



UNIVERSITAT
ROVIRA I VIRGILI

WORKING PAPERS

Col·lecció “DOCUMENTS DE TREBALL DEL
DEPARTAMENT D’ECONOMIA”

Are small firms more sensitive to financial variables?

Agustí Segarra
Mercedes Teruel

Document de treball n° - 24- 2010

DEPARTAMENT D’ECONOMIA
Facultat de Ciències Econòmiques i Empresariales



UNIVERSITAT
ROVIRA I VIRGILI

Edita:

Departament d'Economia

http://www.fcee.urv.es/departaments/economia/public_html/index.html

Universitat Rovira i Virgili

Facultat de Ciències Econòmiques i Empresariales

Avgda. de la Universitat, 1

432004 Reus

Tel. +34 977 759 811

Fax +34 977 300 661

Dirigir comentaris al Departament d'Economia.

Dipòsit Legal: T - 2020 - 2010

ISSN 1988 - 0812

DEPARTAMENT D'ECONOMIA
Facultat de Ciències Econòmiques i Empresariales

Are small firms more sensitive to financial variables? *

Agustí Segarra ^a

Mercedes Teruel ^a

^a Departament d'Economia, Universitat Rovira i Virgili, Reus, Spain.

Abstract

This paper analyses the impact of different sources of finance on the growth of firms. Using panel data from Spanish manufacturing firms for the period 2000-2006, we investigate the effects of internal and external finances on firm growth. In particular, we examine two dimensions of these financial sources: a) the performance of the firms' capital structure in accordance with firm size; b) the combined effect of equity, external debt and cash flow on firm growth. We find that low-growth firms are sensitive to cash flow and short-term bank debt, while high-growth firms are more sensitive to long-term debt. Furthermore, our results show that low-growth firms are more sensitive to short-term financial variables, while fast growth firms are more sensitive to long-term financial variables.

JEL codes: L25, R12

Keywords: Finance, Firm growth, Quantile regressions, Small firms

*This paper is part of the research done with the financial support of the Spanish Ministry of Innovation and Science in the project ECO2009-08735 and the Consolidated Group of Research 2009-SGR-907. We are grateful to Verònica Gombau-Bertomeu for her research support. The usual disclaimer applies.

1 Introduction

Empirical research examining firm growth has paid little attention to financial factors. Three reasons would seem to account for this neglect. First, the field of industrial organization has traditionally ignored corporate finance and vice versa. Second, an increasing number of studies have chosen to analyse firm growth as a theoretical production function and, as such, have paid scarce attention regarding to the strategic relationships that might exist between financial decisions and output market decisions. And, third, scholars have only very recently acceded to panel data that can provide information about production factors and financial flows at the firm level.

However, current empirical evidence shows that a firm's ability to obtain financial sources is a key factor in its growth and survival. According with Aghion et al. (2007a), access to external finance improves market selection by allowing small firms to be more competitive. Additionally, financial accessibility significantly facilitates the post-entry growth of firms. Furthermore, Winker (1999) and Savignac (2008), among others, report that credit constraints have a negative impact on innovation expenditures and overall investment; and Carpenter and Petersen (2002) find that asset growth is constrained by the availability of internal finance. Finally, Musso and Schiavo (2008) conclude that access to external financial resources has a positive impact on firm growth.

In general, a well-developed financial system will seek to facilitate a firm's access to productivity enhancing investments. Indeed, even in well-developed financial systems, such as the Spanish one, small firms may be constrained and be more markedly sensitive to the possibilities of accessing to external finance. Furthermore, current financial environment has increased the larger financial constraints with which small firms have to contend. Although large firms tend to capture a larger share of employment and economic activity, small firms can act as catalysts for the development of local industrial sectors. Hence, small firms deserve special attention given the increasing recognition that they are gaining in the promotion of regional development (Acs 1999). In fact, in recent decades the share of small firms in the economy has increased due to growing global competition, greater uncertainty, and technological advances (Audretsch et al. 2002). However, there is a general consensus that such firms suffer from a series of financial constraints.

This paper analyses the effects of different sources of finance on sales growth at the firm level, with particular attention to small firms. We use an extensive database for Spanish manufacturing firms that includes balance sheet data from the Mercantile Register between the years 2000 and 2006. In order to provide quantitative evidence regarding the performance of a firm's growth determinants we use quantile regressions. Quantile regressions capture the

different marginal effects of a firm's growth determinants on firm growth (Koenker and Basset 1978) and offer a different approach to the analysis of firm performance.

Our main findings can be summarised as follows. First, we show that firms with low growth rates are more sensitive to the access of internal sources of finance. Second, our results suggest that access to external sources is crucial in order to increase these growth rates. Third, cash flow and short-term bank debt are of great importance when firms are small and their growth rates are low. Fourth, high-growth firms are more sensitive to long-term financial sources. Here, the Spanish case is particularly interesting as it has a market structure characterised by firms that are smaller than their European counterparts and which have a smaller capacity to grow. As such, the study sheds some light on the role played by various sources of finance on the growth of Spanish manufacturing firms. Hence, we contribute to the analyses of the interaction of financial sources and also we are able to distinguish between different firm sizes.

The paper is structured as follows. In section 2 we give an overview of the relationship between financial access and firm performance. Section 3 presents our data. Section 4 discusses our econometric model. Our results are presented in section 5, while the final section draws together our main conclusions.

2 Literature review

2.1 Financial access and firm performance

Empirical studies emphasize the crucial role played by financial development on economic growth. However, access to broad, comprehensive databases at the firm-level has given rise to contributions within the field that emphasize the fact that the asymmetries in access to finance are dependent on firm size. At the firm level, finances exert a major influence on the development of firms and innovative activities. Rajan and Zingales (1988) argue that the financial system has two primary goals: to place risks where they are best borne, and to channel resources to their most productive uses. Proper empirical work in assessing the relationship between financial development and the real economy began with King and Levine (1993a,b,c). Those authors reported cross-country evidence suggesting that financial development affects economic growth by fostering productivity improvements (Love, 2003). However, few studies have subsequently analysed the impact of financial access on firm performance.

A number of authors have emphasised the importance of being able to access external finance (Brito and Mello 1995; Beck et al. 2006). First, access to finance plays a key role in the general business environment, potentially serving as a constraint on both firm entry and performance. Further, it is also clearly important to foster a competitive business environment

that permits the entry of new and innovative entrepreneurs resulting in the Schumpeterian process of “creative destruction” rather than maintaining a large stock of SMEs with a low turnover (Beck et al. 2006). Second, taking into account joint financial and production decisions helps to provide a better understanding of the key drivers of entry-exit decisions, as well as the firms’ post-entry performance (Brito and Mello 1995).

Several models have defined, from a theoretical perspective, the mechanism by which the financial system affects productivity. Here, three main arguments have been forwarded. First, the leading argument is that better access to finance increases a firm’s investment in productivity-enhancing projects. Such projects are more easily undertaken when there are liquid financial markets given that investors can sell their shares if they need to recover their savings before the project matures (Levine 1991; Bencivenga et al. 1995). Second, financial markets may help by evaluating prospective entrepreneurs, mobilizing savings to finance the most promising investment projects and diversifying the risks associated with these innovative activities (King and Levine 1993c). Third, perfect credit markets increase the propensity to engage in long-term productivity-enhancing investment by decreasing the level of liquidity risk involved in those investments (see Aghion et al. (2007b)). As a consequence, the presence of financial constraints results in lower productivity.

Hence, the empirical evidence shows that an improvement in the financial system and its further development will increase economic growth at the country level. However, the mechanism by which finance affects economic growth is explained by the firms’ capacity to improve their performance.

2.2 Small firms and financial access

In financial markets, information asymmetries represent a critical barrier in gaining access to finance¹. So while the presence of both large and small firms is important for market competition and, hence, for economic growth, in order to ensure industrial dynamics, firms must have access to financial markets. However, problems of agency costs, information asymmetries and fixed transaction costs result in capital market imperfections. Hence, firm size is a key variable in the analysis of financial restrictions (Beck et al. 2005).

Firms that are typically most severely affected by these imperfections are small firms, as their internal information can be rather opaque or, at least, not as public as it is in the case of their larger counterparts. Small firms seeking small loans face higher transaction costs and higher risk premiums since they are usually more opaque and have less collateral to offer (Beck

¹In order to solve some of these puzzles, corporate finance theory has extended the analysis to three strands of the literature: the free cash flow theory (agency costs), the trade-off theory (tax) and the pecking order theory (information asymmetries). However, we are not interested here in examining these theories.

and Demircuc-Kunt, 2006). Similar results have been found by Beck et al. (2005, 2006) and Schiffer and Weder (2001). Schiffer and Weder (2001) confirm that small firms have to confront higher barriers to their growth. Similarly, Beck et al. (2005, 2006) confirm that size, age and foreign-ownership are good predictors of the existence of barriers to growth.

Oliveira and Fortunato (2006) find that small firms face greater financial constraints and that these have a negative impact on their growth. Audretsch and Elston (2002, 2006) also show that medium-sized firms face greater financial constraints than large firms. Müller and Zimmermann (2008) also observe that SMEs face additional disadvantages. First, small firms cannot exploit scale economies in the same way as large firms can. Second, they face more financial constraints. These authors claim that since young companies have not accumulated sufficient cash flow and are unable to rely on bank financing, they have to depend on the original equity investment of their owners ².

In general, analyses of the effects of financial constraints on firm performance have focused on distinct aspects: firm investment (Fazzari et al. 1988; Lang et al. 1996; Cleary 1999, 2006; Alti 2003; Almeida and Campello 2007), firm growth (Carpenter and Petersen 2002; Beck et al. 2005; Audretsch and Elston 2006; Fagiolo and Luzzi 2006; Oliveira and Fortunato 2006; Hutchinson and Xavier 2006), firm innovation (Himmelberg and Petersen 1994; Hyytinen and Toivanen 2005; Savignac 2008; Mohnen et al. 2008) and firm size distribution (Angelini and Generale 2008³; Cabral and Mata 2003). In general, these studies demonstrate that small firms are more severely affected than their larger counterparts by financial constraints⁴.

At the micro level, recent empirical evidence has been presented. Using panel data on French manufacturing firms, Musso and Schiavo (2008) propose a new approach for identifying and measuring the degree of financial constraints faced by firms and they use it to investigate the effect of these constraints on firm survival and development. These authors found that (1) financial constraints significantly increase the probability of exiting the market, (2) access to external financial resources has a positive effect on the growth of firms in terms of sales, capital stock and employment, (3) financial constraints are positively related to productivity growth in the short-run. We interpret this last result as a sign that firms suffering constraints need to cut costs in order to generate the resources they cannot raise on the financial markets. When using a dataset for a panel of Bulgarian firms to study the empirical relationship between

²According with Cabral and Mata (2003), the disadvantages cause the firm size distribution (FSD) to be right skewed.

³Recently, Angelini and Generale (2008) have found that among OECD countries, the FSD of non-constrained firms virtually overlaps that of the entire sample, suggesting that the overall impact of financial constraints on the FSD is modest. The difference is more pronounced in a sample of firms from non-OECD countries. Thus, they conclude that financial constraints cannot be considered the main determinant of the FSD evolution in developed economies.

⁴Some critiques about the sensitiveness of financial variables to firm growth can be found in Coad (2010).

access to external finance and productivity, Gatti and Love (2008) find that access to credit has a significant positive impact on firm productivity in Bulgaria. In the case of Italy, Nucci et al. (2004) report evidence pointing to the causal effect of financial structure on a firm's propensity to innovate and on its productivity. Furthermore, these authors show that the relationship between leverage and productivity is non-linear, being dependent on some firm-specific characteristics such as the share of short-run bank debt and the lower liquidity in relation to total assets.

However, there is little evidence regarding the relationship between firm size, growth and financial sources at the firm level. In line with Nucci et al. (2004) and Musso and Schiavo (2008), we assume that the mechanism that improves the technical change is provided by the access to internal and external financial sources.

2.3 Financial sources

According with Myers and Majluf (1984), firms establish a hierarchy in their use of funding sources. Hence, firms will prefer to obtain internal financial resources than external financial resources. In particular, due to the presence of information asymmetries between the firm and the potential lenders, the relative costs of finance will vary depending on the financial sources.

In general, cash flow generated internally with the operating activity is preferred to external funding. Hence, the sensitivity of firm growth to cash flow may represent the case that firms use their cash flow as an additional financial source (Kim et al. 1998; Kaplan and Zingales 2000). But this sensitivity may be also interpreted as a signal of financial restrictions (Fazzari et al. 1988) or as a proxy for investment opportunities (Carpenter and Petersen 2002). Whichever is the interpretation, the empirical evidence shows that SMEs are not able to generate such a large amount of cash flow than their larger counterparts. Consequently, they will not enjoy the same options to finance their firm growth.

Equity is a financial source to increase the funds, but it also represents a loss of power by the old shareholders. Hence, this is not a preferable way to funding because of a possible loss of managers' control. Furthermore, new equity holders do not have as much information as the existing owners. Therefore these new equity holders will expect a higher rate of return on capital invested, resulting in new equity finance being more costly to the firm than using existing internal funds. Carpenter and Petersen (2002) find that the small fraction of firms that make heavy use of new share issues exhibit growth rates far above what can be supported by internal finance. For these firms, the relationship between growth and internal finance is weak, suggesting a relaxation of the internal finance constraint. The above disadvantages of equity are crucial for SMEs given that owners' SMEs are often reluctant to be controlled by

new shareholders.

It is argued that bank financing is effective in reducing problems associated with agency conflicts and informational asymmetry because of the comparative advantage of banks in monitoring firms' activities and in collecting and processing information (Fama 1985). However, the debt maturity may transmit signals to the market about the quality of the firm (Flannery 1986; Kale and Noe 1990). Hence, the existence of a bank relationship would enhance the ability of firms to raise external finance. However, external finance is not positively correlated with firm size. According with Berger and Udell (1998), as the firm grows it accumulates assets which may be used to collateralise debt. Empirical evidence on this relationship is found on Coad et al. (2010).

Short-term debt may represent a tool to cope with underinvestment problems (Myers, 1977), temporary deficits (Esperanca et al. 2003), incentives to shareholders to assume risk (Barnea et al. 1980) and tax motivations (Brick and Ravid 1985). Furthermore, short-term debt helps to enhance a firm's production and earnings, as it allows production and product sales to be linked more closely to demand patterns (Emery 2001). However, SMEs are more affected by underinvestment problems (MacMahon, 2003) and they need to accede to external financial sources. In particular, García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007) point out that short-term debt is an important financial source for Spanish manufacturing SMEs.

Long-term debt is more related with the investment in long-term projects (Bhaird and Lucey 2010). However, the debt maturity may also depend to firm's preferences and the attitude of banks to lending. García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007) find that Spanish manufacturing SMEs opt for an aggressive short-term debt to finance their strategies.

3 Database

The data for this study comprise an exhaustive sample of Spanish manufacturing firms between 2000 and 2006. Our data are provided by the SABI (Sistema de Análisis de Balances Ibéricos) database which compiles information from the Mercantile Register. In this paper our data were gathered for a specific set of manufacturing industries, namely all two-digit industrial groups in the NACE classification (manufacturing industries comprising 15 to 36 sectors ⁵). The SABI database has certain advantages when compared to other Spanish databases. First, it offers exhaustive data at the firm level and, second, it is a database in which there is information on nearly the whole firm population.

After applying a depuration process, our sample comprised 59,420 firms with three or more

⁵Code sectors NACE16 (tobacco industry) and NACE23 (petroleum industry) have not been incorporated in the database.

workers and 391,228 yearly observations. This data set included annual information on firm performance, capital structure, and firm size. The panel is unbalanced in the sense that firms can enter the sample after the year 2000.

Table 1: Summary statistics in 2006 for Spanish manufacturing firms.

	Workers	Firm age	Equity / assets	Cash flow / assets	Short-term debt /assets	Long-term debt /assets
Obs.	59420	59420	59420	59410	59407	56545
Mean	23.60	14.36	10.40	3.97	58.05	18.69
s.d.(*)	99.63	10.38	0.27	1.29	2.21	0.96
Skewness	60.73	1.8585	65.15	-112.34	129.65	154.56
Kurtosis	5761.01	9.61	7823.05	15560.21	20570.74	27002.24
Perc. 10	4	3	0.59	-1.16	20.34	0.00
Perc. 25	5	7	1.48	2.79	33.08	1.25
Perc. 50	10	12	4.46	6.24	51.03	10.48
Perc. 75	21	19	12.34	10.77	71.00	27.41
Perc. 90	43	27	25.89	16.49	88.69	47.36

(*) *s.d.* belongs to the standard deviation.

(*) The percentile corresponds to the requested specified percentage for each variable.

Note: authors own based on SABI database.

Table 1 reports descriptive statistics for firm size, firm age and financial structure at the end of the year 2006. In order to control for the volume of the firm, we use financial variables scaled by total assets. On average, the surviving firms in our sample employ 23.60 workers and have been operating for 14.38 years. On average, firms are highly leveraged: 58.05% of the financial sources in their total assets are short-term debt. Long-term debt also plays an important role being recorded at 18.69% of total assets. Therefore, it seems that firms have more difficulties in obtaining a higher ratio of internal resources such as cash flow and equity in order to finance their projects. Furthermore, in general, the variables are highly skewed to the right. The exception is the ratio of cash flow, which presents a right tail. Finally, the kurtosis indicates that the distribution is highly peaked on all the financial variables.

The firm's ability to accede to financial sources varies in accordance with firm size and firm age. Small firms usually face greater difficulties in obtaining long-term bank debt and have limited equity capital. Small firms depend basically on internal cash-flow and commercial debt. Conversely, large firms access more easily long-term bank debt and engage in transactions with a larger number of banks. These differences are more marked among younger firms. For young firms (i.e., those operating for fewer than six years), the contribution made by equity capital and long-term bank debt is low, while their access to short-term bank debt and commercial debt as a proportion of their overall liability is of great importance.

Table 2 shows the evolution in the corporate capital structure in our sample of Spanish

manufacturing firms in the year 2006⁶. During infancy, a firm's financial sources are restricted to the owner's contributions (equity capital) and those provided by financial and commercial borrowings. For firms with less than six years equity capital represents just 6.9% of their total liabilities, while commercial borrowings account for up to 71.1%. As the firm matures, its ability to accede to and diversify its financial sources increases. Among older firms, capital equity, long-term bank debt and cash flow acquire a more important role. For firms operating for more than 50 years, their equity capital is equivalent to 27.3%; their short-term bank debt is equal to 36.5%, and their long-term bank debt is equal to 11.2% of total liability. Furthermore, internal cash flow increases with a firm's age, in particular among those firms older than fifty years.

Additionally, capital structure also varies in accordance with firm size. Small firms accede more easily to financial sources related to their current economic activity. As a consequence, for those firms with ten workers or less, their internal cash flow and commercial borrowings are their two main financial sources. On average, for small firms, 61.69% of their external resources are obtained from commercial borrowings, while only 8.23% is long-term bank debt.

Conversely, as firm size increases, equity capital and bank debt acquire greater importance. In this sense, banks base their lending decisions on several considerations, including their exposure to bad risks and the likelihood that the value of their claims can be reduced by specific borrower actions. These concerns are especially relevant for firm growth loans since the risk of failure is greater among small and young firms. According to Myers (1977), banks may prefer lending on a short-term contract in order to gain control over the firm and its investment decisions, while long-term debt is more suited for firms that invest in projects that do not provide an immediate pay-off.

Since we are interested in analysing the relationship between firm growth and financial sources according to firm size, we show the relationship between these variables. Figure ?? plots the correlations of the sales growth rates in log terms with respect to the different financial sources according to firm size. The most striking finding is that sales growth appears to be independent of the financial sources, regardless the variable. Hence, there seems that firms present a different pattern to grow. However, small firms show a higher dispersion while we can observe that large firms have a more similar pattern.

Hence, Table 2 reveals that small and young firms present lower levels of capital, but when we observe the relationship between firm growth and financial sources at firm level (Figure 1), it emerges an independent relationship. However, we ignore how all the financial variables interact among them and how do they affect firm growth. Section ?? will tackle with the impact

⁶For an analysis of the evolution of financial sources and firm age with the same database, see Coad et al. (2010).

Table 2: Sources of financial funds by age and size in 2006 for Spanish manufacturing firms.

	Equity capital	Long term bank debt	Short term bank debt	Commercial borrowings	Cash Flow	Total liability
Total (62,259 firms)	1,202.10 15.92%	578.17 7.66%	1,622.38 21.48%	4,148.97 54.94%	248.00	7,551.62
By age						
0-5 years (13,346 firms)	432.25 6.90%	414.22 6.61%	960.4 15.32%	4461.86 71.18%	79.49	6,268.73
6-10 years (16,153 firms)	664.86 10.26%	567.66 8.76%	1,202.80 18.55%	4,047.67 62.44%	162.93	6,482.99
11-19 years (24,585 firms)	897.07 13.75%	423.11 6.49%	1,265.55 19.40%	3,936.89 60.36%	211.55	6,522.62
20-29 years (11,749 firms)	1,594.78 23.76%	553.62 8.25%	1,736.67 25.88%	2,826.35 42.11%	292.76	6,711.42
30-50 years (4,293 firms)	4,679.77 30.59%	1,400.69 9.16%	4,776.90 31.23%	4,439.86 29.02%	847.92	15,297.22
More than 50 years (697 firms)	13,117.50 27.46%	5,389.79 11.28%	17,450.53 36.52%	11,820.16 24.74%	2,685.30	47,777.98
By size						
3-9 workers (30,167 firms)	161.98 11.29%	118.10 8.23%	269.77 18.80%	885.25 61.69%	885.25	1,435.10
10-49 workers (26,969 firms)	875.37 19.97%	388.18 8.85%	1,112.53 25.37%	2,008.41 45.81%	164.93	4,384.49
50-249 workers (4,562 firms)	6,509.23 31.34%	2,424.85 11.68%	8,016.51 38.60%	3,818.41 18.39%	1,290.61	20,769.00
250 or more workers (561 firms)	45,620.18 29.05%	22,412.21 14.27%	65,107.33 41.45%	23,926.84 15.23%	10,508.03	157,066.56

Note: Mean in thousands of euros; weight as percentage of total liability.

Note: Rajan and Zingales (1995) define external finance as a fraction of total finance.

In other words, it is the ratio of net external finance over the sum of cash-flow from economic activity and net external financing.

* Capital Equity also includes a firms other own resources.

* Short-term bank debt is the liquid liability; long-term bank debt is the fixed liability

* External/total financing = (Short-term bank debt + long-term bank debt + Commercial borrowings) / Total liability

* Total liability = Equity + Other own resources + Short-term and long-term bank debt + Commercial borrowings

Note: authors own based on SABI database.




Figure 1: Scatterplots of the sales growth (2005-2006) and the financial sources (ratio over assets) in 2005. Financial sources are measured in terms of short-term debt (top-left), long-term debt (top-right), cash-flow (bottom-left) and equity (bottom-right).

that all financial sources have on firm growth.

4 Theoretical framework and econometric approach

4.1 Theoretical framework

This section presents the theoretical model for our empirical estimations. Our model relaxes some of the neoclassical conditions: constant economies of scale, competitive markets and exogenous technical progress. Here, the representative firm i in year t depends on the labour, capital and intermediate materials and a measure of productivity that incorporates the product changes not explained by the previous factors. Given a continuous production function, changes in output are expressed in terms of,

$$dy_{i,t} = da_{i,t} + \beta_1 dn_{i,t} + \beta_2 dk_{i,t} + \beta_3 dm_{i,t} + u_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

where $dy_{i,t}$, $dn_{i,t}$, $dk_{i,t}$, $dm_{i,t}$ and $da_{i,t}$ represent log growth rates in terms of sales, employment, capital stock, intermediate assets and technical change. As is usual, the technical change is neutral (in the sense of Hicks), and are the elasticities of the output with reference to the productive factors.

If Equation 1 presents constant economies of scale and market competitiveness, the production function is homogenous of degree one with respect to labour and capital, where $da_{i,t}$ is Solow's residual or the growth of total factor productivity (TFP). One of the main problems of this production function is that elasticities are non-observable, but under the previous assumptions, the output elasticity of productive factors may be measured by the contribution of the factorial rents to sales.

In our empirical research we are interested in analysing the relationship between growth rates and financial sources. In order to introduce the financial effects we incorporate the impact of internal and external financial sources on firm productivity. In other words,

$$da_{it} = \alpha + \beta_i X_i + v_{i,t} \quad (2)$$

where X is the firm's set of financial sources. Introducing these parameters in Equation 1 we obtain an equation that includes economies of scale and the effect of financial sources on technical change,

$$dy_{i,t} = \alpha + \beta_1 dn_{i,t} + \beta_2 dk_{i,t} + \beta_3 dm_{i,t} + \beta_i X_{i,t} + u_{i,t} \quad (3)$$

where β_i represents the output elasticity of the different financial sources. Thus, our contribution is to analyse the direct effect of financial sources on production growth at the firm level.

4.2 Econometric methodology

Here, we design a model to capture the direct impact of financial sources on a firm's production. The ability to gain access to financial sources may have an impact on the firm's capacity to bring about technical change. As has been pointed out in the literature, greater financial access may facilitate investment in projects or innovations that can increase a firm's productivity. Thus, we focus our analysis on the relationship between the changes in a set of different inputs and the change in output by estimating a direct model that can capture the increase in investment. We are especially interested in observing the evolution in financial elasticity across the entire conditional distribution of production. We estimate the following linear regression model,

$$\begin{aligned} dy_{i,t} = & c + \beta_1 dn_{i,t} + \beta_2 dk_{i,t} + \beta_3 dm_{i,t} + \beta_4 LnAge_{i,t} \\ & + \beta_5 Equity_{i,t-1} + \beta_6 CF_{i,t-1} + \beta_7 STdebt_{i,t-1} + \beta_8 LTdebt_{i,t-1} + \lambda_t + \nu_i + u_{i,t} \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where for each individual firm i , y is its production measured in terms of sales. The independent variables are as follows: n is the labour, k is the capital measured as fixed assets, m is the intermediate materials, and c is a constant. These variables are calculated as log growth between period t and period $t - 1$. Given our assumption that part of the technical change is attributable to better access to financial sources, we include a set of financial variables: *Equity* is the value of equity divided by assets, *CF* is the value of cash flow divided by assets, *LTdebt* is the ratio of long-term debt divided by assets, *STdebt* is the ratio of short-term debt divided by assets, and *LnAge* is the logarithmic firm age measured as the difference between the current age and the year of creation in order to measure the effect of firm's life cycle. Hence, the explanatory variables are divided into two groups. The first group comprises the production factors employed by the firm during the year. The second group presents four variables related to the firm's financial sources

The empirical literature measuring the presence of financial constraints is extremely broad and there is no consensus as to the identity of these variables. For example, some authors apply the ratio of cash flow to assets (Alti 2003; Cleary 1999; Fazzari et al. 1988; Almeida et al. 2004; Hutchinson and Xavier 2006; Gilchrist and Himmelbert 1995; Lang et al. 1996); the ratio of cash flow to sales (Fagiolo and Luzzi 2006); the ratio of debt to assets (Petersen and

Rajan 1994); and the ratio of debt to profits (Coad 2007). To the best of our knowledge, very few studies analyse the impact of different financial sources on firm growth. Consequently, our analysis seeks to contribute to the empirical evidence regarding the linkages generated between financial sources. It is our claim that financial resources are complementary and as such act as a strategic tool in the firm's production decision.

In order to capture the different effects that financial sources might have on firms with low- and high-growth rates, we estimate Equation (1) using quantile regressions. The initial quantile regression method was proposed for application by Koenker and Bassett (1978) as an alternative to OLS when errors are not normally distributed. The central idea in quantile regression is to minimize the sum of absolute residuals by giving different weights to the quantiles being investigated. It is a powerful tool that, given a set of explanatory variables, can characterize the entire distribution of a dependent variable in greater detail than OLS methods (see the survey in Koenker and Hallock (2001)). Quantile regression is useful in the study of firm productivity as the influence of a covariate may differ markedly between individuals with high, medium or low productivity levels. Thus, changes in a firm's financial sources may have a very different impact on the increase in its production depending on whether it belongs to a high, medium or low productive groups. Thus, quantile regressions reveal asymmetries in the data that cannot be detected by simple OLS estimations

Quantile regression was considered preferable to usual regression methods for several reasons. First, the standard least-squares assumption of normally distributed errors does not hold for our data, because the firms' growth rates follow a Laplace distribution and do not fulfil the principle of normality. Second, while conventional regressions focus on the average firm, quantile regression can describe the complete conditional distribution of the dependent variable. And third, quantile regression is more efficient at treating outliers and heavy-tailed distributions. In our case, the quantile regression procedure allows us to estimate a whole set of numbers (the conditional quantiles) which give a more complete picture of the underlying relationship between sources of finance and sales growth.

Finally, we should mention that we consider lagged financial variables in all our regressions to capture the temporal displacement between financial flows on investment and production. We also include sector dummies and time dummies in order to control for specific industrial characteristics and different time periods that might serve as an incentive for an increase in production.

5 Empirical results

The empirical results are presented below in two steps. First, Table 3 presents five conditional regression quantile results for $\theta = 0.10, 0.25, 0.50$ (hence the median), 0.75 and 0.90 . Second, Table 4 offers the marginal effect on firm growth for five conditional regression quantiles depending on firm size. In order to facilitate the analysis of the effects of financial sources according to firm size, we classify firms in three groups: small firms, those employing between three and nine workers; medium-sized firms, those with between 10 and 249 workers; and large firms, those with 250 or more employees.

Our initial analysis of the whole sample (Table 3) shows that equity has a negative impact on firm growth, but not significant in the lowest and highest quantiles, while variables such as cash flow and short-term debt have a positive impact. We should stress that the impact of both variables falls as we consider firms with higher growth rates. Greater access to long-term debt also has a significant and positive impact on firm growth, although it is not significant among those firms that grow at a lower rate (quantile 0.1). Furthermore, we should highlight the fact that in the case of those firms that present the highest growth rates, the impact of access to long-term debt is greatest. A firm's age also presents the expected outcome since it has a positive impact among the less productive firms, while its impact is negative among the more productive. Thus, we find a negative relationship between a firm's age and sales growth.

In the case of the productive factors, the impact was as expected - significant and positive. However, we should stress that these effects differ from one quantile to another. In the case of growth in number of workers and capital, we observe a higher impact among firms with the higher growth rates. Meanwhile, the growth in expenditure on materials has an inverted U-shaped impact on growth in sales.

Our empirical results, therefore, reveal marked differences between their internal and external sources of finance and between their short- and long-term bank debt. In fact, there would appear to be a complementary effect between internal and external financial sources on sales growth. The impact of internal finances in relation to total assets is of relevance when firms present low sales growth, but the parameter decreases in importance as firms grow. The short-term bank debt parameter behaves in a similar manner to that of internal finance cash flow. However, long-term bank debt differs from cash flow and short-term bank debt. The long-term bank debt presents an increasing coefficient parameter that highlights the direct relation between sales growth rates and previous access to long-term external finances.

When we compare the evolution in the financial coefficients of small and large firms, interesting results emerge (Table 4). For small firms' growth is more sensitive to sources of finance than they are to those of large firms. In line with Clementi and Hopenhayn's (2006) model, the

Table 3: Quantile regression for the whole database.

	Quantile 0.1	Quantile 0.25	Quantile 0.5	Quantile 0.75	Quantile 0.9
Productive factors					
<i>dn</i>	0.1157 (0.0027)*	0.1019 (0.0012)*	0.1097 (0.0007)*	0.1322 (0.0013)*	0.1697 (0.0031)*
<i>dk</i>	0.0384 (0.0014)*	0.0310 (0.0006)*	0.0317 (0.0004)*	0.0401 (0.0007)*	0.0566 (0.0015)*
<i>dm</i>	0.4456 (0.0016)*	0.4990 (0.0007)*	0.5254 (0.0004)*	0.5106 (0.0008)*	0.4672 (0.0020)*
Financial sources					
<i>Equity</i>	-0.0002 (0.0004)	0.0002 (0.0002)	-0.0005 (0.0001)*	-0.0010 (0.0002)*	-0.0007 (0.0005)
<i>CF</i>	0.0288 (0.0006)*	0.0216 (0.0003)*	0.0172 (0.0002)*	0.0164 (0.0004)*	0.0151 (0.0008)*
<i>LTdebt</i>	-0.0003 (0.0004)	0.0011 (0.0002)*	0.0021 (0.0001)*	0.0028 (0.0002)*	0.0042 (0.0005)*
<i>STdebt</i>	0.0363 (0.0011)*	0.0244 (0.0006)*	0.0170 (0.0004)*	0.0126 (0.0007)*	0.0108 (0.0013)*
<i>Age</i>	0.0128 (0.0006)*	-0.0004 (0.0004)	-0.0110 (0.0003)*	-0.0264 (0.0004)*	-0.0501 (0.0008)*
<i>Constant</i>	-0.0546 (0.0037)*	0.0435 (0.0020)*	0.1070 (0.0014)*	0.1959 (0.0023)*	0.3414 (0.0044)*
<i>Sector dummies</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Time dummies</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>R²</i>	0.4008	0.4268	0.4475	0.4494	0.4416
<i>N</i>	201143				

Note: The significance levels of the parameters are computed using bootstrapped standard errors (100 replications). Quantile regression coefficients can be interpreted as the marginal change in y at the θ th conditional quantile due to a marginal change in a particular regressor, $\Delta Q(y_i - x_i) / \Delta x$.

, **, * significant at 1%, 5% and 10%.*




Figure 2: Variation in the sales growth coefficient over the conditional quantiles. Confidence intervals extend to 95% confidence intervals in either direction (for computational manageability, we use the Stata default setting of 20 replications for the bootstrapped standard errors). Horizontal lines represent OLS estimates with 95% confidence intervals. Graphs made using the `grqreg` Stata module (Azevedo 2004).

sensitivity of investment and growth to cash flow decreases with firm age and size. For large firms, the capital structure is characterised by a larger share of equity capital and long-term bank debt and a lower percentage of commercial debt. Large firms enjoy a more diversified capital structure which is more neutral with respect to their investment strategy and their growth performance.

How can we, therefore, interpret these results? What contribution can we make to the debate concerning the financial constraints placed on young small firms? The descriptive data included in Table 2 show that small firms, and, in particular, young, small firms, are underinvested and have limited access to external sources of finance. Among small firms, and again especially among young, small firms, commercial debt constitutes an important source of finance.

The Spanish evidence presented here is in line with a growing body of empirical literature presented in the debate concerning the existence of financial restrictions. Fazzari et al. (1988) were the first to introduce the concept of financial restrictions. According to Fazzari and co-authors, *“small and medium-sized firms are less likely to have access to impersonal centralized debt markets. [...] during periods of tight credit, small and medium-sized borrowers are often denied loans in favour of better-quality borrowers.”* (Fazzari et al., 1988). For these authors, a firm’s investment is directly related to changes in cash flow and its sensitivity reveals the presence of financial restrictions. These authors initiated a debate which is far from over. In this sense, Kaplan and Zingales (1997, 2000) develop a theoretical model which demonstrates that the sensitivity of cash flow to investment cannot be interpreted as the existence of financial restrictions.

Here, we consider the possibility that financial restrictions emerge not only through the relationship between growth and cash flow but also as an effect of other financial sources. In fact, the cost of external and internal sources of finance can affect the firm’s financial structure. When a firm, and more specifically a small firm, experiences increasing difficulties in gaining access to external financial sources, its ability to finance its projects is conditioned by its capacity to obtain internal cash flow and commercial borrowings. The key point that we wish to highlight here is that financial decisions taken by a firm will affect its growth and, ultimately, its chances of survival.

Decisions regarding the financial structure are of great consequence for small firms since they experience greater difficulties in accessing external financial sources. Such firms have to rely more heavily on their internal sources of finance, in particular cash flow and commercial borrowings. This result is consistent with the theory that information problems primarily affect small firms. The latter, which are typically undercapitalized, encounter increasing barriers impeding their access to external financial debt, especially for high-risk investment projects under conditions of asymmetric information. In order to invest in strategic projects (R&D and

Table 4: Quantile regression for the whole database.

	Small firms			Medium-sized firms			Large firms			
	Quant. 0.1	Quant. 0.25	Quant. 0.5	Quant. 0.1	Quant. 0.25	Quant. 0.5	Quant. 0.75	Quant. 0.9	Quant. 0.9	
Productive factors										
dn	0.1220 (0.0045)*	0.0950 (0.0017)*	0.0936 (0.0012)*	0.1375 (0.0049)*	0.1048 (0.0016)*	0.1273 (0.0010)*	0.1654 (0.0015)*	0.2149 (0.0040)*	0.1241 (0.0093)*	0.1686 (0.0098)*
dk	0.0399 (0.0024)*	0.0306 (0.0009)*	0.0300 (0.0006)*	0.0445 (0.0026)*	0.0310 (0.0008)*	0.0327 (0.0005)*	0.0426 (0.0007)*	0.0657 (0.0019)*	0.0119 (0.0046)*	0.0302 (0.0045)*
dm	0.4345 (0.0029)*	0.4790 (0.0010)*	0.5037 (0.0006)*	0.4381 (0.0037)*	0.5134 (0.0008)*	0.5426 (0.0005)*	0.5285 (0.0008)*	0.4857 (0.0025)*	0.6977 (0.0055)*	0.7160 (0.0061)*
Financial sources										
$Equity$	0.0023 (0.0008)*	0.0010 (0.0004)*	0.0001 (0.0003)*	-0.0046 (0.0010)*	0.0002 (0.0002)*	-0.0005 (0.0002)*	-0.0008 (0.0002)*	0.0004 (0.0005)*	0.0002 (0.0009)*	-0.0011 (0.0029)***
CF	0.0255 (0.0011)*	0.0204 (0.0005)*	0.0177 (0.0004)*	0.0191 (0.0016)*	0.0212 (0.0004)*	0.0170 (0.0016)*	0.0153 (0.0004)*	0.0124 (0.0010)*	0.0147 (0.0018)*	0.0127 (0.0017)*
$LTdebt$	0.0001 (0.0008)	0.0023 (0.0004)*	0.0032 (0.0003)*	0.0048 (0.0011)*	0.0009 (0.0002)*	0.0016 (0.0002)*	0.0020 (0.0002)*	0.0027 (0.0005)*	0.0008 (0.0007)*	0.0004 (0.0008)*
$STdebt$	0.0331 (0.0019)*	0.0214 (0.0007)*	0.0155 (0.0007)*	0.0121 (0.0024)*	0.0270 (0.0007)*	0.0185 (0.0005)*	0.0131 (0.0007)*	0.0077 (0.0016)*	0.0135 (0.0030)*	0.0051 (0.0029)*
Age	0.0030 (0.0013)**	-0.0067 (0.0006)*	-0.0159 (0.0005)*	-0.0566 (0.0018)*	-0.0007 (0.0004)*	-0.0084 (0.0003)*	-0.0198 (0.0004)*	-0.0382 (0.0010)*	0.0016 (0.0014)*	-0.0025 (0.0013)**
$Constant$	-0.0621 (0.0070)*	0.0415 (0.0033)*	0.1204 (0.0025)*	0.3684 (0.0085)*	0.0563 (0.0024)*	0.0992 (0.0000)*	0.1652 (0.0025)*	0.2754 (0.0053)*	0.0177 (0.0119)*	0.0496 (0.0117)*
R^2	0.3948	0.4112	0.4251	0.3956	0.4414	0.4685	0.4772	0.4805	0.5581	0.6109
N	82,471									2347

Note: The significance levels of the parameters are computed using bootstrapped standard errors (100 replications). Quantile regression coefficients can be interpreted as the marginal change in y at the θ th conditional quantile due to a marginal change in a particular regressor, $\Delta Q(y_{\theta} - x_i) / \Delta x$.

*, **, *** significant at 1%, 5% and 10%.

innovative activities), small firms usually increase their equity capital in order to give a signal to external borrowers that their projects involve a moderate risk (Magri, 2009).

Our results show that SMEs are more sensitive than larger firms to cash flow. The cash flow coefficient decreases monotonically with the firms' sales growth, indicating that cash flow plays an important role in moderating firm growth. Equity and short-term debt present similar parametric evolutions. In general, when firms have few options to obtain leverage their capital structure depends on internal financial sources and this has a negative impact on their investment, growth, profits and survival performance.

Conversely, long-term bank debt presents a monotonically increasing coefficient in small and medium-sized firms. This may indicate that long-term financial sources enable a firm to carry out projects that present greater growth opportunities because of their technological or innovative nature.

6 Conclusion

This paper has examined the capital structure of Spanish manufacturing firms. In recent years, enhanced accessibility to a comprehensive database holding financial and economic information at the firm level has facilitated the analysis of the effect of financial services on these firms' investment strategies and growth patterns. Using a broad sample of firms we have observed the sensitivity shown by sales growth to internal and external sources of finance. We are unable to draw definitive conclusions, but there is sufficient evidence to suggest that the link between the firms' capital structure and their growth patterns is non-linear and readily understandable by applying traditional econometric methods.

Small Spanish firms present marked differences with respect to their larger counterparts. Studies conducted elsewhere show that small firms tend to be more dependent on internal resources and less reliant on bank loans. Further, small firms are more likely to generate cash flows and trade credit than bank debt. This limitation on their external finances acquires greater relevance with firms in their start-up phase. Thus, young, small firms that are undercapitalized encounter greater barriers when attempting to access finances, in particular long-term bank debt, and they also suffer information problems when seeking to finance their investments.

Our analysis of the effects of financial sources on firm growth indicates that sales growth of small firms are more sensitive to these sources than are those of large firms. The cash flow and short-term bank debt parameters were found to be positive and to decrease as a firm gains higher growth rates. Equity capital offered only moderate elasticity, but a similar coefficient pattern, while long-term bank debt was found to be less sensitive with an increase

being recorded as we moved across the quantile distribution.

In general, small firms are more sensitive than large firms to cash flow. In the case of Spain's small firms, the cash flow parameter was found to fall monotonically with the growth in their sales, but cash flow played a key role in firms that presented moderate growth rates. The equity capital and short-term bank debt parameters recorded a similar evolution. These results highlight the fact that firms with little relative ability to obtain leverage suffer from their limited access to long-term debt, which in turn has a negative impact on firm growth. Specifically, therefore, the corporate capital structure of young, small firms would seem to be biased toward internal sources of finance, which tends to limit their capacity to implement appropriate investment strategies. This restriction has a negative impact on the firms' technological level, and impacts negatively on their productivity and growth.

Equity capital among Spain's manufacturers was found to increase with a firm's age and size. A high percentage of equity among a firm's total financial sources is of great importance, since it eases information problems and eliminates barriers limiting access to bank loans. Further, a high proportion of long-term bank debt among these sources ensures an enhanced financing of its strategic projects. In contrast with a firm's other financial sources, the long-term bank debt shows a rising pattern across the quantile distribution. These results indicate the presence of a positive link between long-term financial sources and a firm's growth.

The implications of our results are, we believe, very clear. While internal cash flow may be indicative of the existence of financial constraints related to a firm's physical investment, its investment policy is not related to its short-term financial sources. It is essential that a new, small firm is able to gain progressive access to collateral equity, via owners and venture funds, so as to increase the amount of equity as a share of its overall financial funds. As a firm increases its equity capital, the barriers hindering access to bank loans progressively disappear and the firm encounters the optimum conditions for taking greater risks and implementing more ambitious projects. Likewise, access to external funds, in particular long-term debt, should guarantee that Spanish manufacturing firms are able to increase their capitalization and raise their levels of productivity. We believe our results to have important implications and policy makers should be made aware of them.

7 References

- Acs, Z.J. (1999). Are Small Firms Important? Their Role and Impact, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Aghion, P., Fally, T., & Scarpetta, S. (2007a). Credit Constraints as a Barrier to the Entry and Post-Entry Growth of Firms. *Economic Policy*, 22(52), 731-790.
- Aghion, P., Angeletos, G., Banerjee, A., & Manova, K. (2007b). Volatility and Growth: Credit Constraints and Productivity-Enhancing Investment, unpublished manuscript.
- Almeida, H., Campello, M., & Weisbach, M. S. (2004). The Cash Flow Sensitivity of Cash. *The Journal of Finance*, 59(4), 1777-1804.
- Almeida, H., & Campello, M. (2007). Financial Constraints, Asset Tangibility, and Corporate Investment. *Review of Financial Studies*, 20(5), 1429-1460.
- Alti, A. (2003). How Sensitive Is Investment to Cash Flow when Financing Is Frictionless?. *The Journal of Finance*, 58(2), 707-722.
- Angelini, P., & Generale, A. (2008). On the Evolution of Firm Size Distributions. *The American Economic Review*, 98(1), 426-438.
- Audretsch, D. B., Thurik, R., Verheul, I., & Wennekers, S. (eds.) (2002). *Entrepreneurship: Determinants and Policy in a European-US Comparison*, Boston / Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Audretsch, D. B., & Elston, J.A. (2002). Does Firm Size Matter? Evidence on the Impact of Liquidity Constraints on Firm Investment Behavior in Germany. *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 20 (1), 1-17.
- Audretsch, D. B., & Elston, J.A. (2006). Can Institutional Change Impact High-technology Firm Growth?: Evidence from Germany's Neuer Markt. *Journal of Productivity Analysis*, 25(1-2), 9-23.
- Azevedo, J.P. (2004): GRQREG: Stata module to graph the coefficients of a quantile regression. Statistical Software Components S437001, Boston College (2006). <http://econpapers.repec.org/software/bocbocode/s437001.htm>
- Barnea, A., Haugen, R.A., & Senbet, L.M. (1980). A Rationale for Debt Maturity Structure and Call Provisions in the Agency Theoretic Framework. *Journal of Finance*, 35(5), 1223-1234.
- Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Maksimovic, V. (2005). Financial and Legal Constraints to Growth: Does Firm Size Matter?. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 30(11), 2931-2943.
- Beck, T., & Demirgüç-Kunt, A. (2006). Small and Medium-Size Enterprises: Access

- to Finance as a Growth Constraint. *The Journal of Finance*, 60(1), 137-177.
- Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., Laeven, L., & Maksimovic, V. (2006). The Determinants of Financing Obstacles. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 25(6), 932-952.
- Bencivenga, V.R., Smith, B.D., & Starr, R.M. (1995). Transaction Costs, Technology Choice, and Endogenous growth. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 67 (1), 153-177.
- Berger, A.N., & Udell, G.F. (1998). The Economics of Small Business Finance: The Roles of Private Equity and Debt Markets in the Financial Growth Cycle. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 22(6-8), 613-673.
- Bhaird, C., & Lucey, B. (2010). Determinants of Capital Structure in Irish SMEs, *Small Business Economics*, 35(3), 357-375.
- Brick, I., & Ravid, A. (1985). On the Relevance of Debt Maturity Structure. *Journal of Finance*, 40(5), 1423-1437.
- Brito, P., & Mello, A.S. (1995). Financial Constraints and Firm Post-Entry Performance, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 13(4), 543-565.
- Cabral, L. M. B., & Mata, J. (2003). On the Evolution of the Firm Size Distribution: Facts and Theory. *The American Economic Review*, 93(4), 1075-1090.
- Carpenter, R. E., & Petersen, B.C. (2002). Is the Growth of Small Firms Constrained by Internal Finance?. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 84(2), 298-309.
- Cleary, S. (1999). The Relationship Between Firm Investment and Financial Status. *The Journal of Finance*, 54(2), 673-692.
- Cleary, S. (2006). International Corporate Investment and the Relationships Between Financial Constraint Measures. *The Journal of Banking & Finance*, 30(5), 1559-80.
- Clementi, G.L., & Hopenhayn, H.A. (2006). A Theory of Financing Constraints and Firm Dynamics. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 121 (2), 229-265.
- Coad, A. (2007). Testing the Principle of “Growth of the Fitter” : The Relationship Between Profits and Firm Growth. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 18(3), 370-386.
- Coad, A. (2010). Neoclassical vs Evolutionary Theories of Financial Constraints: Critique and Prospectus. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics*, 21(3), 206-218.
- Coad, A., Segarra, A., & Teruel, M. (2010). Like Milk or Wine: Does Firm Performance Improve with Age?. *Papers on Economics and Evolution, Max Planck*

- Institute of Economics, Evolutionary Economics Group*, 2010-06.
- Emery, G.W. (2001). Cyclical Demand and Choice of Debt Maturity. *Journal of Business*, 74(2), 557-590.
- Esperanca, J.P., Gama, A.P.M., & Gulmhussen, M.A. (2003). Corporate Debt Policy of Small Firms: An empirical (Re)examination. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 10(1), 62-80.
- Fagiolo, G., & Luzzi, A. (2006). Do Liquidity Constraints Matter in Explaining Firm Size and Growth? Some Evidence from the Italian Manufacturing Industry. *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 15(1), 1-39.
- Fama, E.F. (1985). What's Different about Banks?. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 15(1), 29-39.
- Fazzari, S.M., Hubbard, R.G., & Petersen, B.C. (1988). Financing Constraints and Corporate Investment. *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, 1988(1), 141-206.
- Flannery, M.J. (1986). Asymmetric Information and Risky Debt Maturity Choice. *Journal of Finance*, 41(1), 19-37.
- García-Teruel, P.J., & Martínez-Solano, P. (2007). Short-term Debt in Spanish SMEs. *International Small Business Journal*, 25(6), 579-602.
- Gatti, R., & Love, I. (2008). Does Access to Credit Improve Productivity? Evidence from Bulgarian Firms. CEPR working paper N. 6676 (London: Centre for Economic Policy Research).
- Gilchrist, S., & Himmelberg, C.P. (1995). Evidence on the Role of Cash Flow for Investment. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 36(3), 541-572.
- Himmelberg, C., & Petersen, B. (1994). R&D and Internal Finance: A Panel Study of Small Firms in High-tech Industries. *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 76(1), 38-51.
- Hutchinson, J., & Xavier, A. (2006). Comparing the Impact of Credit Constraints on the Growth of SMEs in a Transition Country with an Established Market Economy. *Small Business Economics*, 27(2), 169-179.
- Hyytinen, A., & Toivanen, O. (2005). Do Financial Constraints Hold Back Innovation and Growth? Evidence on the Role of Public Policy. *Research Policy*, 34(9), 1385-1403.
- Kale, J.R., & Noe, T.H. (1990). Risky Debt Maturity Choice in a Sequential Game Equilibrium. *Journal of Financial Research*, 13(2), 155-165.
- Kaplan, S.N., & Zingales, L. (1997). Do Investment-Cash Flow Sensitivities Provide Useful Measures of Financing Constraints?. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*,

- 112(1), 169-215.
- Kaplan, S.N., & Zingales, L. (2000). Investment-Cash Flow Sensitivities are not Valid Measures of Financing Constraints. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 115(2), 707-712.
- Kim, C.S., Mauer, D., & Sherman, A.E. (1998). The Determinants of Corporate Liquidity: Theory and Evidence. *Journal of Financial and Quantitative Analysis*, 33(3), 335-359.
- King, R. G., & Levine, R. (1993a). Financial Intermediation and Economic Development. in C. Mayer and X. Vives, (eds.): *Capital Markets and Financial Intermediation*. London: Centre for Economic Policy Research, 156-89.
- King, R. G., & Levine, R. (1993b). Finance and Growth: Schumpeter Might Be Right. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 108(3), 717-737.
- King, R. G., & Levine, R. (1993c). Finance, Entrepreneurship, and Growth: Theory and Evidence. *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 32(3), 513-42.
- Koenker, R., & Bassett, G. (1978). Regression Quantiles. *Econometrica*, 46(1), 33-50.
- Koenker, R., & Hallock, K.F. (2001). Quantile Regression. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 15(4), 143-156.
- Lang, L., Ofek, E., & Stulz, R.E.M. (1996). Leverage, Investment, and Firm Growth. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 40(1), 3-29.
- Levine, R. (1991). Stock Markets, Growth, and Tax Policy. *The Journal of Finance*, 46(4), 1445-1465.
- Love, I. (2003). Financial Development and Financing Constraints: International Evidence from the Structural Investment Model. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 16(3), 765-791.
- Magri, S. (2009). The Financing of Small Innovative Firms: the Italian Case. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 18 (2), 181-204.
- MacMahon, R. (2003). An Explanatory Study of Under and Over Investment Amongst Manufacturing SMEs from Australia's Business Longitudinal Survey. *International Small Business Journal*, 21(1), 29-53.
- Mohnen, P., Palm, F.C., Loeff, S. S., & Tiwari, A. (2008). Financial Constraints and Other Obstacles: Are they a Threat to Innovation Activity?. *De Economist*, 156(2), 201-214.
- Müller, E., & Zimmermann, V. (2008). The Importance of Equity Finance for R&D activity. *Small Business Economics*, 33(3), 303-318.
- Musso, P., & Schiavo, S. (2008). The Impact of Financial Constraints on Firm

- Survival and Growth. *Journal of Evolutionary Economics*, 18(2), 135-149.
- Myers, S.C. (1977). Determinants of Corporate Borrowing. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 5(2), 147-175.
- Myers, S.C., & Majluf, N. (1984). Corporate Investment and Financing Decisions when Firms Have Information that Investors Do not Have. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 13(2), 187-221.
- Nucci, F., Pozzolo, A., & Schivardi, F. (2004). Is Firm's Productivity Related to its Financial Structure? Evidence from Microeconomic Data. unpublished working paper.
- Oliveira, B., & Fortunato, A. (2006). Firm Growth and Liquidity Constraints: A Dynamic Analysis. *Small Business Economics*, 27(2-3), 139-156.
- Petersen, M., & Rajan, R. (1994). The Benefits of Firm-Creditor Relationships: Evidence from Small Business Data. *Journal of Finance*, 49(1), 3-37.
- Rajan, R.G., & Zingales, L. (1988). Financial Dependence and Growth. *The American Economic Review*, 88(3), 559-586.
- Rajan, R.G., & Zingales, L. (1995). What Do We Know about Capital Structure? Some Evidence from International Data. *Journal of Finance*, 50(5), 1421-1460.
- Savignac, F. (2008). The Impact of Financial Constraints on Innovation: What Can Be Learned from a Direct Measure?. *Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, 17(6), 553-569.
- Schiffer, M., & Weder, B. (2001). Firm Size and the Business Environment: Worldwide Survey Results. Discussion Paper No. 43, International Finance Corporation, Washington, DC.
- Winker, P. (1999). Causes and Effects of Financing Constraints at the Firm Level. *Small Business Economics*, 12(2), 169-181.