EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

WORKING PAPER SERIES

WORKING PAPER NO. 78

INVESTMENT AND MONETARY POLICY IN THE EURO AREA

BY BENOIT MOJON, FRANK SMETS AND PHILIP VERMEULEN

October 2001

EUROPEAN CENTRAL BANK

WORKING PAPER SERIES



WORKING PAPER NO. 78

INVESTMENT AND MONETARY POLICY IN THE EURO AREA*

BY BENOIT MOJON, FRANK SMETS AND PHILIP VERMEULEN†

October 2001

* *We have benefited from discussions at the Conference on "Financial structure, bank behaviour and monetary policy in the EMU" held in Groningen (2000), and in particular from the comments by our discussant Gerard Kuper. Valuable comments were also received from Jean-Bernard Chatelain, Bob Chirinko, Robert Lensink, Elmer Sterken, an anonymous referee and participants in the Eurosystem Monetary Transmission Network.*

† *Corresponding author: Philip Vermeulen, DG-Research, ECB, Kaiserstrasse 29, D-60311 Frankfurt am Main; E-mail: philip.vermeulen@ecb.int.* *The views expressed in this paper only reflect those of the authors and not necessarily those of the European Central Bank.*

Address	**Kaiserstrasse 29**
	D-60311 Frankfurt am Main
	Germany
Postal address	**Postfach 16 03 19**
	D-60066 Frankfurt am Main
	Germany
Telephone	**+49 69 1344 0**
Internet	**http://www.ecb.int**
Fax	**+49 69 1344 6000**
Telex	**411 144 ecb d**

ISSN 1561-0810

Contents

Abstract

This paper analyses the effects of a change in monetary policy on firms' investment in Germany, France, Italy and spain using data set which provides aggregated balance sheet and profit and loss account data for 17 different industries and 3 different siz classes. The main findings are twofold. First, in each of the four countries a change in the user cost of capital, which in turn is affected by interest rates, has both statistically and economically significant effects on investment. Second, while the average interest rate on debt is generally higher for small firms than for large firms, there is little evidence that the effects of monetary policy on small firms are larger.

JEL classification system: E52

Keywords: investment; cost of capital; monetary transmission; euro area

NON TECHNICAL SUMMARY

A good understanding of the monetary transmission mechanism in the euro area is important for the efficient implementation of the ECB's single monetary policy. While there is a large literature that has focused on the macro-economic consequences of a change in policy-controlled interest rates in the various euro area countries, much less comparative work has been done based on micro-economic evidence.

In this paper we analyse the effects of interest rate changes on industry-specific investment behaviour in the four largest euro area countries (Germany, France, Italy and Spain). We use the BACH database: a semi-aggregate dataset on firm's balance sheets assembled by the European Commission. The data comprises 17 industries for each country. For each country we have disaggregated balance sheet information for three different firm-size classes.

A disaggregated analysis of investment behaviour in the euro area is useful for at least two reasons. First, it has proven to be very difficult to find significant interest rate effects on investment using aggregate data. Using the cross-sectional variation in disaggregated data, it may be easier to identify such interest rate effects. Moreover, for the euro area there is hardly any micro-economic evidence on the elasticity of investment with respect to the user cost of capital. Second, disaggregation also allows one to test whether the effects of monetary policy are different across sectors. Testing for heterogeneity may provide information about the different channels (interest rate versus balance sheet channels) through which monetary policy may impact on investment.

With the BACH data set, we first estimate a neo-classical investment model. In such a model, investment is solely a function of sales and user cost. We specifically examine the long run elasticity of investment with respect to sales and with respect to the user cost of capital. Our results indicate that in the long run industry technology can be approximated by a Cobb-Douglas function. Such a specification implies that a one percent increase in sales or a one percent fall in the user cost leads to a one percent rise in the capital stock. We obtain a higher user cost elasticity of investment than is usually the case in micro panel studies. Overall the effects of the user cost on investment suggest that a traditional interest rate channel is operative in the euro area.

We further investigate whether there are significant differences between firms of different size. Although we do find that small firms pay on average higher interest rates, we do not find evidence that the premium small firms pay reacts to interest rate changes. We also do not find systematic differences between large and small firms in the reaction of investment to user cost changes. These findings put doubt on the possibility that accelerator phenomena might play an important role in the transmission mechanism in the largest euro area countries.

1 Introduction

A good understanding of the monetary transmission mechanism in the euro area is essential for the efficient implementation of the ECB's single monetary policy. While there is a large literature which focuses on the macro-economic effects of a change in policy-controlled interest rates in the various euro area countries (Kieler and Saarenheimo, 1998), much less comparative work has been done based on micro-economic evidence. Nevertheless, such evidence is important for at least two reasons. First, it has proven to be very difficult to find significant interest rate effects on investment using aggregate data (Blanchard, 1986). Using the cross-sectional variation in dis-aggregated data, it may be easier to empirically identify such interest rate effects. For the euro area there is hardly any micro-economic evidence on the elasticity of investment with respect to the user cost of capital.[1] Most of the studies that estimate Euler equations of investment postulate a production function that is homogenous of degree one and therefore impose a unit elasticity without testing it.[2] Second, it has been argued that differences in financial systems could lead to asymmetries in the transmission as some countries are more affected by financial accelerator phenomena than others.[3] Typically, such transmission channels imply that monetary policy has distributional effects, which can only be tested using dis-aggregated data.

In this paper we analyse industry-specific investment behaviour in the four largest countries of the euro area (i.e. Germany, France, Italy and Spain) using a semi-aggregate data set on firms' balance sheets assembled by the European Commission. The data comprises 17 industries (both manufacturing and services) for each country. For each industry we have disaggregated balance sheet information for three different firm-size classes bringing the total number to 51 "representative industries". Starting from a neoclassical model for investment, we first examine the elasticity of investment with respect to the user cost of capital, we then examine the effects of an interest rate change on the user cost of capital. Finally, we also study to what extent the strength of the effect of monetary policy on industry investment is related to the size of the firms within the industry.

The contribution of this paper is threefold. First, we use a consistent data set and methodology to estimate investment equations for the four largest countries of the euro area. This increases the comparability of the results across countries. Moreover, these four countries cover around 80 % of total euro area GDP. Second, while most studies that estimate the effect of changes in the user cost of capital on investment focus on variations in tax rates, this paper is the first one to use a time and industry varying interest rate on debt to build firm-specific measures of the user cost of capital. We find a significant negative effect of the

[1] For example, Bond and Van Reenen (1999) note that "Compared to the voluminous literature on financing constraints and investment there has been a dearth of micro-economic studies that focus on estimating the sensitivity of investment to changes in taxes, interest rates or other components of the user cost of capital."

[2] See Mojon (2000) for a survey of the empirical literature on investment and liquidity constraints in the euro area.

[3] See, for example, BIS (1995), Kashyap and Stein (1997) and Guiso et al. (1999).

user cost on investment in all four countries. While the short-term dynamics differs across countries, it is striking that the long-run parameters are quite similar. The long run elasticities of the capital stock with respect to both sales and the user cost are not significantly different from 1, implying that a simple Cobb-Douglas specification of the production function can not be rejected. This result is in stark contrast with the large literature on aggregate investment functions (Blanchard, 1986) and with one of the major arguments of proponents of the credit channel that the empirical evidence on a sizable impact of the user cost on investment is very weak (Bernanke and Gertler, 1995). Our results are in line with the conclusion of Hasset and Hubbard (1997) that recent empirical research on the sensitivity of investment to the user cost with micro data has resulted in substantial estimates of the elasticity ranging from minus one half to minus one[4]. While these studies refer to the US economy, we show that the long run elasticity of the capital stock with respect to the user cost also fall in this range for the four largest countries of the euro area.

Third, we are one of the few studies to use micro-level data to test whether, as suggested by the credit channel, the external finance premium paid by small firms reacts to changes in monetary policy.[5] While there is a relatively large literature which tests the effects of financing constraints on investment in countries of the euro area, only a few studies directly address to what extent liquidity constraints interact with the stance of monetary policy.[6] In this paper, we use firm-specific interest rates to examine financial accelerator phenomena. Although we find that the interest rate paid by small firms is on average higher than that paid by larger firms, we do not find evidence that it is also more sensitive to changes in market interest rates. Similarly, the investment by small firms does not appear to be more sensitive to changes in the user cost of capital. These two results cast some doubt on whether the financial accelerator has played an important role in the link between interest rate changes and investment in Germany, France, Italy and Spain over the sample period.

The rest of the paper is structured as follows. In the next Section we briefly describe the model we estimate. We follow the derivation of a neoclassical investment model as in Hall, Mairesse and Mulkay (1999). In Section 3 we describe the data we use. We also explain how we construct our measure of the user cost of capital and describe the other variables used in the regressions. Section 4 contains the main estimation results. First, we report the estimate of the basic neoclassical investment model. Next, we analyse how the firm specific

[4] See also Chirinko et al. (1999) and Cummins et al. (1994).

[5] For instance, Gertler and Gilchrist (1993) suggest that the monetary transmission may work through unequal access of large and small firms to external finance after adverse monetary policy shocks. See also Vermeulen (2000) for a recent empirical investigation of the effects of the business cycle on the external financial premium of small firms and large firms in the euro area.

[6] Examples of papers that analyse the interaction of the effects of liquidity constraints on investment with the stance of monetary policy in countries of the euro area are Crépon and Rosenwald (2000), Rondi et al. (1998), Wesche (2000) and Beaudu and Heckel (2001). Hu (1999) is one study that directly analyses the effects of monetary policy on firms' investment in the United States using a panel data approach.

interest rates are affected by changes in market interest rates. Finally, we test whether the elasticity of investment with respect to the user cost of capital depends on the size of the firms. Finally, we present the main conclusions in Section 5.

2 Estimation methodology

In order to estimate the effects of a change in interest rates on firms' investment we proceed in two steps. In the first step we estimate a dynamic neoclassical investment model which links investment to sales and, more importantly, the user cost of capital. In the second step, we analyse the sensitivity of the firm specific interest rate component of the user cost of capital to changes in short and long-term interest rates. In both steps we also test whether the sensitivity of investment to the user cost and the sensitivity of the user cost to changes in interest rates differs across firms of different size. The hypothesis to be tested is that smaller firms are subject to greater informational problems and are thus affected more strongly by a monetary policy tightening.

Our basic specification for explaining firms' investment in the first step is a version of the dynamic neoclassical investment model as, for example, discussed and estimated in Hall et al. (1999) and Bond et al. (1997). This specification is a dynamic version of a neoclassical CES-production function model that implies that in the long-run there is a relationship between the level of the capital stock, the level of sales and the user cost of capital:

$$k_{i,t} = \theta_t + \beta s_{i,t} - \sigma uc_{i,t} \tag{1}$$

where the subscripts denote industry i and year t, $k_{i,t}$ is the log of the real capital stock, $s_{i,t}$ is the log of real sales and $uc_{i,t}$ is the log of the real user cost of capital. θ_t is a time-varying productivity parameter, β is the long-run elasticity of capital to sales and σ is the long-run elasticity of capital to the user cost. If the underlying production function is of the constant-returns-to-scale Cobb-Douglas type both long-run elasticities will be equal to one.

We follow Hall et al. (1999) and Bond et al. (1997) and specify a dynamic adjustment mechanism between k, s, and uc as an autoregressive-distributed lag of lenght two[7], written in error correction form,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta k_{i,t} \quad = \quad & \eta_t + \alpha_1 \Delta k_{i,t-1} + \alpha_2 \Delta s_{i,t} + \alpha_3 \Delta s_{i,t-1} + \alpha_4 \Delta uc_{i,t} \\ & + \alpha_5 \Delta uc_{i,t-1} + \alpha_6 k_{i,t-2} + \alpha_7 s_{i,t-2} + \alpha_8 uc_{i,t-2} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

However, Hall et al. (1999) and Bond et al. (1997) deviate substantially from our study in that they do not use a measure of the user cost and therefore replace it with time dummies and fixed effects. In equation (2), α_2 to α_5 capture the short-run effects of sales and the user cost on the capital stock. α_6 captures the speed of adjustment of investment to deviations of the capital stock from

[7] In principle one could allow for more lags than two. However, this leads to a degree of freedom loss in estimation.

its long run desired level as given in equation (1). The long-run elasticities are given by $\beta = -\frac{\alpha_7}{\alpha_6}$ and $\sigma = -\frac{\alpha_8}{\alpha_6}$.

Finally, using the relationship between the net growth rate of the capital stock ($\Delta k_{i,t}$) and the gross investment ratio ($IK_{i,t}$) and the depreciation rate (δ_i), ($\Delta k_{i,t} = IK_{i,t} - \delta_i$), we obtain the basic specification estimated in this paper:

$$\begin{aligned} IK_{i,t} &= \eta_t + \gamma_i + \alpha_1 IK_{i,t-1} + \alpha_2 \Delta s_{i,t} + \alpha_3 \Delta s_{i,t-1} + \alpha_4 \Delta uc_{i,t} \\ &\quad + \alpha_5 \Delta uc_{i,t-1} + \alpha_6 k_{i,t-2} + \alpha_7 s_{i,t-2} + \alpha_8 uc_{i,t-2} + \varepsilon_{i,t} \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

η_t is a time-specific fixed effect which may capture aggregate developments in productivity, while γ_i is an unobserved industry fixed effect which may capture industry-specific depreciation rates.[8] $\epsilon_{i,t}$ is a serially uncorrelated error term which is also uncorrelated with all past variables.

This specification of the neoclassical model is preferred over the Euler specification, basically for its simplicity. This is of importance given the limited size of our data set.[9] The additional structure that the Euler approach imposes is often rejected by the data. For instance, the adjustment cost function is usually imprecisely estimated.[10]

We estimate equation (3) using two different estimators.[11] First, we use the WITHIN estimator. The WITHIN estimator accounts for the fixed industry effects by using least squares on the deviations of all variables to their industry means (that is implicitly including industry dummies). In addition, we account for the time effects by explicitly including a full set of year dummies in all the regressions. The WITHIN estimator may suffer from two possible biases. The first one is due to the presence of the lagged dependent variable.[12] As this bias falls as the sample period lengthens, it is likely to be very small given the relatively long length T of our data set. The second bias is due to the endogeneity of contemporaneous sales growth and changes in the user cost. This may call for an instrumental variable estimator. We therefore also present results with the Orthogonal Deviations (OD) estimator developed in Arellano and Bover (1995).This is a GMM estimator in which each observation is expressed as its deviation from the average of future observations in the sample for the same industry. The level variables lagged two and earlier can then be used as instruments.[13]

[8] Note that we use "industry" here loosely. Each of the 51 "representative industries" has a fixed effect, not only each of the 17 industries.

[9] We can not follow Tobin's Q approach because we do not have the market value of the firms included in the aggregate balance sheet items.

[10] The studies that estimate an Euler equation for a panel of firms within countries of the euro area typically have difficulties in obtaining a convex adjustment cost function. See Mojon (2000) for a survey.

[11] For a more thorough discussion of the advantages and disadvantages of the various estimators in this kind of model, see Hall et al. (1999). All estimations are performed using DPD98 for Gauss written by M. Arrelano and S. Bond.

[12] This bias arises because of the correlation of the lagged investment capital ratio with the past and current values of the ideosyncratic disturbances. See Nickell (1981).

[13] We also experimented with the Arellano-Bond first difference-GMM estimator. However,

In order to make the link with monetary policy, we investigate in the second step the sensitivity of the industry specific (nominal) interest on debt to changes in short and long-term interest rates by estimating the following regression:

$$\Delta ID_{i,t} = \pi_0 + \pi_1 \Delta i_t + \pi_2 ID_{i,t-1} + \pi_3 i_{t-1} \tag{4}$$

where i_t is the short or long-term nominal interest rate and $ID_{i,t}$ is the average interest paid on debt by industry i. . The long-run effect of a change in the interest rate on the average interest rate on debt is given by $-\frac{\pi_3}{\pi_2}$.

Finally, in order to test whether monetary policy has heterogenous effects across different size classes, we also interact the user cost in equation (3) and the interest rate in equation (4) with size dummies. The hypothesis that smaller firms are subject to greater informational problems and are thus affected more strongly by a monetary policy tightening can be tested in our data set. The big advantage of the size criterion is that it can safely be treated as exogenous to the balance sheet of the industry, so that no simultaneity problems arise. A more direct test of the broad balance sheet channel of monetary policy would be to analyse whether the interest rate effects are stronger in industries with "weak" balance sheets. However, most indicators of the strength of the balance sheet position such as the coverage ratio or leverage will be endogenously determined with the average interest rate on debt.

3 The data

3.1 The BACH database

The BACH-database from the European Commission contains aggregated yearly balance sheet and profit and loss account information for seventeen different sectors and three size classes of firms. It covers eleven European countries for a period from the early 1980s to the mid-1990s. A unit of observation, is defined by country, size and sector. For instance, large German firms in the food, drink and tobacco sector is one observational unit; small French firms in the chemical and man-made fibers industry is another. The number of firms used in the aggregation usually differs from year to year, but in general it is quite large. For instance, for Germany it is around 19,000 firms employing around 3,500,000 employees, for Italy it is around 27,000 firms employing 2,6000,000 employees. Before the aggregation takes place, the accounting data are harmonised across countries in a single format. Therefore, each industry has one aggregated bal-

the coefficients turned out to be very imprecisely estimated. This was mainly due to difficulties in finding good instruments for the difference in the change of the user cost. We also suspect measurement error to be a problem in the first difference estimator, as measurement error is exacerbated when taking first differences rather than differences from means. Ziliak (1997) has argued that Orthogonal Deviations may offer efficiency gains over first differences when measurement error is present. This may explain why orthogonal deviations works better in our case.

ance sheet and one profit and loss account that should be relatively comparable across countries.

In this paper we focus on the ten manufacturing industries present in BACH, construction and up to six trade and services sectors.[14] The three size classes are: small firms (turnover of less then 7 million ECU), medium-sized firms (turnover between 7 million and 40 million ECU) and large firms (turnover in excess of 40 million ECU). An important advantage of this database is the inclusion of very small firms. For instance, for Germany, the firms used for aggregation in the small firms size class have on average around 30 employees for the manufacturing sectors and around 12 employees for the services sectors. For the other countries similar numbers hold.

Unfortunately, the use of the data for cross-country comparison is severely hampered by the fact that for many countries many items are not available (i.e. left blank in the database). Because of this reason, in this paper only the information on Germany, France, Italy and Spain could be used.[15] Only these countries provide enough information on the variables used in this study. Fortunately, these countries represent a large part of euro-area wide business investment. Also the length of the sample differs across countries. It is shortest for Germany covering annual data from 1988 to 1997 and longer for France (1985-1998), Italy (1983-1998) and Spain (1983-1998). The details of how the individual variables were constructed can be found in the Appendix.

3.2 Definition of the user cost of capital

Following the original contribution by Hall and Jorgenson (1967), we construct the user cost of capital as:

$$UC_{i,t} = \frac{P_{I,i,t}}{P_{i,t}} \left((1-\tau) ID_{it} \frac{D_i}{D_i + E_i} + l_t \frac{E_i}{D_i + E_i} + \delta_i + (1-\delta_i) \frac{\Delta P_{I,it+1}}{P_{I,t}} \right) \tag{5}$$

where $UC_{i,t}$ is the level of the user cost, $P_{I,i,t}$ and $P_{i,t}$ are respectively the industry specific prices of investment goods and output. The term in brackets consists of three parts: $(1-\tau) ID_{it} \frac{D_i}{D_i+E_i} + l_t \frac{E_i}{D_i+E_i}$ is the industry specific required rate of return on capital, δ_i is the depreciation rate and $(1-\delta_i) \frac{\Delta P_{I,it+1}}{P_{I,t}}$ the capital gain on the fraction of capital left over after depreciation. The industry-specific required rate of return, is defined by a weighted average of the required return on equity, which we capture by the nominal long-term interest rate l_t, and the average interest rate paid on debt, ID_{it}, allowing for tax deduction of interest paid, τ being the highest marginal tax rate on corporate profits.[16] The weights

[14] The sectors are three intermediate goods sectors, three investment goods sectors, four consumption goods sectors, building and civil engineering, wholesale trade, sales of motor vehicles, retail trade, hotels-restaurants, transport and communication and other services. See the Appendix for a full list.

[15] Since BACH only contains West-German firm data, all numbers used in this paper are based on West-German data only.

[16] See the data appendix for the construction of the data series used.

used are respectively the average percentage of equity finance $\frac{E_i}{D_i+E_i}$ and the average percentage of debt finance $\frac{D_i}{D_i+E_i}$ in the particular industry. Naturally, the weights sum to one.

Our measure of the interest rate component of the user cost has two main drawbacks. First, the long-term interest rate on bonds is a poor proxy for the required return on firms' equity. However, we prefer not to base this required return on the stock market yield. Our data set contains many firms that are too small to be traded, at least in continental Europe where market finance is still underdeveloped. As a result, the stock market return is unlikely to reflect the return requirement on these firms. Second, the average interest rate on debt is only a proxy for the expected marginal interest rate the firm needs to pay on new loans, which enters the true user cost. Unfortunately, this expected marginal interest rate is not observable. We choose to use the firm specific apparent interest rate rather than a market based interest rate in order to exploit the cross-industry variation. That the apparent interest rate may contain useful cross-sectional information is suggested by the fact that small firms do pay a higher cost for their external debt (see next section).[17]

3.3 Investment, the user cost of capital and balance sheet indicators

Table 1 contains a brief description of the dataset. It compares, both across size classes and across countries, the ratio of investment to capital (IK_{it}), sales growth (Δs_{it}), the level (not the log) of the user cost of capital (UC_{it}) and the average interest rate on debt (real ID_{it}). It also contains two variables used to explain differences accross size classes in average interest rates on debt: the ratio of land and building to capital (BK_{it}) as a measure of collateral and short-term debt on total debt (SD_{it}) as a measure of the maturity of debt.[18]

As the standard deviation indicate, the variability of these variables across sectors within each country and each size is very high. However, some of the differences across size classes are quite instructive. We observe first that with the exception of Italy, small or medium-sized firms tend to invest more than large firms. Overall, small firms tend, with the exception of Germany, to use more short term debt than large firms. Finally, the average interest rate on debt is larger for smaller firms. This finding corresponds with other evidence that smaller firms generally need to pay a higher risk premium.[19] While this may be an indication that smaller firms face larger informational problems, it may also be the result of the fact that smaller firms are generally more risky firms.

[17] To check robustness, we also run our investment regressions with the real long-term interest rate as our measure of the required rate on capital. The results are not significantly affected.

[18] The median and standard deviation for each size class are based on 272 observations for either Italy or Spain (16 periods times 17 sectors), 238 for France (14 periods times 17 sectors) and 130 for Germany (10 periods times 13 sectors).

[19] See for instance the survey conducted by Banque de France on the cost of bank loans according to size or Angeloni et al. (1994) for comparable evidence in Italy.

[Insert Table 1]

This finding is confirmed by the more formal regression results reported in Table 2. The first regression of Table 2 shows that small firms pay statistically and economically a significantly higher average interest on their debt than large firms. Even in Germany, the country with the smallest difference between large and small firms, the difference is still 75 basis points. In Italy, also medium sized firms pay significantly more than large firms. The second regression reported in Table 2 tests whether this could be due to differences in maturity structure. The results show that even accounting for differences in maturity structure, small firms pay significantly more than large firms. Somewhat surprisingly, a shorter maturity structure implies a higher average interest rate in Italy and Spain. This may indicate that firms with a low credit standing are forced to finance primarily through short-term debt at high interest rates. The third regression tests whether there are differences in the cost of debt across sizes after controlling for differences in collateral. Again, the small firm effect remains. We also find, for France and Spain, that firms with a higher share of collateralisable assets on average pay less on their debt. Only when controlling jointly for collateral and maturity, the small firm effect disappears in Germany. Overall, these results suggest that size has an independent effect on a firm's interest rate and that it may indeed be useful to use size as an indicator to test for credit channel effects.

[Insert Table 2]

Graphs 1 to 4 give an impression of the cyclical behaviour of the investment-capital ratio, sales growth, the user cost and the average interest rate on debt in each of the four countries. Although there is quite some cross-industry variation, there is a clear cyclical pattern in the overall behaviour of investment and sales growth. For example, in each of the countries the investment capital ratio fell in the early 1990s as the economy went through a recession. One can also observe that the cross industry variation is higher in Italy and Spain than in Germany and France. The time variation in the user cost is less pronounced. However, the effects of the ERM crisis in the early 1990s is evident in a rise of the real cost of debt and on the user cost in that period in France, Italy and Spain.

[Insert Graphs 1 to 4]

4 Results

4.1 The dynamic neoclassical model

Table 3 reports the regression results of the basic specification (3) for each of the four countries. For completeness, Table 3 also reports the regression results when we pool the country data.[20] However, the hypothesis that all the

[20] In this case, the estimates are carried out with country-specific time dummies.

parameters of the model are equal across countries is strongly rejected (the P-value of the F test against a specification with country specific coefficients is of the order of 10E-8). As discussed below, this appears to be mostly due to the significant differences in the parameters capturing the short run dynamics. The first panel reports the WITHIN estimates and the second panel the OD estimates. For each set of estimates, we compute the long run elasticities of capital with respect to sales and to the user cost of capital. The standard error of these elasticities is derived with the delta method.

A number of interesting features can be observed.[21] First, the long-run elasticities of the real capital stock with respect to sales and the user cost do not appear to be significantly different from one in all of the countries, except for the OD estimates in Germany. Pooling the observation of the four countries, we obtain an elasticity of -0.90 for the user-cost and of 0.98 for sales with the WITHIN and respectively -1.20 and 0.78 for respectively the user cost and sales with the OD. These estimates indicate that a Cobb-Douglas specification of the production function is not rejected by the data.[22] According to our knowledge this is the first study to show a close to unity user cost elasticity of capital on the basis of cross-industry variations in the average interest rate on debt. As mentioned in the introduction this finding is consistent with the literature which has identified changes in the user cost of capital based on tax rates (Hasset and Hubbard, 1997). Our estimates are close to the upper bound for the effect of user cost as found by this other literature. It is also consistent with the findings of Caballero et al. (1995), which uses time series econometrics on historical data.

[insert Table 3]

Second, in all countries the coefficient α_6, which captures the adjustment towards the long run desired capital stock is negative and significant. This further confirms that an error correction mechanism, of the kind proposed by Bond et al. (1997) and Hall et al. (1999) is appropriate to model investment demand in each of the four countries we look at. Notice that the speed of adjustment is highest in Germany. However, if we estimate the model for France, Italy and Spain over the same sample as Germany, these differences are somewhat reduced.

Third, although the short-run effects of the user cost and of sales are always significant, their magnitude are, in contrast to the long-run effects, quite different across countries. Looking at the OD estimates, the sum of short-run coefficients on changes in the user cost range from -0.23 in Italy to -0.69 in Spain and the sum on the coefficients associated to the growth of sales range from 0.48 in Spain to 0.83 in France. One should, however, be careful about interpreting

[21] To check robustness we also estimated the basic specification (3) for France, Italy and Spain over the same sample as Germany. Overall, the results highlighted below continue to hold. These results are available upon request.

[22] This result is robust to variations in the definition of the user cost of capital. For instance, the result also holds when defining the interest rate part of the user cost as equal to the long term bond rate or as equal to the firm specific interest rate on debt.

these differences across countries as structural differences. It is also noteworthy that although the qualitative results are very similar, the WITHIN estimates of the short-run coefficients suffer from a downward bias which is most severe in France and in Italy. This may indeed be due to the endogeneity problem.

4.2 The average interest rate on debt and monetary policy

In this Section, we report the results of estimating equation (4) which links the average interest rate on debt to the short and long-term interest rate. The base regressions (the first and third panel in Table 4) show that the average interest rate paid by firms responds positively and quite strongly to interest rate changes. The long-run pass-through of the short-term interest rate (π_3/π_2) is lowest in Germany and France (about 0.60) and highest in Italy (1.36) with Spain taking an intermediate position. This may in part be a result of the longer maturity structure of firms' debt in the former countries. Indeed, the third panel of Table 4 shows that the pass-through of the long-term interest rate is higher in Germany and France than in the other countries.

[insert Table 4]

According to the theory of the financial accelerator (Bernanke, Gertler and Gilchrist, 1999), the interest paid by firms with weak balance sheets should react more to monetary policy shocks then the interest paid by firms with strong balance sheets. Since the strength of the balance sheet is endogenous, we use size dummy variables to test if the average interest paid by small firms responds more to interest rate changes (See the second and fourth panel of Table 4). Overall, we do not find compelling evidence that the interest rate cost of small firms reacts stronger than that of medium or large sized firms.

4.3 Size and the effect of the user cost on investment

The size of firms is often used as a criterion to distinguish between those firms that are liquidity constrained and those that are not. But only a perfect measure of the user cost of capital would capture the effects of such liquidity constraints by a higher user cost of capital. Because our measure is based on the average interest rate paid on debt rather than on the marginal interest rate and because their may be an unobserved shadow cost associated with small firms, it is worth analysing whether the sensitivity of investment with respect to the user cost depends on the size of the firms. After having shown that the interest rate component of the user cost is correlated to monetary policy, we test whether the effects of the user cost on investment depend on the size of the firm. If the financial accelerator matters for the transmission of monetary policy, changes in the level of interest rate should imply changes in the external financial premium. The user cost should have a smaller effects on large firms for which the external finance premium should be less severe. We interact the short-run effects of the

user costs with size dummies.[23]

[insert Table 5]

Table 5 reports the results of the unrestricted model and the Fisher tests for the constraints of similar effects across firms of different sizes. We observe some differences across size classes. For instance, the short-run effects of the user costs on large German firms is half of what it is measured to be for small and medium firms. However, for every country, we can not reject that the short run effects of the user cost is the same across size classes. Overall, there appears to be no evidence that the investment of small firms is more sensitive to changes in the user cost than the investment of large firms.

5 Conclusion

In this paper we have analysed the effects of a change in the user cost of capital and of sales on firms' investment in Germany, France, Italy and Spain using a data set which provides aggregated balance sheet and profit and loss account data for 17 different industries and 3 different size classes. Our main findings are twofold. First, in each of the four countries a change in the user cost of capital has both statistically and economically significant effects on investment. The long run effect of changes in the user cost on the capital stock does not reject a Cobb-Douglas production technology. We obtain a somewhat higher and more significant user cost elasticity than what is usually obtained with panels of individual firm-level data where mostly tax changes are used to identify changes in the user cost. In part, our stronger results could also be due to the fact that the data we use are actually for "representative firms" for which some of the measurement problems typical of panels are averaged out. Overall, the effects of the user cost on investment suggest that the interest rate channel of monetary policy is operative in the euro area. Changes in the level of interest rates have an impact on firms investment through the user cost of capital.

Second, while the average interest paid by small firms is significantly larger than the average interest paid by large firms, there is no evidence that the premium paid by small firms reacts to changes in the interest rate. There is also no evidence that investment of small firms is more sensitive to the user cost of capital than investment of large firms. These findings put some doubt on the possibility that financial accelerator phenomena play an important role in the transmission mechanism of monetary policy for the large countries of the euro area during the sample period. However, a number of drawbacks of the data we used need to be kept in mind. First, the data does not allow to test for distributional effects of monetary policy among the firms within each size class. Second, our measure of the cost of debt is an average interest rate rather than the marginal cost of debt.

[23] We assume that the long-run elasticity (which is given by the production function parameters) is not affected by size.

6 Appendix: Data sources, data construction and cleaning

6.1 Construction of the sample

The source of the data is the BACH-database from the European Commission. It contains aggregated balance sheet and profit and loss account information for 17 (13 for Germany) different industries (both manufacturing and services) and 3 size classes of firms. Small firms have a turnover of 7 million ECU or less, medium sized firms have turnover between 7 million ECU and 40 million ECU. Large firms have a turnover of more then 40 million ECU. There are 51 "firm size-industry classes" (39 for Germany) for each country . The years of data available are for Germany (1988-1997), for France (1985-1998), for Italy (1983-1998) and for Spain (1983-1998).

Outliers of the variables are detected by the following robust regression technique. Outliers are looked for year by year for all variables used in the regressions. An observation is considered an outlier for a given year when it deviates from the median of that variable (the median of the given year) by more then 3.5 times the median absolute deviation. Outliers are then replaced by the median plus or minus 3.5 times the median absolute deviation.

6.2 Construction of the variables

- $IK_{i,t}$: Investment ratio. The investment ratio is constructed by dividing the deflated book value of investment (at time t) by the deflated book value of capital (at time t-1). The book value of investment I_t is calculated by $K_t - K_{t-1} + Depreciation_t$. The book value of capital is measured by fixed assets. The book value of the capital stock and investment are deflated by the industry investment price deflator (at the industry level).
- $UC_{i,t}$: User cost of capital. Is constructed as explained in the main text.
- P_I : The industry investment price deflator from Eurostat
- P : The industry output price deflator from Eurostat
- $\Delta s_{i,t}$: Real sales growth. Real sales growth is measured as nominal sales growth minus goods price level inflation (as measured by the industry output price deflator.)
- $ID_{i,t}$: Average interest on financial debt. Interest is measured by interest payments on financial debts. Debt is measured by the book value of amounts owned to credit institutions plus other creditors plus debenture loans. Financial debt does not include trade credit. Real ID is nominal ID minus the inflation rate as measured by the GDP-deflator.

- $DA_{i,t}$: Debt asset ratio. Debt is measured by summing all credit (both financial and trade). Assets are measured by total assets.
- $SD_{i,t}$: Short-term debt as a fraction of total financial debt. Short-term debt is financial debt payable within one year.
- $BK_{i,t}$: the ratio of land and buildings in total fixed assets. Used as a measure of collateralisable assets.
- l_t : the long term interest rate. The interest rate on government bonds (BIS).

6.3 List of the industries used

The following industries are used.

- Extraction of metalliferous ores and preliminary processing of metal
- Extraction of non-metalliferous ores and manufacture of non-metallic mineral products
- Chemical and man-made fibers
- Manufacture of metal articles, mechanical and instrument engineering
- Electrical and electronic equipment including office and computing equipment
- Manufacture of transport equipment
- Food, drink and tobacco
- Textiles, leather and clothing
- Timber and paper manufacturing, printing
- Other manufacturing industries not elsewhere specified
- Building and civil engineering
- Wholesale trade, recovery services
- Sale of motor vehicles, wholesale and retail trade
- Retail trade
- Hotels-restaurants
- Transportation and communication
- Other services not included elsewhere

References

Angeloni, I., Buttiglione, L., Ferri, G., Gaiotti, E., 1994. The credit channel of monetary policy across heterogeneous banks: The case of Italy. Banca d'Italia Temi di discussione 256.

Arellano, M., Bover, O., 1995. Another look at the instrumental-variable estimation of error-components models. Journal of Econometrics 68, 29-52.

Beaudu, A., Heckel, T., 2001. Le canal du credit fonctionne-t-il en Europe?. Forthcoming in Economie et Prévision 147.

Bernanke, B., Gertler, M., 1995. Inside the black box: The credit channel of monetary policy transmission. Journal of Economic Perspectives 9 (4), 27-48.

Bernanke, B., Gertler, M., Gilchrist S., 1999, The financial accelerator in a quantitative business cycle framework, in: Taylor, J., Woodford, M. (Eds.) Handbook of Macroeconomics I, Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, pp. 1341-1393.

BIS, 1995. Financial structure and the monetary policy transmission mechanism. Bank for international settlements, Basle.

Blanchard, O., 1986. Investment, output, and the cost of capital: Comments. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 1, 153-158.

Bond, S., Elston, J., Mairesse J., Mulkay, B., 1997. Financial factors and investment in Belgium, France, Germany and the UK: a comparison using company panel data. NBER working paper 5900.

Bond, S., Van Reenen, J., 1999. Microeconomic models of investment and employment. Mimeo, Nuffield Colledge, Oxford University.

Caballero, R., Engle, E., Haltiwanger, J., 1995. Plan-level adjustement and aggregate investment dynamics. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 2,1-54.

Chirinko, R., Fazzari, S., Meyer, A., 1999. How responsive is business capital formation to its user cost? An exploration with micro data. Journal of Public Economics 74, 53-80.

Crépon, B., Rosenwald, F., 2000. Investissement et contraintes de financements: le poids du cycle. Working paper, INSEE.

Cummins, J., Hassett, K., Hubbard, R., 1994. A reconsideration of investment behavior using tax reforms as natural experiments. Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 2, 1-74.

Gertler, M., Gilchrist, S. 1993. The role of credit market imperfections in the monetary transmission mechanism: arguments and evidence. The Scandinavian Journal of Economics 95 (1), 43-64.

Guiso, L., Kashyap, A., Panetta, F., Terlizzese, D., 1999. Will a common European monetary policy have asymmetric effects? Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago Economic Perspectives 23, 56-75.

Hall, B., Mairesse J., Mulkay B., 1999. Firm level investment in France and the United States: An exploration of what we have learned in twenty years. Annales d'Economie et de Statistique 55-56, 27-67.

Hall, R., Jorgenson, D., 1967. Tax policy and investment behaviour. American Economic Review 57, 391-414.

Hasset, K., Hubbard, R., 1997, Tax policy and investment, in: Auerbach, A. (Ed.) Fiscal policy: Lessons from economic research. MIT Press, Cambridge, pp. 339-385.

Hu, C., 1999. Leverage, monetary policy, and firm investment. Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Economic Review 2, 32-39.

Kashyap, A., Stein, J., 1997. The role of banks in monetary policy: A survey with implications for the European Monetary Union. Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago Economic Perspectives 21, 2-18.

Kieler, M., Saarenheimo T., 1998. Differences in monetary policy transmission? A case not closed. Economic papers 132. European Commission, Directorate-General for Economic and Financial Affairs.

Mojon, B., 2000. Credit channel(s) in the euro area: A survey of the distributional effects. Mimeo, European Central Bank.

Nickell, S., 1981. Biases in dynamic models with fixed effects. Econometrica 49, 1399-1416.

Rondi, L., Sack, B., Schiantarelli F., Sembenelli A., 1998. Firms' financial and real responses to monetary tightening: Evidence for large and small Italian companies, Giornale degli Economisti e Annali di Economia 57, 35-64.

Vermeulen, P., 2000. Business fixed investment: Evidence of a financial accelerator in Europe. ECB Working Paper 37.

Wesche, K., 2000. Is there a credit channel in Austria? The impact of monetary policy on firms' investment decisions. Working Paper 41, Oesterreichische Nationalbank.

Ziliak, J., 1997. Efficient estimation with panel data when instruments are predetermined: an empirical comparison of moment-condition estimators. Journal of Business & Economic Statistics 15, 419-431.

Table 1: Median balance sheet structures in Germany, France, Italy and Spain

		Germany		France		Italy		Spain	
		Median	Std. Dev.	Median	Std. Dev.	Median	Std. Dev.	Median	Std. Dev.
IK	*Total*	0.29	0.08	0.25	0.07	0.20	0.08	0.16	0.08
	Large	0.27	0.07	0.22	0.08	0.20	0.09	0.15	0.08
	Medium	0.29	0.07	0.25	0.07	0.21	0.07	0.16	0.08
	Small	0.30	0.08	0.26	0.07	0.17	0.08	0.16	0.07
Δs	*Total*	0.04	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.09	0.04	0.07
	Large	0.04	0.05	0.02	0.05	0.06	0.07	0.04	0.08
	Medium	0.04	0.06	0.02	0.05	0.05	0.07	0.05	0.07
	Small	0.02	0.07	0.00	0.05	-0.04	0.09	0.04	0.07
UC	*Total*	0.23	0.03	0.22	0.04	0.17	0.04	0.14	0.03
	Large	0.24	0.03	0.21	0.05	0.18	0.04	0.14	0.04
	Medium	0.23	0.02	0.22	0.04	0.17	0.04	0.15	0.03
	Small	0.24	0.02	0.23	0.04	0.15	0.04	0.14	0.03
real ID	*Total*	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.03
	Large	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.02	0.03	0.02
	Medium	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.03	0.02
	Small	0.05	0.01	0.05	0.02	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.03
BK	*Total*	0.18	0.06	0.16	0.13	na	na	0.24	0.14
	Large	0.20	0.06	0.17	0.15	na	na	0.22	0.12
	Medium	0.20	0.06	0.15	0.12	na	na	0.24	0.16
	Small	0.15	0.06	0.15	0.11	na	na	0.27	0.13
DA	*Total*	0.63	0.16	0.66	0.08	0.66	0.07	0.57	0.10
	Large	0.42	0.12	0.63	0.09	0.64	0.08	0.57	0.12
	Medium	0.61	0.08	0.65	0.08	0.66	0.07	0.57	0.10
	Small	0.74	0.06	0.66	0.07	0.66	0.07	0.58	0.09
SD	*Total*	0.69	0.09	0.50	0.10	0.70	0.09	0.69	0.14
	Large	0.75	0.10	0.46	0.11	0.69	0.11	0.65	0.16
	Medium	0.69	0.06	0.52	0.08	0.71	0.08	0.72	0.13
	Small	0.62	0.05	0.51	0.10	0.69	0.08	0.70	0.12

Source: Authors' calculation based on BACH. Medians and standard deviation over time and across firms for the total sample and for each size class of: investment capital ratio (*IK*), growth rate of sales (*Δs*), the user cost of capital (*UC*), the ratio of land and building to capital (*BK*), the real apparent interest rate on debt (*real ID*), the ratio of total debt on total asset (*DA*) and the ratio of short term debt to total debt (*SD*). See the appendix for the definition of the variables. Time periods vary across countries: 1983-1998 for Italy and Spain, 1985-1998 for France and 1988-1997 for Germany. The mean and standard deviation for each size class are based on 272 observations for either Italy or Spain (16 periods times 17 sectors), 238 for France (14 periods times 17 sectors) and 130 for Germany (10 periods times 13 sectors).

Table 2: Determinants of the cost of debt

	Germany		France		Italy		Spain	
	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error
CONST	3.84	0.22	4.43	0.26	3.28	0.31	2.22	0.22
Small	0.73	0.25	0.79	0.39	2.22	0.50	0.98	0.43
Medium	0.33	0.25	0.50	0.43	0.99	0.43	0.63	0.37
CONST	4.38	1.03	3.65	1.38	-2.91	1.67	-1.46	0.84
Small	0.65	0.27	0.73	0.37	2.35	0.46	0.83	0.39
Medium	0.29	0.25	0.40	0.43	1.00	0.43	0.43	0.35
SD_i	-0.72	1.43	1.69	2.97	8.93	2.49	5.71	1.32
CONST	4.19	0.52	5.15	0.35	na	na	3.38	0.43
Small	0.66	0.28	0.72	0.36	na	na	1.15	0.39
Medium	0.32	0.25	0.45	0.39	na	na	0.80	0.35
BK_i	-1.75	1.95	-3.47	1.69	na	na	-4.55	1.31
CONST	6.57	1.37	7.05	1.96	na	na	-0.43	1.53
Small	0.26	0.32	0.83	0.38	na	na	0.91	0.40
Medium	0.15	0.24	0.64	0.43	na	na	0.51	0.38
BK_i	-3.71	2.23	-5.00	2.20	na	na	-1.38	1.71
SD_i	-2.66	1.48	-3.43	3.73	na	na	4.66	1.87

Source: Authors' calculation. The dependent variable is the firms mean over time of the ratio of interest payment on total debt (ID_i). It is regressed on a constant, and, successively, on dummy variables for size classes (*Small* and *Medium*), firms' mean over time of short-term debt on total debt (SD_i), and the firms mean over time of collateralizable assets (BK_i) (land and buildings as a fraction of total fixed assets).

Table 3: Error correction form of an accelerator model of investmen

Within estimates

		Germany		France		Italy		Spain		Pooled	
		Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error
$IK_{i,t-1}$	$\alpha 1$	0.03	0.06	0.12	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.22	0.04	0.12	0.02
$\Delta s_{i,t}$	$\alpha 2$	0.12	0.07	0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.13	0.04	0.14	0.02
$\Delta s_{i,t-1}$	$\alpha 3$	0.29	0.07	0.16	0.05	0.11	0.03	0.05	0.04	0.10	0.02
	$\alpha 2+\alpha 3$	0.41		0.41		0.26		0.18		0.23	
$\Delta uc_{i,t}$	$\alpha 4$	-0.24	0.12	-0.08	0.05	-0.08	0.03	-0.28	0.05	-0.13	0.02
$\Delta uc_{i,t-1}$	$\alpha 5$	-0.34	0.12	0.07	0.05	-0.01	0.03	-0.10	0.05	-0.03	0.02
	$\alpha 4+\alpha 5$	-0.58		-0.01		-0.09		-0.38		-0.16	
$k_{i,t-2}$	$\alpha 6$	-0.13	0.03	-0.04	0.01	-0.06	0.01	-0.06	0.01	-0.06	0.01
$s_{i,t-2}$	$\alpha 7$	0.16	0.04	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.06	0.01	0.05	0.01
$uc_{i,t-2}$	$\alpha 8$	-0.09	0.06	-0.03	0.03	-0.05	0.02	-0.05	0.04	-0.05	0.02
Rsquare		0.50		0.48		0.43		0.37		0.43	
	Long run elasticities of capital with respect to										
sales	$\alpha 7/\alpha 6$	1.24	0.19	1.08	0.35	0.84	0.11	1.07	0.16	0.98	0.08
user cost	$\alpha 8/\alpha 6$	-0.68	0.45	-0.75	0.74	-0.83	0.35	-0.88	0.59	-0.90	0.25

Orthogonal Deviation estimates

		Germany		France		Italy		Spain		Pooled	
		Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error
$IK_{i,t-1}$	$\alpha 1$	-0.16	0.13	0.15	0.11	-0.01	0.11	0.42	0.08	0.43	0.09
$\Delta s_{i,t}$	$\alpha 2$	0.20	0.14	0.64	0.11	0.35	0.07	0.42	0.09	0.55	0.07
$\Delta s_{i,t-1}$	$\alpha 3$	0.33	0.13	0.19	0.11	0.25	0.07	0.06	0.08	0.08	0.07
	$\alpha 2+\alpha 3$	0.53		0.83		0.61		0.48		0.63	
$\Delta uc_{i,t}$	$\alpha 4$	0.07	0.20	-0.30	0.09	-0.13	0.04	-0.41	0.07	-0.38	0.05
$\Delta uc_{i,t-1}$	$\alpha 5$	-0.52	0.22	-0.08	0.12	-0.10	0.06	-0.28	0.09	-0.28	0.08
	$\alpha 4+\alpha 5$	-0.45		-0.38		-0.23		-0.69		-0.66	
$k_{i,t-2}$	$\alpha 6$	-0.35	0.07	-0.16	0.03	-0.19	0.02	-0.15	0.02	-0.28	0.02
$s_{i,t-2}$	$\alpha 7$	0.35	0.08	0.10	0.03	0.14	0.03	0.14	0.02	0.22	0.02
$uc_{i,t-2}$	$\alpha 8$	-0.05	0.12	-0.14	0.06	-0.15	0.04	-0.11	0.06	-0.34	0.04
Rsquare		0.34		0.24		0.28		0.19		-0.20	
	Long run elasticities of capital with respect to										
sales	$\alpha 7/\alpha 6$	1.00	0.11	0.64	0.15	0.74	0.06	0.94	0.11	0.78	0.04
user cost	$\alpha 8/\alpha 6$	-0.15	0.34	-0.88	0.34	-0.77	0.19	-0.76	0.38	-1.20	0.14

Source: Authors' calculation. Estimation of equation (3) in the text. The dependent variable is the investment capital ratio. All equations contain time dummies (not reported). The standard errors of the long run elasticities are computed with the delta method. Instruments used for the Orthogonal Deviations estimation are lags t-2 of Ik, k, s and uc and the time dummies.

Table 4: Firm specific apparent interest rate and the short-term and long term interest rates

Within estimates		*Firm specific and short-term interest rates*							
		Germany		**France**		**Italy**		**Spain**	
		Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error
Δi_t	$\pi 1$	0.31	0.03	0.34	0.02	0.60	0.03	0.25	0.02
$ID_{i,t-1}$	$\pi 2$	-0.55	0.08	-0.66	0.04	-0.51	0.05	-0.47	0.04
i_{t-1}	$\pi 3$	0.34	0.04	0.40	0.03	0.69	0.04	0.42	0.03
	$\pi 3 / \pi 2$	0.61		0.60		1.36		0.89	
Rsquare		0.66		0.51		0.61		0.40	
	Including differentiated effects for firms of different size								
Δi_t * *Small*	$\pi 1$	0.27	0.04	0.28	0.03	0.66	0.04	0.17	0.03
Δi_t * *Medium*		0.33	0.05	0.36	0.04	0.60	0.04	0.27	0.03
Δi_t * *Large*		0.32	0.04	0.37	0.04	0.51	0.04	0.30	0.04
$ID_{i,t-1}$	$\pi 2$	-0.58	0.09	-0.66	0.04	-0.55	0.04	-0.47	0.04
i_t * *Small*	$\pi 3$	0.30	0.04	0.39	0.04	0.80	0.06	0.42	0.03
i_t * *Medium*		0.38	0.04	0.42	0.04	0.71	0.04	0.42	0.03
i_t * *Large*		0.36	0.05	0.38	0.04	0.62	0.05	0.42	0.03
Small	$\pi 3 / \pi 2$	0.52		0.59		1.46		0.90	
Medium		0.65		0.64		1.30		0.89	
Large		0.63		0.58		1.14		0.88	
Rsquare		0.68		0.52		0.63		0.40	
		Firm specific and long-term interest rates							
		Germany		**France**		**Italy**		**Spain**	
		Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error
Δl_t	$\pi 1$	0.30	0.02	0.28	0.04	0.38	0.02	0.25	0.03
$ID_{i,t-1}$	$\pi 2$	-0.53	0.03	-0.60	0.04	-0.54	0.04	-0.51	0.03
l_{t-1}	$\pi 3$	0.72	0.04	0.58	0.03	0.49	0.03	0.33	0.02
	$\pi 3 / \pi 2$	1.38		0.98		0.90		0.64	
Rsquare		0.52		0.41		0.56		0.32	
	Including differentiated effects for firms of different size								
Δl_t * *Small*	$\pi 1$	0.25	0.03	0.22	0.03	0.42	0.03	0.19	0.04
Δl_t * *Medium*		0.36	0.03	0.32	0.06	0.39	0.04	0.23	0.04
Δl_t * *Large*		0.29	0.06	0.32	0.09	0.32	0.04	0.33	0.05
$ID_{i,t-1}$	$\pi 2$	-0.53	0.03	-0.60	0.04	-0.57	0.03	-0.52	0.04
l_t * *Small*	$\pi 3$	0.64	v	0.59	0.05	0.60	0.03	0.27	0.03
l_t * *Medium*		0.79	0.05	0.65	0.05	0.48	0.03	0.35	0.03
l_t * *Large*		0.74	0.09	0.52	0.04	0.44	0.04	0.38	0.04
Small	$\pi 3 / \pi 2$	1.11		0.90		1.09		0.58	
Medium		1.37		0.99		0.89		0.74	
Large		1.28		0.79		0.80		0.80	
Rsquare		0.53		0.42		0.57		0.33	

Source: Authors' calculation. Estimation of equation (5) in the text. The dependent variable is the first difference of the firm specific interest rate ($\Delta IDi,t$). The independent variables are the first difference and the level of the three month money market and the government bonds interest rate, the level of the firm specific interest rate (IDi,t) and the product of the short-term or the long term rate with size class dummies.

Table 5: Size and the effect of the user cost on investment

Within estimates		**Germany**		**France**		**Italy**		**Spain**	
		Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error	Coefficient	Std. Error
$IK_{i,t-1}$	$\alpha 1$	0.02	0.06	0.12	0.04	0.00	0.04	0.22	0.04
$\Delta s_{i,t}$	$\alpha 2$	0.16	0.07	0.25	0.05	0.15	0.03	0.13	0.04
$\Delta s_{i,t-1}$	$\alpha 3$	0.33	0.07	0.17	0.05	0.11	0.03	0.05	0.04
	$\alpha 2+\alpha 3$	0.48		0.42		0.26		0.18	
$\Delta uc_{i,t}$ * *Small*		-0.28	0.16	-0.15	0.07	-0.07	0.04	-0.30	0.06
$\Delta uc_{i,t-1}$ * *Small*	$\alpha 5$	-0.51	0.16	0.06	0.06	-0.01	0.04	-0.11	0.06
	$\alpha 4+\alpha 5$	-0.80		-0.10		-0.09		-0.40	
$\Delta uc_{i,t}$ * *Medium*	$\alpha 4$	-0.36	0.15	-0.02	0.06	-0.10	0.04	-0.28	0.06
$\Delta uc_{i,t-1}$ * *Medium*	$\alpha 5$	-0.41	0.15	0.04	0.06	-0.03	0.04	-0.11	0.06
	$\alpha 4+\alpha 5$	-0.77		0.01		-0.12		-0.39	
$\Delta uc_{i,t}$ * *Large*	$\alpha 4$	-0.15	0.15	-0.07	0.06	-0.06	0.04	-0.26	0.06
$\Delta uc_{i,t-1}$ * *Large*	$\alpha 5$	-0.23	0.14	0.10	0.06	0.00	0.04	-0.07	0.06
	$\alpha 4+\alpha 5$	-0.37		0.03		-0.06		-0.33	
$k_{i,t-2}$	$\alpha 6$	-0.14	0.03	-0.04	0.01	-0.06	0.01	-0.06	0.01
$s_{i,t-2}$	$\alpha 7$	0.17	0.04	0.04	0.01	0.05	0.01	0.06	0.01
$uc_{i,t-2}$	$\alpha 8$	-0.11	0.06	-0.03	0.03	-0.05	0.02	-0.05	0.04
Rsquare		0.51		0.48		0.43		0.37	
		Test of the restriction that the short-run effects of the user cost are equal for all sizes							
		F-Stat	P. val.	F-Stat	P. val.	F-Stat	P. val.	F-Stat	P. val.
		1.54	0.19	1.14	0.34	0.19	0.94	0.24	0.91

Source: Authors' calculation. Estimation of equation (3) extended to allow for different short run effects of the user cost for firms of different size. The dependent variable is the investment capital ratio. The independent variables are the lagged investment capital ratio and appropriate lags of the growth rates and the logarithm of sales and the user cost of capital and of t capital level. The growth rate of the user cost is multiplied by dummy variables for each size class. The F-Stats are computed on the basis of the residual sum of square of the unrestricted model above and the restricted model presented in Table 3.

Graph 1 to 4: Germany



Graph 1 to 4: France



Graph 1 to 4: Italy



Graph 1 to 4: Spain



European Central Bank Working Paper Series

1 "A global hazard index for the world foreign exchange markets" by V. Brousseau and F. Scacciavillani, May 1999.

2 "What does the single monetary policy do? A SVAR benchmark for the European Central Bank" by C. Monticelli and O. Tristani, May 1999.

3 "Fiscal policy effectiveness and neutrality results in a non-Ricardian world" by C. Detken, May 1999.

4 "From the ERM to the euro: new evidence on economic and policy convergence among EU countries" by I. Angeloni and L. Dedola, May 1999.

5 "Core inflation: a review of some conceptual issues" by M. Wynne, May 1999.

6 "The demand for M3 in the euro area" by G. Coenen and J.-L. Vega, September 1999.

7 "A cross-country comparison of market structures in European banking" by O. de Bandt and E. P. Davis, September 1999.

8 "Inflation zone targeting" by A. Orphanides and V. Wieland, October 1999.

9 "Asymptotic confidence bands for the estimated autocovariance and autocorrelation functions of vector autoregressive models" by G. Coenen, January 2000.

10 "On the effectiveness of sterilized foreign exchange intervention" by R. Fatum, February 2000.

11 "Is the yield curve a useful information variable for the Eurosystem?" by J. M. Berk and P. van Bergeijk, February 2000.

12 "Indicator variables for optimal policy" by L. E. O. Svensson and M. Woodford, February 2000.

13 "Monetary policy with uncertain parameters" by U. Söderström, February 2000.

14 "Assessing nominal income rules for monetary policy with model and data uncertainty" by G. D. Rudebusch, February 2000.

15 "The quest for prosperity without inflation" by A. Orphanides, March 2000.

16 "Estimating the implied distribution of the future short term interest rate using the Longstaff-Schwartz model" by P. Hördahl, March 2000.

17 "Alternative measures of the NAIRU in the euro area: estimates and assessment" by S. Fabiani and R. Mestre, March 2000.

18 "House prices and the macroeconomy in Europe: Results from a structural VAR analysis" by M. Iacoviello, April 2000.

19 "The euro and international capital markets" by C. Detken and P. Hartmann, April 2000.

20 "Convergence of fiscal policies in the euro area" by O. De Bandt and F. P. Mongelli, May 2000.

21 "Firm size and monetary policy transmission: evidence from German business survey data" by M. Ehrmann, May 2000.

22 "Regulating access to international large value payment systems" by C. Holthausen and T. Rønde, June 2000.

23 "Escaping Nash inflation" by In-Koo Cho and T. J. Sargent, June 2000.

24 "What horizon for price stability" by F. Smets, July 2000.

25 "Caution and conservatism in the making of monetary policy" by P. Schellekens, July 2000.

26 "Which kind of transparency? On the need for clarity in monetary policy-making" by B. Winkler, August 2000.

27 "This is what the US leading indicators lead" by M. Camacho and G. Perez-Quiros, August 2000.

28 "Learning, uncertainty and central bank activism in an economy with strategic interactions" by M. Ellison and N. Valla, August 2000.

29 "The sources of unemployment fluctuations: an empirical application to the Italian case" by S. Fabiani, A. Locarno, G. Oneto and P. Sestito, September 2000.

30 "A small estimated euro area model with rational expectations and nominal rigidities" by G. Coenen and V. Wieland, September 2000.

31 "The disappearing tax base: Is foreign direct investment eroding corporate income taxes?" by R. Gropp and K. Kostial, September 2000.

32 "Can indeterminacy explain the short-run non-neutrality of money?" by F. De Fiore, September 2000.

33 "The information content of M3 for future inflation" by C. Trecroci and J. L. Vega, October 2000.

34 "Capital market development, corporate governance and the credibility of exchange rate pegs" by O. Castrén and T. Takalo, October 2000.

35 "Systemic risk: A survey" by O. De Bandt and P. Hartmann, November 2000.

36 "Measuring core inflation in the euro area" by C. Morana, November 2000.

37 "Business fixed investment: Evidence of a financial accelerator in Europe" by P. Vermeulen, November 2000.

38 "The optimal inflation tax when taxes are costly to collect" by F. De Fiore, November 2000.

39 "A money demand system for euro area M3" by C. Brand and N. Cassola, November 2000.

40 "Financial structure and the interest rate channel of ECB monetary policy" by B. Mojon, November 2000.

41 "Why adopt transparency? The publication of central bank forecasts" by P. M. Geraats, January 2001.

42 "An area-wide model (AWM) for the euro area" by G. Fagan, J. Henry and R. Mestre, January 2001.

43 "Sources of economic renewal: from the traditional firm to the knowledge firm" by D. R. Palenzuela, February 2001.

44 "The supply and demand for eurosystem deposits – The first 18 months" by U. Bindseil and F. Seitz, February 2001.

45 "Testing the Rank of the Hankel matrix: a statistical approach" by G. Camba-Mendez and G. Kapetanios, February 2001.

46 "A two-factor model of the German term structure of interest rates" by N. Cassola and J. B. Luís, February 2001.

47 "Deposit insurance and moral hazard: does the counterfactual matter?" by R. Gropp and J. Vesala, February 2001.

48 "Financial market integration in Europe: on the effects of EMU on stock markets" by M. Fratzscher, March 2001.

49 "Business cycle and monetary policy analysis in a structural sticky-price model of the euro area" by M. Casares, March 2001.

50 "Employment and productivity growth in service and manufacturing sectors in France, Germany and the US" by T. von Wachter, March 2001.

51 "The functional form of the demand for euro area M1" by L. Stracca, March 2001.

52 "Are the effects of monetary policy in the euro area greater in recessions than in booms?" by G. Peersman and F. Smets, March 2001.

53 "An evaluation of some measures of core inflation for the euro area" by J.-L. Vega and M. A. Wynne, April 2001.

54 "Assessment criteria for output gap estimates" by G. Camba-Méndez and D. R. Palenzuela, April 2001.

55 "Modelling the demand for loans to the private sector in the euro area" by A. Calza, G. Gartner and J. Sousa, April 2001.

56 "Stabilization policy in a two country model and the role of financial frictions" by E. Faia, April 2001.

57 "Model-based indicators of labour market rigidity" by S. Fabiani and D. Rodriguez-Palenzuela, April 2001.

58 "Business cycle asymmetries in stock returns: evidence from higher order moments and conditional densities" by G. Perez-Quiros and A. Timmermann, April 2001.

59 "Uncertain potential output: implications for monetary policy" by M. Ehrmann and F. Smets, April 2001.

60 "A multi-country trend indicator for euro area inflation: computation and properties" by E. Angelini, J. Henry and R. Mestre, April 2001.

61 "Diffusion index-based inflation forecasts for the euro area" by E. Angelini, J. Henry and R. Mestre, April 2001.

62 "Spectral based methods to identify common trends and common cycles" by G. C. Mendez and G. Kapetanios, April 2001.

63 "Does money lead inflation in the euro area?" by S. N. Altimari, May 2001.

64 "Exchange rate volatility and euro area imports" by R. Anderton and F. Skudelny, May 2001.

65 "A system approach for measuring the euro area NAIRU" by S. Fabiani and R. Mestre, May 2001.

66 "Can short-term foreign exchange volatility be predicted by the Global Hazard Index?" by V. Brousseau and F. Scacciavillani, June 2001.

67 "The daily market for funds in Europe: Has something changed with the EMU?" by G. P. Quiros and H. R. Mendizabal, June 2001.

68 "The performance of forecast-based monetary policy rules under model uncertainty" by A. Levin, V. Wieland and J. C.Williams, July 2001.

69 "The ECB monetary policy strategy and the money market" by V. Gaspar, G. Perez-Quiros and J. Sicilia, July 2001.

70 "Central Bank forecasts of liquidity factors: Quality, publication and the control of the overnight rate" by U. Bindseil, July 2001.

71 "Asset market linkages in crisis periods" by P. Hartmann, S. Straetmans and C. G. de Vries, July 2001.

72 "Bank concentration and retail interest rates" by S. Corvoisier and R. Gropp, July 2001.

73 "Interbank lending and monetary policy transmission – evidence for Germany" by M. Ehrmann and A. Worms, July 2001.

74 "Interbank market integration under asymmetric information" by X. Freixas and C. Holthausen, August 2001.

75 "Value at risk models in finance" by S. Manganelli and R. F. Engle, August 2001.

76 "Rating agency actions and the pricing of debt and equity of European banks: What can we infer about private sector monitoring of bank soundness?" by R. Gropp and A. J. Richards, August 2001.

77 "Cyclically adjusted budget balances: An alternative approach" by C. Bouthevillain, P. Cour-Thimann, G. van den Dool, P. Hernández de Cos, G. Langenus, M. Mohr, S. Momigliano and M. Tujula, September 2001.

78 "Investment and monetary policy in the euro area" by B. Mojon, F. Smets and P. Vermeulen, September 2001.