 1994, 42 pages.
- 9406 : Dinardo, John, Nicole M. Fortin et Thomas Lemieux, "Labor Market Institutions and the Distribution of Wages, 1973-1992 : A Semiparametric Approach", avril 1994, 73 pages.
- 9407 : Campbell, Bryan et Jean-Marie Dufour, "Exact Nonparametric Tests of Orthogonality and Random Walk in the Presence of a Drift Parameter", avril 1994, 32 pages.
- 9408 : Bollerslev, Tim et Eric Ghysels, "Periodic Autoregressive Conditional Heteroskedasticity", mai 1994, 29 pages.
- 9409 : Cardia, Emanuela, "The Effects of Government Financial Policies : Can We Assume Ricardian Equivalence?", mai 1994, 42 pages.

- 9410 : Kollmann, Robert, "Hidden Unemployment : A Search Theoretic Interpretation", mai 1994, 9 pages.
- 9411 : Kollmann, Robert, "The Correlation of Productivity Growth Across Regions and Industries in the US", juin 1994, 14 pages.
- 9412 : Gaudry, Marc, Benedikt Mandel et Werner Rothengatter, "Introducing Spatial Competition through an Autoregressive Contiguous Distributed (AR-C-D) Process in Intercity Generation-Distribution Models within a Quasi-Direct Format (QDF)", juin 1994, 64 pages.
- 9413 : Gaudry, Marc et Alexandre Le Leyzour, "Improving a Fragile Linear Logit Model Specified for High Speed Rail Demand Analysis in the Quebec-Windsor Corridor of Canada", août 1994, 39 pages.
- 9414 : Lewis, Tracy et Michel Poitevin, "Disclosure of Information in Regulatory Proceedings", juillet 1994, 38 pages.
- 9415 : Ambler, Steve, Emanuela Cardia et Jeannine Farazli, "Export Promotion and Growth", août 1994, 41 pages.
- 9416 : Ghyssels, Eric et Haldun Sarlan, "On the Analysis of Business Cycles Through the Spectrum of Chronologies", août 1994, 37 pages.
- 9417 : Martel, Jocelyn et Timothy C.G. Fisher, "The Creditors' Financial Reorganization Decision : New Evidence from Canadian Data", août 1994, 21 pages.
- 9418 : Cannings, Kathy, Claude Montmarquette et Sophie Mahseredjian, "Entrance Quotas and Admission to Medical Schools : A Sequential Probit Model", septembre 1994, 26 pages.
- 9419 : Cannings, Kathy, Claude Montmarquette et Sophie Mahseredjian, "Major Choices : Undergraduate Concentrations and the Probability of Graduation", septembre 1994, 26 pages.
- 9420 : Nabeya, Seiji et Pierre Perron, "Approximations to Some Exact Distributions in the First Order Autoregressive Model with Dependent Errors", septembre 1994, 40 pages.
- 9421 : Perron, Pierre, "Further Evidence on Breaking Trend Functions in Macroeconomic Variables", octobre 1994, 50 pages.

- 9422 : Vogelsang, Timothy J. et Pierre Perron, "Additional Tests for a Unit Root Allowing for a Break in the Trend Function at an Unknown Time", novembre 1994, 57 pages.
- 9423 : Ng, Serena et Pierre Perron, "Unit Root Tests in ARMA Models with Data Dependent Methods for the Selection of the Truncation Lag", décembre 1994, 41 pages.
- 9424 : Perron, Pierre, "The Adequacy of Asymptotic Approximations in the Near-Integrated Autoregressive Model with Dependent Errors", décembre 1994, 37 pages.
- 9425 : Ghysels, Eric et Pierre Perron, "The Effect of Linear Filters on Dynamic Time Series with Structural Change", décembre 1994, 35 pages.
- 9426 : Boyer, Marcel, Jean-Jacques Laffont, Philippe Mahenc et Michel Moreaux, "Sequential Location Equilibria Under Incomplete Information", décembre 1994, 38 pages.
- 9427 : Perron, Pierre et Serena NG, "Useful Modifications to Some Unit Root Tests with Dependent Errors and their Local Asymptotic Properties", décembre 1994, 41 pages.
- 9428 : Garcia, René et Pierre Perron, "An Analysis of the Real Interest Rate Under Regime Shifts", décembre 1994, 42 pages.
- 9501 : Boyer, Marcel et Jean-Jacques Laffont, "Environmental Risks and Bank Liability", janvier 1995, 46 pages.
- 9502 : Margolis, David. N., "Firm Heterogeneity and Worker Self-Selection Bias Estimated Returns to Seniority", décembre 1994, 29 pages.
- 9503 : Abowd, John M., Francis Kramarz et David N. Margolis, "High-Wage Workers and High-Wage Firms", janvier 1995, 73 pages.
- 9504 : Cardia, Emanuela et Steve Ambler, "Indexation Lags and Heterodox Stabilization Programs", janvier 1995, 29 pages.
- 9605 : Garcia, René et Huntley Schaller, "Are the Effects of Monetary Policy Asymmetric?", février, 42 pages.
- 9506 : Parent, Daniel, "Survol des contributions théoriques et empiriques liées au capital humain", février 1995, 70 pages.

- 9507 : Parent, Daniel, "Wages and Mobility : The Impact of Employer-Provided Training", février 1995, 34 pages.
- 9508 : Parent, Daniel, "Industry-Specific Capital and the Wage Profile : Evidence from the NLSY and the PSID", février 1995, 21 pages.
- 9509 : Parent, Daniel, "Matching, Human Capital, and the Covariance Structure of Earnings", février 1995, 54 pages.
- 9510 : Garcia, René, "Asymptotic Null Distribution of the Likelihood Ratio Test in Markov Switching Models", mars 1995, 50 pages.
- 9511 : Garcia, René, Annamaria Lusardi and Serena Ng, "Excess Sensivity and Asymmetries in Consumption : An Empirical Investigation", mars 1995, 26 pages.
- 9512 : Sprumont, Yves, "An Axiomatization of the Pazner-Schmeidler Rules in Large Fair Division Problems", mars 1995, 26 pages.
- 9513 : Ghysels, Eric, Lynda Khalaf and Cosmé Vodounou, "Simulation Based Inference in Moving Average Models", mars 1995, 10 pages.
- 9514 : Ng, Serena, "Looking for Evidence of Speculative Stockholding in Commodity Markets", mars 1995, 25 pages.
- 9515 : Ng, Serena and Huntley Schaller, "The Risky Spread, Investment, and Monetary Policy Transmission: Evidence on the Role of Asymmetric Information", mars 1995, 26 pages.