Financial Constraints and Firms' Investment: Results of a Natural Experiment Measuring Firm Response to Power Interruption*

Jevgenijs Steinbuks†

Department of Economics, University of Cambridge

August 10, 2008

*The author would like to thank Anthony Yezer, Shahe Emran, Bill Even, Vivien Foster, Mary Hallward-Driemeier, Roberto Samaniego, Ilya Shvartsman, and seminar participants at the George Washington University, Miami University, University of Cambridge, the World Bank, and the 2008 International Conference on Economic Development in Africa at the University of Oxford for useful comments. All remaining errors are mine.

†js782@cam.ac.uk

Abstract

This study uses the observed differences between public system failures and private investment as a natural experiment to reveal the effect of financing constraints on firms' ability to substitute specifically for deficient public services and more generally to acquired complementary capital. The analysis of the firm-level data from Sub-Saharan Africa shows that, controlling for other factors, firms with a better access to credit are also more likely to invest into private substitutes when public services are deficient. Consistent with the predictions of the theoretical model these findings indicate that financing constraints have a significant impact on firms' ability to deal with poor public capital.

JEL Classification: D92, H54, O16.

Keywords: Financing Constraints, Complementary Capital, Natural Experiment, Sub-Saharan Africa

1 Introduction

Financing constraints is an important research subject in the economic literature, which attempts to explain why firms do not undertake profit-maximizing investment, i.e. why they do not expand their capital stock if marginal return to capital is above the market interest rate.[1] Credit constraints now figure prominently in macroeconomic analysis, and there is a strong evidence from cross-country regressions that underdeveloped financial systems are associated with poor investment and growth.[2] The microeconomic evidence, especially from the developing country data, remains limited. Establishing evidence of credit constraints from microeconomic data is difficult, because measuring the return to capital is complicated by unobserved factors such as entrepreneurial ability and demand shocks, which are likely to be correlated with capital stock.

This study uses the observed differences between public system failure and private investment as a natural experiment to reveal the effect of financing constraints on firms' ability to substitute specifically for deficient public services and more generally to acquired complementary capital. The complementary capital is defined as as capital that provides support services necessary for the operation of productive private capital (e.g., transport infrastructure, such as roads, ports, and railways; or utilities, such as electricity, water, and telephone).[3] Abundant complementary capital improves firms' productivity and is essential for economic growth.[4]

Frequent disruptions in infrastructure generate excess demand for complementary capital by firms and households in most developing countries.[5] On the other hand, increasing the supply of complementary capital remains a difficult task. The public sector, the largest contributor to the financing of infrastructure is constrained by the fiscal adjustment programs, and decentralization resulting in mismatches between resources and needs. Official development assistance (ODA), traditionally the second largest source of infrastructure financing, started to decline in the 1990s with the greater hope for a large private sector contribution. The private sector contributions to complementary capital financing have been growing, but its success is hampered by the cost of doing business in developing countries, which has been much higher than expected.[6]

Given these difficulties in increasing the supply of complementary capital, how can the private sector cope with this problem? Reinikka and Svensson (2002) have shown that firms can partially mitigate the problem and substitute for deficient public services by investing in complementary capital themselves.[7] The

[1] See Hubbard (1998).

[2] See e.g. King and Levine (1993), Rajan and Zingales (1998), and Beck, Levine and Loayaza (2000).

[3] Reinikka and Svensson (2002, p. 53)

[4] See Calderon and Serven (2004), and Dollar, Hallward-Driemeier, and Mengistae (2005).

[5] See Briceno-Garmendia, Estache, and Shafik (2004) for rough estimates of desired and actual investment in complementary capital.

[6] Estache (2004, p.9)

[7] The conclusions of Reinikka and Svensson (2002) are based from the microeconomic evidence on the quality of power supply from public grid and private investment in electric power generators in Uganda. Foster and Steinbuks (2007) provide more general evidence from the regression analysis on 24 African countries, which demonstrates that though power outages are significant in explaining firms' generator ownership.

loss to the economy is the difference between the marginal gains to public and private complementary capital. An important implication of this finding is that larger adverse supply shocks to complementary capital are associated with larger demand for private investment in complementary capital.

Supply shocks to complementary capital are typically uncorrelated with firms' entrepreneurial ability. This is because poor infrastructure, including power shortages, bad roads, inadequate water and sanitation, and unreliable communications is the outcome of public policies not firms' decisions. This study exploits these exogenous shocks to identify the effect of financing constraints on firms' investment in complementary capital.

The analysis focuses on the natural experiment created by the firm's decision to invest in electric power generator. First, a theoretical model is developed to derive profit maximizing conditions of a risk-neutral firm choosing whether to acquire a private generator to hedge against unreliable public power supply. The model predicts that financing constraints will reduce firm's expected return from the generator. Thus, holding other things constant, firms with better access to credit will be more likely to install the generator if the power outages are frequent.

The predictions of the theoretical model are then tested empirically on firm-level data from Sub-Saharan African countries. Endogenous switching regression and the difference-in-differences methods are used to obtain consistent estimates and overcome the measurement and the identification problems. The results show that firms with better access to credit are more likely to own a private generator in the areas where public power supply is unreliable. Also, the firms are more likely to respond to the power outage shocks and privately install generators if they operate in the countries with more developed financial systems or during the periods of rapid domestic credit growth. Consistent with the predictions of the theoretical model, these findings suggest that financing constraints can significantly restrain firms' ability to find a replacement for a deficient public capital.

The rest of this study is organized as follows. The first section reviews the existing literature. The second section presents a theoretical model, which attempts to explain the impact of financing constraints on firm's choice of electric generator. The third and fourth sections discuss data and stochastic specification. The fifth section presents findings based on the analysis of the World Bank enterprise survey data. The last section outlines main conclusions of this study.

2 Literature Review

The influence of credit constraints on manufacturing firms is evident based on economic theory[8] and has been linked in the empirical literature to economic development.[9] Many theoretical models incorporate financing

[8] For a detailed survey, see Hubbard (1998)

[9] See King and Levine (1993), and Rajan and Zingales (1998), and Beck, Levine and Loayaza (2000).

constraints based on information problems (adverse selection and moral hazard).[10] Other theoretical models explore financial constraints in the context of 'enforcement' problems (e.g. ability to seize collateral).[11] More recent theoretical papers[12] also view financing constraints from the perspective of the literature on industry dynamics.

The central challenge in the empirical work on financing constraints is to estimate consistently their effects on firms' performance indicators, such as growth, output, returns to capital, and investment. This task appears to be complicated. First, a firm's financing constraints are difficult to measure, especially in the context of unreliable developing country data. Second, both financing constraints and performance indicators are likely to be correlated with entrepreneurial ability, which is typically unobservable to the econometrician. As a result, omitted variables bias will render ordinary least squares regression estimates biased and inconsistent. The empirical literature provides several approaches to address these challenges.

The first approach, suggested by Fazzari, Hubbard and Petersen (1988) relies on Tobin's q theory of investment and tests for the sensitivity of firm investment to cash flows.[13] The intuition of this approach is as follows. Modigliani and Miller (1958) have shown that, in perfect financial markets, a firm's investment should only respond to its investment growth opportunities (measured by marginal Tobin's q). Indicators of the availability of internal funds, such as cash flow, should not affect the firm's investment. Therefore, a significant coefficient on the measure of the cash flow in an investment equation may indicate the presence of financial market imperfections.

Because cash flow may be correlated with investment for other reasons, for example it may predict future profitability[14], Fazzari, Hubbard, and Petersen (1988) implement cash flow tests separately for firms that are likely to be more constrained and firms that are likely to be less constrained.[15] Their results show large and significant positive coefficients on cash flows coefficients for for firms that are likely to be more constrained, and interpret this finding as an evidence of financing constraints. More recent applications of the cash flows test rely on simulation based econometrics. Instead of estimating reduced form investment equations, this method develops and calibrates a dynamic model of firm-level investment and then estimates it using econometric simulation techniques.[16] The recent examples of this approach include Alti (2003), Moyen (2004), Bond and Soderbom (2006), and Schundeln (2007).

The key criticisms of cash-flow tests are that the proposed solution to estimate separate models for different classes of firms does not resolve endogeneity between cash-flows and investment, and that the investment

[10] These models follow Jaffe and Russell (1976), and Stiglitz and Weiss (1981). For a survey of application of these models in the development economics literature, see Banerjee (2001).

[11] See e.g. Aghion and Bolton (1992), and Hart and Moore (1994, 1998).

[12] Gomes (2001), Quadrini (2003), Clementi and Hopenhayn (2006).

[13] A close alternative to this approach suggested by Bond and Meghir (1994) is based on Euler equations.

[14] See Schiantarelli (1996)

[15] The economic literature suggests different criteria to sort out firms into "more constrained" and "less constrained" categories. Fazzari, Hubbard and Petersen (1988) group firms according to their deposit retention ratios. Nabi (1989) distinguishes between firms, which borrow in formal and informal markets. Kaplan and Zingales (1997) propose an index of financing constraints based on the predictions from an ordered logit regression.

[16] For a survey of simulation based econometric methods see Gourieroux and Monfort (1996).

equations based on Tobin's q theory of investment are not valid if Modigliani and Miller (1958) assumptions are not satisfied.[17] For the investment equations based approach, it is difficult to obtain measures of average q and cash flows, in particular in the context of developing countries, because market value of the firm is not observed.[18] Also, the accounting information provided by the firms in developing countries (especially small and microenterprises) is subject to serious measurement errors.[19] Due to these errors the average q might be a poor proxy for marginal q, which is usually unobserved.[20] This test also requires sufficiently long data panels, which are typically unavailable.[21] As regards simulation based econometric methods, although they allow researchers to estimate very rich models of firm behavior, they still face similar identification and measurements problems, which make them very difficult to apply on developing country data.[22]

The second approach looks at direct evidence for constraints by analyzing survey data. For example, Bigsten, Collier, Dercon *et al* (2003) estimate the determinants of demand for external formal funds (i.e. bank loans) in Sub-Saharan Africa explicitly using a selection model. Their results suggest that access to finance is greater for larger and more profitable firms. Beck, Demirguc-Kunt, and Maksimovic (2005) assess the importance of financing obstacles, using survey evidence on each firm's ordinal ratings on how problematic specific financing issues are for the operation and growth of their business.

The limitation of the analysis based on the survey data is that it relies on strong assumptions about the relationship between a firm's perceptions and its true credit demand. For example, a firm that does not apply for a bank loan because "the interest rate is too high" may be constrained or simply unproductive relative to the prevailing market interest rate. Firms perceptions are also subject to serious measurement errors. For example, strongly negative assessment of financing constraints can reflect the complaints of overly pessimistic managers, not the true financial position of the firm.[23]

The approach undertaken in this paper is related to studies that use the stock market, financial intermediaries, or enterprise survey data to find randomized evaluations[24] and natural experiments[25] that directly

[17] See also the debate about whether this method is valid in Kaplan and Zingales (1997, 2000) and Fazzari, Hubbard, and Petersen (2000). Cooper and Ejarque (2003) demonstrate that in standard "Q-regressions" the coefficient on cash flow can be positive, although there are no capital market imperfections, if firms have market power as sellers. Strebulaev (2007) shows that the tests of capital structure may fail if firms' capital adjustments are infrequent.

[18] Rajan and Zingales (1998) attempt to overcome this problem by using U.S. firm information and assuming that the behaviour of the firms in other countries is similar to that of the U.S. firms in the same industry.

[19] See de Mel, McKenzie, and Woodruff (2007a).

[20] Erickson and Whited (2000) attempt to remedy this problem by constructing appropriate Generalized Method of Moments estimator.

[21] This is especially important for Euler equations approach (see footnote 13). Love (2003) implemented the Euler equations based approach on the developing country data, and showed that the sensitivity of investment to cash flow depends negatively on financial development.

[22] Schundeln (2007) attempts to resolve endogeneity between cash-flows and investment by simultaneously modeling the real side and the financial side of the firm, in a manner that allows identification of investment opportunities of a firm separately from determinants of the cost of credit, which is unobserved in the data, and alternative reasons for low investment that are common to all firms, as for example adjustment costs.

[23] Love and Mylenko (2003) attempt to solve this problem, by controlling for each manager's general perceptions of other (non-financial) constraints. They argue that a manager who answers most of questions on any type of constraint negatively will be more likely to report major financing constraints.

[24] For a survey of randomization methods in the development economics, see Duflo, Glennerster, and Kremer (2007).

[25] For a survey of natural experiments in economics, see Meyer (1995). Though well known before, their widespread use is frequently attributed to a series of influential papers by Steven Levitt and Jeff Grogger, see e.g. Bronars and Grogger (1994), Levitt (1997), and Duggan and Levitt (2002).

identify credit constraints. The advantage of the approach used in this study is that it exploits an exogenous shock uncorrelated with entrepreneurial activity and provides an unbiased estimate of the treatment effect under the assumption that absent the treatment outcomes for financially constrained and unconstrained firms would have followed parallel trends. Another advantage of this approach is that it makes use of relatively simple information provided by firms, and thus it is less prone to the measurement error.

A well known example in the economic literature illustrating this approach is a study by Banerjee and Duflo (2004), which investigates the nature of credit constraints' by looking at the credit allocation rules of a particular (state owned) Indian bank. They exploit a change in government preferential lending rules to investigate whether firms would like to obtain more credit at the going interest rate than they can actually obtain. Banerjee and Duflo (2004) find that directed credit was used to finance more production - not to substitute for other forms of credit, and conclude that many of the firms must have been severely credit constrained.

Other examples of this approach include related papers by Cull, McKenzie, and Woodruff (2007), and de Mel, McKenzie, and Woodruff (2007b), which use a randomized experiment to measure the return to capital for the average microenterprise in their sample, regardless of whether they apply for credit. They accomplish this by providing cash and equipment grants to small firms in Sri Lanka and Mexico, and measuring the increase in profits arising from this exogenous (positive) shock to capital stock. After controlling for possible spillover effects, the shock is found to generate large increase in the average real return to capital relative to prevailing market interest rate. These studies interpret the increase in returns to capital as an evidence of missing credit markets.

3 Theoretical Model

A simple two-period model is presented below to guide the empirical specification. The objective is to show how financial constraints influence a firm's decisions to invest privately in capital. The salient features of the model are the assumptions that firms can (partly) cope with deficient public capital, but that it is costly to do so, and that the cost of financing of the investment in private capital increases with the degree of financial market imperfections.

3.1 Model Setup

This model adapts the analytical framework developed by Reinikka and Swensson (2002).[26] A risk-neutral firm has to decide whether to make a capital investment $i > 0$. Investment is productive with a one-period

[26] The model of Reinikka and Swensson (2002) investigates firm's decision to install an electric generator in the absence of financing constraints.

lag. The opportunity cost of capital is $c(i)$, with $c(0) = 0$, $c_i > 0$ and $c_{ii} > 0$, where lower subscripts denote first and second derivatives. The return to i depends (partly) on the power supply, which is either publicly provided or provided by the firms itself. There is uncertainty about the availability and quality of publicly provided electricity supply. Firms can (partly) insure against this uncertainty by investing in complementary capital (e.g., own a generator). However, there is a fixed cost $k > 0$ of doing so.[27] A firm that has installed an electric generator can ensure a return $(1 + r)i$, where $r > 0$ is a fixed return on investment. When the power supply is perfectly reliable, the return is also $(1 + r)i$, while if it is not available (or of poor quality), the return is $\mu(1 + r)i$, where $0 < \mu < 1$.

Financing constraints are introduced from the model of Kaplan and Zingales (1997). Investment i and the cost of a generator k can be financed either with internal funds (W) or with external funds (E). The cost of internal funds equals the opportunity cost of capital, $c(i)$, which is the rate of return the owners of the firm could get by investing outside the firm. Because of financial market imperfections, it is assumed that the use of external funds generates an additional cost. The reduced form of this cost function is represented by $g(E, \theta)$, where θ is an unobservable measure of a firm's wedge between the internal and the external costs of funds, which reflects the extent of agency or information problems.[28] It is assumed that the total cost of raising external funds is convex in the amount of funds raised and it increases in θ $(g(0, \theta) = g(E, 0) = 0$, $g_E > 0$, $g_{EE} > 0$, $g_\theta > 0)$.[29] For the model to be well behaved, it is also assumed that cross-partial derivative of the total cost of raising external funds with respect to the amount of funds raised and the extent of the agency or information problems is positive $(g_{E\theta} > 0)$.[30]

At the time of the investment in a generator, the conditions under which production takes place are unknown. Specifically, the timing of events is as follows. Initially, in the start of Period 1, the firms obtain information about the availability (and quality) of public power supply. This information can be used to derive a probability that power supply will be available (and of good quality). To simplify, it is assumed that there are only two possible outcomes: power supply is available with a probability p, and unavailable (or of very poor quality) with a probability $1 - p$. This variation is partly due to large differences in the priority attached to power lines, but also to local geographical (e.g., distance to nearest voltage connection) and political conditions in Period 1.[31] With this *ex ante* information given, each firm makes a decision whether

[27] Earlier empirical work, e.g. Bental and Ravid (1982), finds that adding electric generator capacity has two main cost components: a fixed installation cost and an operating cost. These costs are typically higher than that of public supply. The operating cost is captured in k as a present value of running costs in period 2. There is also a second-order effect of the size of investment size on k because of increasing returns to scale in electric power generation. Reinikka and Svensson (2002, p. 55) however note that this second-order effect is small, and this assumption "seems like a reasonable first approximation."

[28] Kaplan and Zingales (1997, p. 174) point out that existing measures of financing constraints discussed in the literature (e.g. cash-flows sensitivities, firms' perceptions, or institutional quality indexes) can be thought of as different proxies for unobservable θ.

[29] Kaplan and Zingales (1997) note that this assumption is reasonable but might not be warranted if the average transaction costs decline with loan amount. Also, see Calomiris and Himmelberg (1995).

[30] This assumption implies that the amount of funds rised and the degree of agency problems are complementary in rising the cost of external funds. Thus, the cost of external funds increases faster in the amount of funds rised in presence of agency problems. This is consistent with theory of credit supply under asymmetric information. For example, in Jaffee and Russell's (1976) model, the slope of credit supply function becomes steeper in the degree of default distribution, which, in turn, captures agency problems.

[31] For more discussion on that subject see Reinikka and Svensson (2002), and Svensson (2000).

or not to acquire an electric generator. In Period 2, the outcome is realized and production with or without the newly installed capital takes place.

3.2 Equilibrium with no Financial Constraints

First, let us consider the case in which financial constraints are not binding. In this case the firm has either sufficient internal funds to finance investments ($W > i + k$) or has access to perfect capital markets ($g(E, \theta) = 0$). The problem can then be solved by working backwards. At the end of Period 2, two possible histories need to be considered:

1. The firm invests in a generator, and therefore ensures a return $(1 + r)i$. In this case the investor's problem can formally be stated as

$$\underset{i}{max}\ (1 + r)i - c\,(i + k) \tag{1}$$

The optimal investment rate following this history, denoted by i_1 is equal to

$$i_1(r, k) = c_i^{-1}\,(1 + r) - k \tag{2}$$

2. The firm does not invest in a generator, and has expected return of $\psi(1+r)i$, where $\psi = p+\mu(1-p)$. In this case the investor's problem becomes

$$\underset{i}{max}\ = \psi(1 + r)i - c\,(i) \tag{3}$$

The optimal investment rate following this history, denoted by i_2 is equal to

$$i_2(r, p) = c_i^{-1}\,[\psi\,(1 + r)] \tag{4}$$

At the end of period 1, each firm makes a decision whether or not to install private power, taking into account the investment functions (2) and (4). The optimal choice depends on the initial information of the availability (and quality) of publicly provided complementary capital. The condition for installing a generator at the end of period 1 is:

$$(1 + r)i_1 - c\,(i_1 + k) \geq \psi(1 + r)i_2 - c\,(i_2) \tag{5}$$

The left-hand side of the equation (5) is the expected return if the firm installs a generator. The right-hand side is the expected return if the firm chooses to rely solely on the public power supply. The main result of the preceding analysis is summarized below.

Proposition 1 *If a financially unconstrained firm's losses from power outages are high compared to the fixed cost of an electric generator, then (1) there exists a unique* p^* *defined on a convex compact set* $I \subset [0,1]$*, such that (5) holds as an equality, and (2) firms will always choose to install a generator if the reliability of public power supply is less than* p^**.*

Proof. The equation (5) can be rearranged to define the net expected return from a generator

$$f(p) = (1+r)i_1 - c\,(i_1 + k) - \psi(1+r)i_2 + c\,(i_2) : \mathbb{R} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}, \tag{6}$$

which is a continuous function on the $I \subset [0,1]$. A rational profit maximizing firm will always choose to install a generator if $f(p) > 0$. Let $p' = 0$ and $p'' = 1$. Using the results (2) and (4) in (6) and rearranging terms gives

$$f(p') = (1+r)\left[c_i^{-1}(1+r)\right] - \mu(1+r)[c_i^{-1}\{\mu(1+r)\}] - c\left[c_i^{-1}(1+r)\right] + c\left[c_i^{-1}\{\mu(1+r)\}\right] - (1+r)k, \tag{7}$$

and

$$f(p'') = -(1+r)k \tag{8}$$

It can be seen from equation (8) that $f(p'') < 0$. The sign of $f(p')$ depends on parameters μ and k. Differentiating (7) with respect to μ (using the chain rule) and k gives

$$\frac{\partial f(p')}{\partial \mu} = -(1+r)[c_i^{-1}\{\mu(1+r)\}] < 0 \tag{9}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial f(p')}{\partial k} = -(1+r) < 0 \tag{10}$$

It thus follows from (9) and (10) that $f(p') > 0$ only if the firm's losses from power outages are relatively high compared to the fixed cost of generator (e.g. both μ and k are sufficiently small[32]). If $f(p') > 0$ then, by the intermediate-value theorem there exists at least one point p^* lying between p' and p'', such that $f(p^*) = 0$. Because $f'(p) = -(1-\mu)(1+r)i_2 < 0$, the function $f(p)$ is monotonically decreasing in p, and hence the solution $f(p^*) = 0$ is unique, which proves first part of the proposition. The firms choose to have electric generator if the net expected return on $f(p)$ is positive, which is true $\forall\ p \in [0, p^*)$ (e.g. where the reliability of public power supply is sufficiently low), which proves second part of the proposition. ■

[32] It can be easily verified that if $\mu = 1$ then $f(p') = -(1+r)k < 0$.

3.3 Equilibrium with Financial Constraints

Now, let us consider the case in which financial constraints are binding. In this case the firm does not have sufficient internal funds to finance investments ($W < i + k$) and has access to imperfect capital markets ($g(E, \theta) > 0$). The problem can still be solved in a similar way as the previous section. At the end of period 2, there are the same two possible outcomes:

1. The firm invests in a generator, and therefore can ensure a return $(1 + r)i$. In this case the investor's problem can formally be stated as

$$\underset{i}{max}\ (1 + r)i - c(i + k) - g(E, \theta), \text{ such that } i + k = W + E \tag{11}$$

which can be rewritten in the unconstrained form as

$$\underset{i}{max}\ (1 + r)i - c(i + k) - g(i + k - W, \theta) \tag{6a}$$

The first order condition for the problem is

$$(1 + r) - c_i\,(i + k) - g_i(i + k - W, \theta) = 0 \tag{12}$$

Let $i_1'\,(r, k, W, \theta) = \arg\max\limits_{i}\ (1+r)i - c(i+k) - g(i+k-W, \theta)$ be the optimal investment by the financially constrained firm, which solves equation (12). The effects of the rate of return, cost of generator, availability of internal finance, and financial market imperfections on the size of optimal investment can be obtained by implicit differentiation:

$$\frac{di_1'}{dr} = \frac{1}{c_{ii} + g_{ii}} > 0, \tag{13}$$

$$\frac{di_1'}{dk} = -\frac{c_{ik} + g_{ik}}{c_{ii} + g_{ii}} < 0, \tag{14}$$

$$\frac{di_1'}{dW} = \frac{g_{iw}}{c_{ii} + g_{ii}} > 0, \tag{15}$$

and

$$\frac{di_1'}{d\theta} = -\frac{g_{i\theta}}{c_{ii} + g_{ii}} < 0. \tag{16}$$

The optimal investment thus increases in the rate of return and the availability of internal finance, and decreases in cost of generator and the degree of financial market imperfections.

2. The firm does not invest in a generator, and expected return is $\psi(1+r)i$, where $\psi = p + \mu(1-p)$. In this case the investor's problem in the unconstrained form becomes

$$\underset{i}{max}\ \psi(1+r)i - c\,(i) - g(i - W, \theta) \tag{17}$$

The first order condition for the problem is

$$\psi(1+r) - c_i\,(i) - g_i(i - W, \theta) = 0 \tag{18}$$

Let $i_2'\,(\psi, r, W, \theta) = \arg\max_i\ \psi(1+r)i - c(i) - g(i - W, \theta)$ be the optimal investment by the financially constrained firm, which solves the equation (18). It is straightforward to show that, as in the case discussed above, optimal investment increases in the rate of return and the availability of internal finance, and decreases in the degree of financial market imperfections. The effect of the power supply reliability on the size of optimal investment can be obtained by implicit differentiation:

$$\frac{di_2'}{dp} = \frac{1-\mu}{c_{ii} + g_{ii}} > 0. \tag{19}$$

Optimal investment thus increases in the reliability of power supply. Similarly to analysis in the previous section the condition for installing electric generator at the end of period 1 is

$$(1+r)i_1' - c\,(i_1' + k) - g(i_1' + k - W, \theta) \geq \psi(1+r)i_2' - c\,(i_2') - g(i_2' - W, \theta) \tag{20}$$

The results of the preceding analysis can be summarized by the following proposition.

Proposition 2 *If the financially constrained firm's losses from power outages are high compared to the fixed costs of a generator and the financial adjustment costs, (1) there exists a unique p^{**} defined on a convex compact set $I \subset [0,1]$, such that (20) holds as an equality, (2) p^{**} is lower than p^*, holding other things constant, and (3) p^{**} declines with the degree of financial market imperfections θ.*

Proof. The equation (20) can be rearranged to define the net expected return from a generator

$$f(p) = (1+r)i_1' - c\,(i_1' + k) - g(i_1' + k - W, \theta) - \psi(1+r)i_2' + c\,(i_2') + g(i_2' - W, \theta) \tag{21}$$

If $\theta\ = 0$ then equation (21) becomes the equation (6) analyzed in the previous section. The likelihood of reliable power supply that equalizes expected returns from choosing and not choosing a generator is then given by p^*, and the optimal investments are i_1 and i_2.

Now consider a small increase in θ. We know from the result (16) that both i_1 and i_2 decrease but i_1 decreases by a larger amount.[33] Thus, the net expected return from a generator will become negative at p^*.

[33] It follows from the results (2) and (4) that $i_1(p^*) + k > i_2(p^*)$. Because $g(\cdot)$ is monotonically increasing in all arguments,

By the result (10) i_2 increases in p, therefore it should be true that at positive θ, the net expected return from a generator can only increase if p declines, holding other things constant, which proves the second and third parts of the proposition. Because $f(p)$ is monotonic in all arguments, the p^{**} will still be unique. As θ keeps increasing the net expected return from a generator will continue to decline so p^{**} may not exist at very high θ (if the firm is redlined and does not have enough internal resources it may never choose to invest into a private generator), which proves first part of the proposition. ■

Proposition 2 summarizes the main result of the model. Financing constraints reduce a firm's net expected return from a generator, and reduce the likelihood of investment in an electric generator. Thus, holding other things constant, firms with better access to credit are more likely to install a generator if the power outages are frequent. Financially constrained firms invest in a generator only if the quality of public power supply is very low.

Figure 1 illustrates the aforementioned effects by providing the numerical example.[34]



Figure 1

4 Stochastic Specification

The theoretical model developed in the previous section is based on the assumption that a rational profit-maximizing firm will choose to have an electric generator if net expected return (21) is positive. In an empirical model the reduced-form of net expected return from a generator can be written as

$g(i_1(p^*) + k - W, \theta)$ is larger than $g(i_2(p^*) - W, \theta)$. Hence i_1 decreases by more because larger amount will be substracted.

[34] The numerical example is based on the following assumptions, $c(i) = e^i$, $g(E, \theta) = \frac{1}{2}(E\theta)^2$, $r = 0.3$, $W = 0.8$, $\theta_0 = 0$, $\theta_1 = 0.3$, $k = 0.2$, and $\mu = 0.1$. The model was solved in MATLAB v.R2007a.

$$y^*_{it} = X'_{it}\beta + \theta'_{it}\delta + \xi_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (22)$$

where y^*_{it} is the net expected return from a generator for a firm i in time t, X_{it} is a set of explanatory variables, which, as discussed in the previous section, may include reliability of the public power supply, availability of internal funds, cost of a generator, and return on investment, θ_{it} is a proxy for financing constraints, ξ_{it} is unobserved firm's idiosyncratic shock (e.g. entrepreneurial ability), and ε_{it} is the error term. The net expected return from a generator y^*_{it} is an unobservable variable. Instead, we observe

$$\begin{aligned} d_{it} &= 1 \quad \text{if} \quad y^*_{it} > 0, \text{ and} \\ d_{it} &= 0 \quad \text{if} \quad y^*_{it} \leq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where d_{it} is observed firm's investment in a private electric generator.

Based on the theoretical model discussed in the previous section one can formulate the following empirically testable hypothesis to identify the effect of financing constraints on firms' choice of private generator:

Hypothesis 1: The estimated coefficient δ on the proxy for financing constraints θ_{it} in equation (22) will be negative and significant.

The main problem in testing hypothesis 1 is that both the proxy for financing constraints θ_{it} and the firm's observed investment in electric generator d_{it} are correlated with the firm's unobserved idiosyncratic shock ξ_{it}. Therefore probit estimates of (22) are biased and inconsistent. The identifying assumption for consistent estimation of equation (22) is based on the theoretical model presented in the previous section. It follows from the model that both financially constrained and unconstrained firms could make different decisions about investing in a private generator if reliability of public power supply worsens. Yet, though reliability of power supply affects the choice of electric generator, it should not be correlated with firm's idiosyncratic shock.[35] Two econometric approaches that utilize this assumption are discussed below.

4.1 Endogenous Switching Regression Approach

Endogenous switching regression approach discussed by Maddala (1983), and frequently applied in the literature on financing constraints[36], can be expressed as

$$Y^*_{1i} = \alpha_0 + x'_{1i}\beta_1 + Z'_{1i}\gamma + \varepsilon_{1i} \text{ if } d_1 = 0 \quad (24)$$

[35] This happens because reliability of the power supply results from the government's decision to invest in public power infrastructure, which is independent from a firm's investment decision affected by idiosyncratic shocks (e.g. entrepreneurial ability).

[36] See e.g. Nabi (1989), Hu and Schiantarelli (1998), and Lamont, Polk, and Saa-Requejo (2001).

$$Y_{2i}^* = \alpha_0 + x_{2i}'\beta_2 + Z_{2i}'\gamma + \varepsilon_{2i} \text{ if } d_1 = 1 \tag{25}$$

$$Y_{3i}^* = W_i'\alpha + \omega_i \tag{26}$$

$$d_1 = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } Y_{3i}^* > 0, \\ 0 \;\text{ if } Y_{3i}^* \leq 0 \end{cases} \tag{27}$$

In the endogenous switching regression framework the functional form of the net expected return from a private generator (Y_{ji}^*, $j = 1, 2$) is assumed to vary across two regimes ("financially constrained" and "financially unconstrained") as specified by the equations (24) and (25). Both equations share the same set of explanatory variables, which, as explained above, include reliability of power supply (denoted by x_{ji}, $j = 1, 2$) and other factors, such as return on investment, cost of generator, and the firm's observed idiosyncratic factors (denoted by Z_{ji}, $j = 1, 2$). Equation (26) is a selection equation determining which regime applies. The variable Y_{3i}^* is a latent variable representing the cost of choosing external financing over internal financing. We know from the theoretical model that this choice depends on two factors - availability of internal funds (W) and the degree of informational or agency problems (θ).The matrix W_i captures the set of variables related to these factors, which may include firms' borrowing costs, credit demand, and risk, as well as the financial market's institutional characteristics. The variable d_1 is a dummy variable, which takes value of 1 if firm undertakes internal financing, and zero otherwise. In the presence of financial market imperfections external funding is not a perfect substitute for internal finance, therefore d_1 also indicates whether a firm is more or less likely to be financially constrained.

Consistent estimation of the endogenous switching model in our case is complicated because the variables Y_{1i}^* and Y_{2i}^* are unobserved. Instead we observe d_{21} and d_{22} defined as

$$d_{21} = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } Y_{1i}^* > 0, \\ 0 \;\text{ if } Y_{1i}^* \leq 0 \end{cases} \text{ if } d_1 = 0, \text{ and} \tag{28}$$

$$d_{22} = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } Y_{2i}^* > 0, \\ 0 \;\text{ if } Y_{2i}^* \leq 0 \end{cases} \text{ if } d_1 = 1 \tag{29}$$

Kimhi (1999) has shown that in this case the two-stage solution proposed by Maddala will result in biased estimates. The full information maximum likelihood (FIML) estimator, which corrects the bias, results from maximization of the following likelihood function

$$\ln L = \sum \left\{ \begin{array}{c} d_1 \cdot d_{22} \cdot \ln \Phi \left(\frac{W_i \alpha}{\sigma_1}, \frac{X_{2i}\beta_2}{\sigma_{22}}, \rho_2 \right) + \\ +d_1 \cdot (1 - d_{22}) \cdot \ln \Phi \left(\frac{W_i \alpha}{\sigma_1}, -\frac{X_{2i}\beta_2}{\sigma_{22}}, -\rho_2 \right) + \\ +(1 - d_1) \cdot d_{21} \cdot \ln \Phi \left(-\frac{W_i \alpha}{\sigma_1}, \frac{X_{1i}\beta_1}{\sigma_{21}}, -\rho_1 \right) + \\ +(1 - d_1) \cdot (1 - d_{21}) \cdot \ln \Phi \left(-\frac{W_i \alpha}{\sigma_1}, -\frac{X_{1i}\beta_1}{\sigma_{21}}, \rho_1 \right) \end{array} \right\}, \tag{30}$$

where $\Phi(\bullet)$ is cumulative distribution function of a standardized bivariate normal random variable.[37]

As explained above, because the unobserved firm's idiosyncratic shock is uncorrelated with reliability of power supply (e.g. $Cov(x_{ij}, \omega_i) = 0$), maximizing (30) yields consistent estimates of β_1 and β_2.[38] If financial constraints have no effect on the firms' decisions to invest in a generator given their expectations of power outages, then the difference between the estimated coefficients β_1 and β_2 ($\beta_1 \geq \beta_2$) on reliability power supply in the equations (24) and (25) is not statistically significant:

$$\beta_1 - \beta_2 = 0 \tag{31}$$

This inference can be tested by maximizing the likelihood function (30) both subject to the constraint (31) and without this constraint, and then implementing the likelihood ratio test:[39]

$$-2 \ln \frac{\widehat{L}_R}{\widehat{L}_U} \sim \chi^2 [J], \tag{32}$$

where $\widehat{L}_R$ and $\widehat{L}_U$ are the estimates of the restricted and unrestricted likelihood functions, and J is the number of restrictions. The rejection of the hypothesis that the constraint (31) is binding will indicate that financial constraints have effect on the firms' decisions to invest in a generator given their expectations of power outages, and confirm the theoretical model's predictions.

The advantage of the endogenous switching regression approach is that it is possible to estimate simultaneous equations for the firm's investment and financing decisions. It also makes use of more precise cross-sectional data on power outages in local areas, reported at the firm level. The limitation of this approach is that it relies on cross-sectional estimates, and hence stronger assumptions (e.g. positive correlation between current power outages reported by firm and the level of power outages at the time of buying a generator) are needed to identify the model.[40]

4.2 Difference-in-Differences Approach

[37] The likelihood function (30) was maximized in the statistical package STATA v.9.2. using *lf* method. For more details, see Gould, Pitblado, and Sribney (2006).

[38] If financially constrained firms make electric power sharing arrangements with financially unconstrained firms to take advantage of economies of scale in power generation, firm's idiosyncratic shock will be correlated with reliability of power supply, and estimated coefficients will be biased and inconsistent. There is no evidence of such arrangements in the data the hypothesis is tested.

[39] For more details on the likelihood ratio test, see e.g. Greene (2003).

[40] Another complication from the endogenous switching regression approach arises if some firms are located in the areas without access to public power supply, because the firms' decisions to install private generators in this case will be different. This complication is addressed because all firms used in this study indicated they had an access to public grid.

Difference-in-differences approach uses pre-period differences in outcomes between treatment and control groups to control for pre-existing differences between the groups, when data exists both before and after the treatment.[41] To illustrate this approach, let us sort the firms into two groups. Group T is affected by the power outage shocks ("treated") in period 1 and unaffected by power outage shocks ("untreated") in period 0. Group C is never treated. Denote by y_1^T (y_1^C) the realization of firms' decisions to invest in electric generator in period 1 (after the power outages occur), and y_0^T (y_0^C) the realization of firm's decisions to invest in electric generator in period 0 (before the power outages).

The difference-in-differences estimator is given by

$$\widehat{DD} = [\widehat{E}[y_1^T\ |T] - \widehat{E}[y_0^T|T]] - [\widehat{E}[y_1^C|C] - \widehat{E}[y_0^C|C]], \tag{33}$$

and provides an unbiased estimate of the treatment effect under the following assumptions:

1. Treatments are exogenous to time and group fixed effects.[42] This assumption is satisfied because power outage shocks are typically caused by random events, such as draughts, natural disasters, or purposeful (e.g. terrorist) attacks.[43]

2. $[\widehat{E}[y_1^C\ |T] - \widehat{E}[y_0^C|T]] = [\widehat{E}[y_1^C|C] - \widehat{E}[y_0^C|C]]$, i.e., absent the treatment the outcomes in the two groups would have followed parallel trends.[44] This critical assumption is satisfied because the theoretical model discussed in the previous section predicts that in the absence of power outage shocks neither financially unconstrained nor financially constrained firms would invest in a private generator.

Because there is more than one time period and more than one treatment group in the observed data, this study adopts the fixed-effects estimator, which generalizes the difference-in-differences approach. The fixed-effects models estimated in this study are given by

$$\begin{aligned} y_{ijt}^* &= \alpha + \beta_1 \cdot PO_{jt} + \beta_2 \cdot PO_{jt} \cdot FC_j + \delta_j' \beta_3 + x_{ij}' \beta_4 + \varepsilon_{ijt}, \\ & \begin{cases} d_{ijt}^1 = 1 \text{ if } y_{ijt}^* > 0; \\ d_{ijt}^1 = 0 \text{ if } y_{ijt}^* \leq 0; \end{cases} \end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

[41] The discussion in this paragraph closely follows Duflo, Glennerster, and Kremer (2007, pp. 12-13).
[42] See Besley and Case (2000).
[43] The relationship between power outage shocks and the cost of finance could be endogenous if financial institutions respond to power outage shocks by reducing lending to avoid credit losses due to increased output volatility. To test for this possibility the growth of domestic credit to private sector was regressed on the dummy variable for power outages, and a series of country and time dummy variables. Contrary to the endogeneity hypothesis the estimated coefficient was positive and significant.
[44] See Bertrand, Duflo, and Mullainathan (2004).

$$
\begin{aligned}
y^*_{ijt} &= \alpha_i + \gamma'_t\beta_1 + \beta_2 \cdot PO_{jt} \cdot FC_{jt} + \delta'_j\beta_3 + x'_{ij}\beta_4 + \varepsilon_{ijt}, \\
& \begin{cases} d^2_{ijt} = 1 \text{ if } y^*_{ijt} > 0; \\ d^2_{ijt} = 0 \text{ if } y^*_{ijt} \leq 0; \end{cases}
\end{aligned} \tag{35}
$$

and

$$
\begin{aligned}
y^*_{ijt} &= \alpha + \beta_2 \cdot FC_{jt} + \delta'_j\beta_3 + x'_{ij}\beta_4 + \varepsilon_{ijt}, \\
& \begin{cases} d^3_{ijt} = 3 \text{ if } \mu_2 < y^*_{ijt}; \\ d^3_{ijt} = 2 \text{ if } \mu_1 < y^*_{ijt} \leq \mu_2; \\ d^3_{ijt} = 1 \text{ if } 0 < \ y^*_{ijt} \leq \mu_1; \\ d^3_{ijt} = 0 \text{ if } y^*_{ijt} \leq 0; \end{cases} .
\end{aligned} \tag{36}
$$

The dependent variable y^*_{ijt} in the specifications (34)-(36) is unobserved net expected return from adding an electric generator. In the models (34)-(35) the observed realization of y^*_{ijt} is the choice of generator. In the model (36) the observed realization of y^*_{ijt} is a categorical variable, which takes values of zero if a firm did not invest in a generator, the value of one if the firm invested in a generator in the absence of serious (at the state level) power outages, the value of two if the firm invested in a generator during power outages, and the value of three if the firm invested in a generator following a series of power outages.

The explanatory variables are the observed periods of disruptions in public power supply PO_{jt}, countries' time-invariant and time-varying financial system's performance indicators FC_{jt} and FC_j, vector of firm characteristics x'_{ij}, and country and year dummies δ'_j and γ'_t respectively. The subscripts i, j, and t denote the firm, country, and time effects, respectively, and ε_{ijt} is the error term. In the model (36) μ's are unknown parameters to be estimated with β's.

The models (34)-(35) are estimated by logit. The model (36) is estimated by ordered logit.[45] The inferences from the theoretical model discussed in the previous section can then be verified by testing if the estimated coefficient β_2 is positive and significant in specifications (34)-(36). This implies that the likelihood of investing in an electric generator during power outages is higher in the countries with better financial systems.

The advantage of the difference-in-differences approach is in its simplicity as well as the potential to circumvent many of the endogeneity problems that typically arise when making comparisons between heterogeneous groups under less restrictive assumptions.[46] However, obtaining statistically significant results

[45] For more details on logit and ordered logit models, see e.g. Greene (2003). All models were estimated in statistical package STATA v.9.2.

[46] e.g. endogeneity arising from omitted entry and exit variable bias (see Clementi and Hopenhayn, 2006) for discussion of

could more complicated because it makes use of less precise state-level information on power supply reliability and quality of financial systems.

5 Data

The lack of a good quality firm-level data has been a substantial limitation to the research on credit constraints and firm behavior. This study makes use of a new dataset compiled from the World Bank Enterprise Surveys (WBES) collected from 2002 to 2006.[47] The WBES data capture business perceptions of the biggest obstacles to enterprise growth, the relative importance of various constraints to increasing employment and productivity, and the effects of a country's investment climate on its international competitiveness.

The enterprise survey questions are concerned with factors constraining the effective functioning of the product and financial markets, focusing on the weaknesses in an economy's infrastructure, law enforcement, public administration, and regulatory framework. The enterprise surveys sample from the universe of registered businesses[48] and follow a stratified random sampling method.[49] The enterprise survey is confidential to protect the respondents.[50]

5.1 Sample Selection

The entire WBES dataset comprises information from surveys of over 60,000 firms in 97 developing countries. The analysis in this study is restricted to a selection of 860 firms from 3 Sub-Saharan African countries for implementation of the endogenous switching regression approach, and a subset of 1309 firms from 12 Sub-Saharan African countries for implementation of the difference-in-differences approach. These samples were chosen to ensure better compliance with the assumptions of the theoretical model and the stochastic specifications. Specifically, the following sample selection criteria were used.

First, one of the critical assumptions of the theoretical model discussed in the previous section is that a firm purchases a generator to prevent loss on the productive investment from power outages. Therefore, the sample should be restricted to regions where power outages are frequent. One of such regions is Sub-Saharan Africa[51], where the main reason for electric generator ownership is related to poor quality of electric power infrastructure.[52]. In other regions, private generator ownership is frequently not related to the quality of

this bias).

[47] For detailed information on the World Bank enterprise surveys, see WBES website at http://www.enterprisesurveys.org/.

[48] e.g. firms listed in a country's enterprise register.

[49] The sample is stratified on the basis of firm's location, industry, and size contribution to a country's GDP. Because the distribution of establishments in most countries is overwhelmingly populated by small and medium enterprises, surveys may over-sample large establishments.

[50] Confidentiality provisions are especially necessary if the firms are underreporting their income or wages to public agencies.

[51] Another region, which satifies this assumption is South Asia (India, Pakistan, Bangladesh). Unfortunately, good quality data were not available for this region.

[52] Estache (2005), Foster and Steinbuks (2007).

public power supply and therefore this assumption is unlikely to be satisfied.[53]

Second, both empirical approaches require exogeneity of power outages in the generator choice equations. In some countries, the governments pursue active regional policies by providing substantial public capital and creating other incentives for productive businesses to stimulate growth in selected areas.[54] Then, the relationship between location-specific power outages and generation ownership may be endogenous because as a result of such policies more productive (and less financially constrained) firms may start up in the locations with more reliable power supply. The sample therefore should be restricted to regions, where active regional investment policies are not implemented. Sub-Saharan African countries fit this criterion, because implementation of such policies is limited by political instability, corruption, ethnical fragmentations and clan struggles (Easterly and Levine, 1997). Power outages are thus exogenous to entrepreneurial ability and reflect underperformance of power sector institutions, that are mainly characterized by unreliability of power supply, low capacity utilization, deficient maintenance, poor procurement of spare parts, and high transmission and distribution losses among other problems (Karekezi and Kimani, 2002).[55]

Third, because the endogenous switching approach relies on cross-sectional data it is important that the information on power supply reported by the firms at the year of survey be correlated with the state of the power infrastructure at the time of installing a generator.[56] The sample therefore should also exclude developing countries where economic and structural reforms rendered them able to improve their public power supply significantly and reduce power outages. In Sub-Saharan Africa despite some reforms initiated in 1990s, only limited progress has been achieved.[57]

Based on the selection criteria discussed above, the sample for the difference-in-difference approach was reduced to countries from Sub-Saharan Africa. To minimize the effect of other large exogenous shocks affecting the firm's investment decisions, countries in armed conflict (e.g. Sierra Leone, Angola, Burundi) and with severe public governance breaches (e.g. Zimbabwe) were excluded from the sample.[58] The sample also excludes countries with little variation in generator ownership (e.g. in Nigeria 100 percent of firms owned a generator) with the exception of South Africa, which has reliable power infrastructure and developed financial markets, and provides a good comparison basis for the difference-in-differences approach.[59] The sample includes only firms that started operations after 1990, when most economic reforms in the region

[53] It happens for other reasons, such as compliance with safety standards, industry-specific requirements, and the adoption of environmentally friendly technologies or economic gains (e.g. from cogeneration).

[54] The impact of these policies has not been yet clearly established. For example, de la Fuente and Vives (1995) find that investment in infrastructure has made only a small contribution to regional convergence in Spain. On the other hand, Demurger (2001) concludes that infrastructure endowment did account significantly for observed differences in growth performance across provinces in China.

[55] To test for exogeneity of location, the quality of power supply (measured by days of power outages) was regressed on a series of firms' characteristics, and spatial dummy variables. Spatial characteristics were not significant for any of three countries used in endogenous switching regression model.

[56] For most firms in the sample the gap between survey year and installing own generation was small (about 2 - 3 years), but for some firms it was larger (about 10 years).

[57] Estache (2005).

[58] Though sample includes Erirea and Uganda, it does not comprise areas affected by armed conflicts (border regions between Eritrea and Somalia, and Uganda and Sudan).

[59] The results were not sensitive to the exclusion of South Africa.

took place.

The cross-sectional nature of the endogenous switching approach makes it more sensitive to measurement errors. To minimize the impact of the measurement errors, the cross-sectional analysis was further reduced to three countries - Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. These three countries were selected for several reasons. First, the surveys on these countries were performed during the same year (2002) by the same company, and using the identical survey instrument. Second, these countries are more comparable because of cultural and institutional similarities originating from their common British colonial past, and strong economic and political ties in the East African Community (EAC).[60] Third, public power supply in all three countries depends heavily on hydro-generation, and power outages are frequently caused by the same factor (e.g. drought). Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda are also developing plans to share power supplies, including a regional energy interconnectivity plan that will enable any EAC country to connect with another nation's electricity supply.[61]

5.2 Empirical Specification

This section discusses the variables used in the stochastic specification. Based on the theoretical model, a firm's choice of a generator depends on reliability of power supply (positively), cost of a generator (negatively), return on investment (uncertain), availability of internal funds (non-negatively), and a proxy for financing constraints (negatively). Tables 1 and 2 summarize the variables representing these factors.[62]

Table 1 presents the variables used in the endogenous switching approach, summarized at country level for Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. In the regime-switching equations (24) and (25), reliability of the power supply is measured by the number of days per year when firms experienced power outages. The theoretical model predicts that higher power outages have positive effects on the probability of investing in a generator. Table 1 shows that all three countries have very unreliable power supply, with average days of power outages per annum ranging from 67 in Tanzania to 82 in Kenya. It is therefore not surprising to observe that sixty eight percent of surveyed firms in Kenya, fifty eight percent of firms in Tanzania, and thirty eight percent of firms in Uganda owned a generator in 2002. The information on the cost of a generator and the return on investment is assumed to be captured by firms' characteristics, measured by size, industry[63] and ownership dummies.[64] Specifically, because electric generation exhibits economies of scale, larger firms are expected to have smaller generation costs, and higher probability of owning a generator.

As regards the selection equation (26), operationalization of variables is similar to the approach of Bigsten, Collier, Dercon *et al* (2003). Firms' choice of internal over external financing is represented by the share of

[60] For more information on the East African Community, see http://www.eac.int/.
[61] Source: U.S. Department of Energy website: http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/eafrica.html.
[62] For more details, also see tables 1 - 8, Appendix 1.
[63] Industry dummies also capture important information about energy intensity in firm's production process. Quality of electric power infrastructure is endogenous to observed industrial structure. Sorting out this problem is beyond the scope of this study.
[64] Detailed summary of these variable can be found in tables 1 to 4, appendix 1.

firms financing more than 90 percent of their working capital from the retained earnings. Table 1 shows that this share was only 30 percent of surveyed firms in Kenya, compared with 62 percent of firms in Tanzania, and 68 percent of firms in Uganda. Availability of internal funds is measured by the share of firms indicating that they never applied for a loan, because they did not need one. This share was 18 percent in Kenya, 10 percent in Tanzania, and 12 percent in Uganda. According to the model, availability of internal funds increases likelihood of owning a generator. On the other hand, 24 percent of surveyed firms in Kenya never applied for a loan because of other reasons, such as high collateral requirements, large debt burden, or complicated administrative procedures, compared to 50 percent of firms in Tanzania, and 47 percent of firms in Uganda. As discussed earlier, these reasons may indicate that firm is financially constrained, and is more likely to choose internal over external financing.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics (3 Countries Dataset)

Variable	Kenya		Tanzania		Uganda	
	mean	sd	mean	sd	mean	sd
Share of firms owning a generator	0.68	0.47	0.58	0.49	0.38	0.49
Power outages (days per annum)	81.69	103.78	66.85	65.04	70.32	99.21
Share of firms financing more than 90% of working capital from retained earnings	0.30	0.46	0.62	0.49	0.68	0.47
Share of firms that never applied for a loan because it was not needed	0.18	0.39	0.10	0.30	0.12	0.32
Share of firms that never applied for a loan because of other reasons	0.24	0.43	0.50	0.50	0.47	0.50
Share of firms that were rejected a loan	0.03	0.18	0.07	0.25	0.03	0.16
Share of firms that currently have a loan	0.32	0.47	0.16	0.37	0.17	0.38
Share of firms with LTV less than 50%	0.12	0.33	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.18
Share of firms with LTV between 50% and 75%	0.04	0.21	0.02	0.14	0.03	0.16
Share of firms with LTV between 75% and 100%	0.12	0.32	0.08	0.28	0.03	0.18
Share of firms with LTV more than 100%	0.03	0.18	0.04	0.19	0.08	0.26

The extent of the agency or information problems θ is proxied by several variables. The share of firms that were rejected for a loan may indicate a non-price rationing (redlining) due to asymmetric information, as discussed in Stiglitz and Weiss (1981). According to the data, 7 percent of surveyed firms in Tanzania and 3 percent of firms in Kenya and Uganda were rejected a loan. These firms may be financially constrained, and are more likely to choose internal over external financing. For firms with a loan, the differential cost of external over internal is financing is captured by collateral requirements. The theory of credit supply under asymmetric information predicts that, holding other things constant, loans secured by collateral are less costly.[65] Table 1 shows that, about a half of the firms with a bank loan in Kenya, two-thirds of firms with a bank loan in Uganda and 75 percent of firms with a bank loan in Tanzania had the loan to value ratio above 75 percent. It is expected that firms with high loan-to-value ratio are more likely to choose internal over

[65] Collateral requirements are measured by firms' response to the Enterprise survey question "What was the approximate value of collateral required as a percentage of the loan value?"

external financing. The institutional financial market characteristics are represented by country dummies. Among three countries, Kenya has the most developed financial system. The World Bank *Doing Business* (2007) report ranks Kenya 33^{rd} among the world countries in the overall ease of getting credit, whereas Tanzania and Uganda are ranked 117^{th} and 159^{th} respectively. Therefore, the anticipated coefficient in the selection equation for the Kenyan country dummy variable is negative. Selection equation (26) also includes firm characteristics, such as size, industry and ownership. Consistent with earlier findings from the literature on financing constraints[66] it is expected that larger and foreign owned firms are less likely to face financing constraints, and are more likely to choose external financing over internal financing.

Table 2 summarizes the variables used in the difference-in-differences approach for 1309 firms from 12 Sub-Saharan African countries, which started their operation after 1990. Because time-series data on power outages and the cost of external financing were not available at the firm-level, the aggregate indicators were used in panel dataset. The data on power outages came from the *International Energy Annual (2004)*, published by Energy Information Administration, U.S. Department of Energy. The data on the cost of external financing came from the World Bank *World Development Indicators* (WDI) and *Doing Business* databases.

Table 2: Descriptive Statistics (12 Countries Dataset)

Country	Share of Firms Owning a Generator		Periods of Power Outages		Growth in Domestic Credit		Credit Information index	Credit Registry Coverage
	mean	sd	mean	sd	mean	sd		(% of adults)
Benin	0.20	0.40	0.57	0.51	0.06	0.33	1	3.5
Eritrea	0.38	0.50	0.30	0.48	0.19	0.24	0	0
Kenya	0.68	0.47	0.17	0.38	-0.01	0.08	2	0.1
Madagascar	0.18	0.38	0.13	0.34	-0.04	0.12	1	0.3
Malawi	0.35	0.48	0.35	0.48	0.06	0.20	0	0
Mali	0.41	0.50	0.12	0.33	0.03	0.13	1	2.3
Mauritius	0.28	0.45	0.25	0.44	0.06	0.10	0	0
Senegal	0.52	0.50	0.13	0.33	-0.02	0.06	1	4.3
South Africa	0.06	0.25	0.00	0.00	0.04	0.13	5	63.4
Tanzania	0.56	0.50	0.23	0.42	-0.09	0.10	0	0
Uganda	0.26	0.44	0.21	0.41	0.11	0.33	0	0
Zambia	0.20	0.41	0.17	0.39	0.01	0.25	0	0

Table 2 shows that there is a considerable variation across countries in the share of firms having a private generator, ranging from 6 percent in South Africa to 68 percent in Kenya. There are also significant differences across countries in the average periods of power outages, measured as a significant (more than 10 percent) increase in country's electricity distribution losses.[67] Starting from 1990 the most frequent power

[66] Beck, Demirguc-Kunt, and Maksimovic (2005)

[67] For more robustness this measure was checked against the country average days of power outages, reported by the firms from the WBES data in 2002-2005. The Spearman correlation coefficient was 0.5.

outages were in Benin (57% of surveyed periods), Malawi (35% of surveyed periods), and Eritrea (30% of surveyed periods). The most reliable power supply was in South Africa (0% percent of surveyed periods).[68]

Table 2 also presents the summary statistics on the country-level measures of cost of external finance. Costs of external finance are lower in countries with more developed financial markets.[69] Financial market institutional characteristics are measured by the World Bank's *Doing Business* credit information index and credit registry coverage indicator.[70] The credit information index measures rules affecting the scope, accessibility and quality of credit information available through either public or private credit registries. The credit registry coverage indicator reports the number of individuals and firms listed in a public or private credit registry with current information on repayment history, unpaid debts or credit outstanding.[71] Higher values of both indicators are associated with better financial market institutional characteristics. External finance costs are also affected by monetary policy, and are negatively correlated with growth in domestic credit (with domestic credit measured by the ratio of banking sector credit to private sector to surveyed countries' GDP[72]). It follows from table 2, that, among surveyed countries, South Africa has the most developed financial infrastructure, yet the domestic credit was frequently growing faster in countries with less developed financial systems (e.g. Eritrea, Malawi and Uganda).

6 Empirical Results

6.1 Endogenous Switching Approach

Tables 3, 4, and 5 summarize the results from the endogenous switching regression approach described by the equations (24)-(29). Table 3 shows the estimates from the selection equation, formulated by (26) and (27). The signs of the estimated coefficients correspond to the predictions of economic theory. Borrowers with low loan-to-value ratios, foreign owned firms, and Kenyan businesses are more likely to choose external financing. Firms that were not able to apply for a loan because of red tape, high collateral requirements or the debt burden are more likely to choose internal financing. The estimated coefficients for firms that did not apply for a loan because it was not needed, and for the size and industry characteristics variables are not statistically significant in the selection equation.

[68] According to the WBES data there are rare occasions of power outages in South Africa (about 6 days per year). This may explain why some firms own an electric generator in this country.

[69] See La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, and Vishny (1997), and Love (2003).

[70] These indicators can be found on the World Bank's *Doing Business* website http://www.doingbusiness.org

[71] Though these two measures do not vary by time, they reflect an important information about the surveyed countries' financial systems. Different research studies, including La Porta, Lopez-de-Silanes, Shleifer, and Vishny (1997), Love and Mylenko (2003), and Djankov, McLiesh, and Shleifer (2007) found that credit registries are associated with lower financing constraints and higher share of bank financing.

[72] This measure has been previously used in the economic literature, see e.g. Beck, Levine, and Loayza (2000), and Barth, Caprio, and Levine (2004)

Table 3: Selection Equation

Equation: $d_1 = \Phi(W_i'\alpha) + \omega_i$. Dep. var. (d1): Firm finances more than 90% of working capital from retained earnings (1 = "Yes")

Variable	coeff.	p-value	Exp. Sign
Current loan: LTV less than 50% (1="Yes")	-0.83	0.00	-
Current loan: LTV between 50% and 75% (1= "Yes")	-0.89	0.01	-
Current loan: LTV between 75% and 100% (1="Yes")	-0.45	0.02	
Current loan: LTV more than 100% (1="Yes")	-0.21	0.35	
Never applied for a loan because it was not needed (1 = "Yes")	0.13	0.43	
Never applied for a loan because of other reasons (1 = "Yes")	0.33	0.01	+
Loan application rejected (1 = "Yes")	0.55	0.03	+
Country: Kenya	-0.90	0.00	-
Country: Tanzania	-0.19	0.16	
Industry: Garments and Textiles	0.06	0.73	
Industy: Food and Beverages	-0.14	0.39	
Industry: Metals and Machinery	-0.04	0.81	
Industry: Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals	-0.21	0.25	
Firm's Size: Less than 10 Employees	0.29	0.12	+
Firm's Size: 10 - 49 Employees	-0.02	0.92	
Firm's Size: 50 - 99 Employees	-0.26	0.17	
Foreign Ownership (1 = "Yes")	-0.37	0.01	-
Constant	0.51	0.02	
Number of Observations		659	

Table 4 compares the predicted values for the dependent variable, based on the regression model in the selection equation, with the actual observed values in the data. Table 4 shows that the selection equation correctly predicts 78% of firms that rely solely on internal financing (constrained firms), and 64% of firms that use external funds to finance their working capital (unconstrained firms). Overall, the selection equation correctly classifies 71% of firms, which is an improvement over naive model that blindly estimates the most frequent category (constrained firms) for all cases, and correctly classifies just 54% of firms.

Table 4: Selection Equation - Classification Table

	True Classification		
Switching Regression Classification	*Constrained*	*Unconstrained*	**Total**
Constrained	279	109	388
Unconstrained	80	191	271
Total	359	300	659
Correctly classified	78%	64%	71%

Table 5 illustrates the results from the switching regressions (24) and (25). A comparison of the estimated coefficients for reliability of power supply in the switching regressions strongly supports the hypothesis that financial constraints affect the firms' decisions to invest in a generator given their expectations of power outages. The estimated coefficient of the logarithm of days of power outages in the generator choice equation for firms that externally finance their working capital is statistically significant and nearly ten times higher than the corresponding coefficient in the equation for firms that finance their working capital from retained earnings. The likelihood ratio test (32) rejects the hypothesis that the estimated coefficients are equal in the switching equations at the 0.03 level of significance.

As regards other explanatory variables, in both equations larger firms are found more likely to install an electric generator. This may reflect effect of the economies of scale or technical requirements and safety standards with which the larger firms are more likely to comply. The estimated coefficient is positive and significant for the metals and machinery industry in the equation for external financing, which may reflect energy intensity of this industry. The estimated coefficient is also positive and significant for foreign owned firms in the equation for internal financing, which may capture the share of less constrained firms among those financing working capital from retained earnings. Country dummies are not statistically significant in either equation, except for Tanzania in the equation for internal financing, which is positive, but only marginally significant. This coefficient may reflect unobserved financial market institutional characteristics in Tanzania. The correlation coefficients (rho's) between the residuals in the selection and switching equations are large and statistically significant for both switching equations. This confirms simultaneity in choice of electric generator and firm's financing constraints.[73]

Table 5: Switching Regression Equations

Equations: $d_{2j} = \Phi(\alpha_0 + x'_{ji}\beta_j + Z'_{ji}\gamma) + \varepsilon_{ji}$. $j = 1, 2$. Dep. vars. (d21, d22): Firm owns a generator (1 = "Yes")

	Equation d21 (d1 = 0)		**Equation d22 (d1 = 1)**	
	coeff.	**p-value**	**coeff.**	**p-value**
Days of Power Outages (log)	0.19	0.00	0.02	0.73
Country: Kenya	-0.06	0.82	-0.19	0.43
Country: Tanzania	0.07	0.75	0.31	0.06
Industry: Garments and Textiles	0.04	0.87	0.31	0.17
Industy: Food and Beverages	0.26	0.29	0.16	0.38
Industry: Metals and Machinery	0.51	0.05	0.25	0.24
Industry: Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals	0.21	0.43	0.08	0.76
Firm's Size: Less than 10 Employees	-1.31	0.00	-1.37	0.00
Firm's Size: 10 - 49 Employees	-0.78	0.00	-0.71	0.02
Firm's Size: 50 - 99 Employees	-0.11	0.69	-0.08	0.77
Foreign Ownership (1 = "Yes")	0.10	0.62	0.60	0.03
Constant	0.63	0.18	-0.30	0.38
Rho	0.72	0.01	0.83	0.00
Number of Observations	659		659	

LR Test: chi2(1) = 4.77, Prob > chi2 = 0.0289

The results from the endogenous switching approach, tested on the data from Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda, thus fully correspond to the predictions of the theoretical model described in the previous section. Holding other things constant, firms that finance their working capital from external funds are more likely to install the generator in the localities where the power outages are more frequent. This happens because these firms are less likely to be financially constrained, and therefore their net expected return from a generator

[73] Tables 9a and 9b (Appendix 1) illustate that exogenous swirching regression estimates of the same stochastic specification are seriously biased.

is higher. The theoretical model predicts that financially constrained firms invest in a generator only if the quality of public power supply is very low. Consistent with that prediction of the model, the choice of electric generator is unaffected by small differences in the reliability of power supply for firms that finance their working capital solely from internal funds, and are more likely to be financially constrained.

6.2 Difference-in-Differences Approach

This section discusses findings from the difference-in-differences approach. As discussed earlier, the hypothesis is that the estimated coefficient of the product of power outages and financial development (β_2) is positive and significant in stochastic specifications (34)-(36). Tables 6, 7, and 8 contain the test results.[74] The predictions from all three models confirm the hypothesis that during the periods of power outages firms from the countries with financially developed markets are more likely to buy generators.

Table 6 shows the findings from the model 1, described by the equation (34) which employs time-invariant indices of financial markets' institutional characteristics for the cost of external financing. The estimated coefficients on the product of power outages and the cost of external financing are all positive and significant. The size and significance levels of the estimated coefficients increase with the degree of countries' financial development. For example, the estimated coefficients on power outages in countries with no registry coverage are positive but not significant. The estimated coefficient is only marginally significant when sole existence of public or private registries was used as the measure of financial development. The estimated coefficient increases both in size and the level of significance when only countries with actual registry coverage (at least 3% of all adults) are considered as financially developed.

Table 6: Difference-in-Differences: Model 1

Dependent variable: Firm owns a generator (1 = "Yes")

Variable	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value
Power Outages (1 = "Yes")	0.07	0.26	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.09
Registry Coverage > 0 X Power Outages	0.17	0.09				
Registry Coverage > 3% X Power Outages			0.22	0.05		
Credit Information Index > 1 X Power Outages					0.47	0.00
Constant	-0.28	0.48	-0.28	0.47	-0.28	0.48
Wald chi2(27)	263.36	0.00	263.35	0.00	272.62	0.00
Number of obs	8201		8201		8201	

Table 7 illustrates the results for model 2, described by the equation (35), which uses the growth in domestic credit as a measure for the cost of external financing. The estimated coefficient on the product

[74] Full results, including the estimates of the fixed effects and the control variables are reported in the appendix 2, tables 9, 10, and 11. The standard errors used in computation of p-values were adjusted for heteroscedaticity and cluster correlations. For details, see Wooldridge (2002, section 13.8.2).

of power outages and domestic credit growth is positive and significant, suggesting that, consistent with predictions of the theoretical model, the probability of installing an electric generator during power outages is higher in countries experiencing rapid growth of domestic credit.

Table 7: Difference-in-Differences: Model 2

Dependent variable: Firm owns a generator (1 = "Yes")

Variable	Coef.	P-value
Power Outages X Domestic Credit Growth	0.43	0.01
Constant	-0.25	0.56
Wald chi2(39)	441.06	0.00
Number of obs	8166	

Table 8 presents the results from the model 3, described by the equation (36), and estimated by ordered logit.[75] Again the results are consistent with theoretical expectations. The estimated coefficient of the domestic credit growth variable is positive and significant. To understand better the effect of a country's financial development on firm's decision to buy generator, table 8 also presents the computed marginal effects.[76] One percent increase in domestic credit increases the probability of buying a generator by 0.07 at stable power supply. The probability of buying a generator further increases by 0.02 during power outages, and by 0.001 after consecutive power outages. These figures sum to 0.091, which indicates the total marginal effect of a one percent increase in domestic credit growth on the probability of installing an electric generator. All marginal effects are statistically significant.

Table 8: Difference-in-Differences: Model 3

Dependent variable: Firm bought a generator at stable power supply (1 = "Yes"), Firm bought a generator during outages (2 = "Yes"), Firm bought a generator after consecutive outages (3 = "Yes")

Variable	Regression coeff.		Marginal effect (d=1)		Marginal effect (d=2)		Marginal effect (d=3)	
	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value
Domestic Credit Growth	0.68	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.001	0.00
mu1	1.98							
mu2	4.74							
Wald chi2(26)	313.30	0.00						
Number of obs				8464				

[75] Time-invariant measures of financial deepening could not be used in the ordered logit model because of perfect collinearity problem.

[76] For details on interpreting coefficients and the marginal effects in ordered logit equations, see Greene (2003, chapter 21).

7 Conclusions

This study uses indirect testing techniques to identify and measure the effects of access to capital on firms in developing countries. Recent economic research has shown that poor public capital significantly reduces productive investment by firms. If financial markets are functioning well, firms can cope with deficient public capital by investing in private capital, which substitutes for public services. The major cost to firms comes from the installation of less productive capital.

This paper investigates the effect of financing constraints on a firm's ability to substitute for deficient public services by investing in private capital. The theoretical model focuses on a firm's decision to acquire a private generator to hedge against unreliable public power supply. It shows that holding other things constant, financially unconstrained firms will be more likely to install private generator if the public power supply becomes unreliable.

The effect of financing constraints on a firms' decision to install a private generator is investigated empirically on firm-level datasets from Sub-Saharan African countries where power interruptions are not uncommon and financial systems vary in their development. Both endogenous switching regression and difference-in-differences methods are used to overcome the measurement and identification problems arising from simultaneity of financing constraints and firms' investment.

The results show that, controlling for other factors, firms with a better access to credit are also more likely to own a private generator in areas, where public power supply is unreliable. The results also indicate that firms are more likely to respond to the power outage shocks, by installing private generators if they operate in the countries with more developed financial systems or during the periods of rapid domestic credit growth.

These results have important policy implications. If poor provision of public capital has a significant effect on firms' capital accumulation, and fiscal constraints hamper investment in infrastructure, a financial sector reform can open bottlenecks for private provision of complementary capital, and thus create conditions for improvement in the private sector development.

References

[1] Aghion, Philippe, and Patrick Bolton. 1992. "An Incomplete Contracts Approach to Corporate Bankruptcy", *Review of Economic Studies 59*, pp. 473-494.

[2] Alti, Aydogan. 2003. "How Sensitive Is Investment To Cash Flow When Financing Is Frictionless?" *Journal of Finance 58 (2)*, pp. 707-722.

[3] Banerjee, Abhijit V. 2001. "Contracting Constraints, Credit Markets and Economic Development." *Advances in Economics and Econometrics: Theory and Applications, Eighth World Congress, Volume III* Cambridge University Press.

[4] Banerjee, Abhijit V., and Esther Duflo. 2004. "Do Firms want to Borrow More? Testing Credit Constraints Using a Directed Lending Program." manuscript, MIT.

[5] Barth, James R., Gerard Caprio, Jr., and Ross Levine. 2004. "Bank Regulation and Supervision: What Works Best?" *Journal of Financial Intermediation 13(2)*, pp. 205-248.

[6] Beck, Thorsten, Asli Demirguc-Kunt, and Vojislav Maksimovic. 2005. "Financial and Legal Constraints to Growth: Does Firm Size Matter?" *Journal of Finance 60(1)* pp. 137-177.

[7] Beck, Thorsten, Ross Levine, and Norman Loayza. 2000. "Finance and the Sources of Growth." *Journal of Financial Economics 58(1-2)*, pp. 261-300.

[8] Besley, Timothy, and Anne Case. 2000. "Unnatural Experiments? Estimating the Incidence of Endogenous Policies." *Economic Journal CDLXVII*, pp. 672-694.

[9] Bental Benjamin, and Abraham Ravid. 1982. "A Simple Method for Evaluating the Marginal Cost of Unsupplied Electricity", *Bell Journal of Economics 13*, pp. 249-253.

[10] Bertrand Marianne, Esther Duflo, and Sendhil Mullainathan. 2004. "How Much Should We Trust Differences-in-Differences Estimates?", *Quarterly Journal of Economics 119 (1)*, pp. 249-275.

[11] Bigsten, Arne, Paul Collier, Stefan Dercon, Marcel Fafchamps, Bernard Gauthier, Jan W. Gunning, Abena Oduro, Remco Oostendorp, Cathy Patillo, Mans Soderbom, Francis Teal, and Albert Zeufack. 2003. "Credit Constraints in Manufacturing Enterprises in Africa." *Journal of African Economies 12(1),* pp. 104-125.

[12] Bond, Stephen and Costas Meghir. 1994. "Dynamic Investment Models and the Firm's Financial Policy", *Review of Economic Studies 61, pp. 197-222.*

[13] Bond, Stephen and Mans Soderbom. 2006. "Conditional Investment Cash Flow Sensitivities and Financing Constraints." Institute for Fiscal Studies Working Paper, electronic version available at http://www.ifs.org.uk/docs/kz_paper.pdf

[14] Briceno-Garmendia, Cecilia, Antonio Estache, Nemat Shafik. 2004. "Infrastructure Services in Developing Countries: Access, Quality, Costs and Policy Reform." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3468.*

[15] Bronars, Stephen G., and Jeff Grogger. 1994. "The Economic Consequences of Unwed Motherhood: Using Twin Births as a Natural Experiment." *American Economic Review, 84(5)*, pp. 1141-1156

[16] Calderon, Cesar and Luis Serven. 2004. "The Effects of Infrastructure Development on Growth and Income Distribution." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3400.*

[17] Calomiris, Charles W., and Charles P. Himmelberg. 1995. "Investment Banking Costs as a Measure of Access to External Finance." manuscript, University of Illinois.

[18] Clementi, Gian L., and Hugo A. Hopenhayn. 2006. "A Theory of Financing Constraints and Firm Dynamics," *Quarterly Journal of Economics 121(1)*, pp. 229-265.

[19] Cooper, Russell, and Joao Ejarque. 2003. "Financial Frictions and Investment: Requiem in Q." *Review of Economic Dynamics 6(4)*, pp. 710-728.

[20] Cull, Robert, David McKenzie, and Christopher Woodruff. 2007. "Experimental Evidence on Returns to Capital and Access to Finance in Mexico." Manuscript, World Bank.

[21] Demurger, Sylvie. 2001. "Infrastructure Development and Economic Growth: An Explanation for Regional Disparities in China?" *Journal of Comparative Economics 29(1)*, pp. 95-117.

[22] Djankov, Simeon, Caralee McLiesh, and Andrei Shleifer. 2007. "Private Credit in 129 Countries." *Journal of Financial Economics 84(2)*, pp. 299-329.

[23] Dollar, David, Mary Hallward-Driemeier, and Taye Mengistae. 2005. "Investment Climate and Firm Performance in Developing Economies." *Economic Development and Cultural Change 54*, pp. 1–31

[24] Duflo, Esther, Rachel Glennerster, and Michael Kremer. 2007. "Using Randomization in Development Economics Research: A Toolkit." *CEPR Discussion Paper No. 6059.*

[25] Duggan, Mark, and Steven D. Levitt. 2002. "Winning Isn't Everything: Corruption in Sumo Wrestling." *American Economic Review 92(5)*, pp. 1594-1605.

[26] Easterly, William, and Ross Levine. 1997. "Africa's Growth Tragedy: Policies and Ethnic Divisions." *Quarterly Journal of Economics 112(4)*, pp. 1203-1250.

[27] Erickson, Timothy and Toni M. Whited. 2000. "Measurement Error and the Relationship between Investment and q". *Journal of Political Economy 108(5)*, pp. 1027-1057.

[28] Estache, Antonio. 2004. "Emerging Infrastructure Policy Issues in Developing Countries: A Survey of the Recent Economic Literature." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3442.*

[29] Estache, Antonio. 2005. "What do we know about Sub-Saharan Africa's Infrastructure and the Impact of its 1990s reforms?" Manuscript, World Bank.

[30] Fazzari, Steven M., Glenn R. Hubbard, and Bruce C. Peterson. 1988. "Financing Constraints and Corporate Investment", *Brookings Papers on Economic Activity*, pp. 141-195.

[31] Fazzari, Steven M., Glenn R. Hubbard and Bruce C. Peterson. 2000. "Investment-Cash Flow Sensitivities are Useful: A Comment on Kaplan and Zingales." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, pp. 695-704.

[32] Foster, Vivien and Jevgenijs Steinbuks. 2007. "Paying the Price for Unreliable Power Supplies: Own Generation of Electricity by Private Firms in Africa," *World Bank Policy Research Paper*, forthcoming.

[33] de la Fuente, Angel, and Xavier Vives. 1995. "Infrastructure and Education as Instruments of Regional Policy: Evidence from Spain." *Economic Policy 10(20)*, pp. 11-51.

[34] Gomes, Joao. 2001. "Financing Investment", *American Economic Review 91(5)*, pp. 1263-1285.

[35] Gould, William, Jeffrey Pitblado, and William Sribney. 2006. "*Maximum Likelihood Estimation with Stata.*" 3rd ed. College Station, TX: Stata Press.

[36] Gourieroux, Christian, and Alain Monfort. 1996. "*Simulation-Based Econometric Methods.*" Oxford University Press.

[37] Greene, William H. 2003. "*Econometric Analysis.*" Prentice Hall.

[38] Hart, Oliver, and John Moore. 1994. "A Theory of Debt Based on the Inalienability of Human Capital", *Quarterly Journal of Economics 109*, pp. 841-879.

[39] Hart, Oliver, and John Moore. 1998. "Default and Renegotiation: A Dynamic Model of Debt", *Quarterly Journal of Economics 113*, pp. 1-42.

[40] Hu, Xiaoqiang, and Fabio Schiantarelli. 1998. "Investment and Capital Market Imperfections: A Switching Regression Approach Using U.S. Firm Panel Data." *Review of Economics and Statistics 80(3),* pp. 466-479.

[41] Hubbard, Glenn R. 1998. "Capital-Market Imperfections and Investment." *Journal of Economic Literature 36(1)*, pp. 193-225.

[42] Jaffe, Dwight M. and Thomas Russell. 1976. "Imperfect Information, Uncertainty and Credit Rationing," *Quarterly Journal of Economics 90, pp. 651-666.*

[43] Kaplan, Steven N., and Luigi Zingales. 1997. "Do Investment–Cash Flow Sensitivities Provide Useful Measures of Financing Constraints?" *Quarterly Journal of Economics 112*, pp. 169–215.

[44] Kaplan, Steven N., and Luigi Zingales. 2000. "Investment-Cash Flow Sensitivities are not Valid Measures of Financing Constraints." *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, pp. 707-712.

[45] Karekezi Stephen, and John Kimani. 2002. "Status of Power Sector Reform in Africa: Impact on the Poor." *Energy Policy 30*, pp. 923–945.

[46] Kimhi, Ayal. 1999. "Estimation of an Endogenous Switching Regression Model with Discrete Dependent Variables: Monte-Carlo Analysis and Empirical Application of Three Estimators." *Empirical Economics 24(2)*, pp. 225-241.

[47] King, Robert G., and Ross Levine. 1993. "Finance and Growth: Schumpeter Might be Right." *Quarterly Journal of Economics 108(3)*, pp. 717-737.

[48] Lamont, Owen, Christopher Polk, and Jesus Saa-Requejo. 2001. "Financial Constraints and Stock Returns." *Review of Financial Studies 14(2)*, pp. 529-554.

[49] La Porta, Rafael, Florencio Lopez-de-Silanes, Andrei Shleifer, and Robert Vishny. 1997. "Legal Determinants of External Finance." *Journal of Finance 52*, pp. 1131-1150.

[50] Levitt, Steven D. 1997 "Using Electoral Cycles in Police Hiring to Estimate the Effect of Police on Crime ." *American Economic Review 87(3),* pp. 270-290.

[51] Love, Inessa. 2003. "Financial Development and Financing Constraints: International Evidence from the Structural Investment Model." *Review of Financial Studies 16(3)*, pp. 765-791.

[52] Love, Inessa, and Nataliya Mylenko. 2003. "Credit Reporting and Financing Constraints." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 3142.*

[53] Maddala, G.S. 1983. *"Limited-Dependent and Qualitative Variables in Econometrics."* Cambridge University Press.

[54] de Mel, Suresh, David. J. McKinzie, and Christopher Woodruff. 2007a. "Measuring Microenterprise Profits. Don't Ask How the Sausage is Made." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 4229.*

[55] de Mel, Suresh, David. J. McKinzie, and Christopher Woodruff. 2007b. "Returns to Capital in Microenterprises: Evidence from a Field Experiment." *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 4230.*

[56] Meyer, Bruce D. 1995. "Natural and Quasi-Experiments in Economics." *Journal of Business & Economic Statistics 13(2),* pp. 151-161.

[57] Modigliani, Franco and Merton H. Miller. 1958. "The Cost of Capital, Corporation Finance and the Theory of Investment". *American Economic Review 48(3)*, pp. 261-297.

[58] Moyen, Nathalie. 2004. "Investment-Cash Flow Sensitivities: Constrained Versus Unconstrained Firms." *Journal of Finance, 59(5)*, pp. 2061-2092.

[59] Nabi, Ijaz. 1989. "Investment in Segmented Capital Markets." *Quarterly Journal of Economics 104(3)*, pp. 453-462.

[60] Quadrini, Vincenzo. 2003 “Investment and Liquidation in Renegotiation-proof Contracts with Moral Hazard,” *Journal of Monetary Economics LI*, pp. 713–751.

[61] Rajan, Raghuram G., and Luigi Zingales. 1998. "Financial Dependence and Growth." *American Economic Review 88*, pp. 559–587.

[62] Rajan, Raghuram G., and Luigi Zingales. 2003. *"Saving Capitalism from the Capitalists: Unleashing the Power of Financial Markets to Create Wealth and Spread Opportunity."* New York: Crown Business.

[63] Reinikka Ritva and Jacob Svensson. 2002. "Coping with Poor Public Capital." *Journal of Development Economics 69*, pp. 51– 69.

[64] Schiantarelli, Fabio. 1996. "Financial Constraints and Investment: Methodological Issues and International Evidence." *Oxford Review of Economic Policy 12(2)*, pp. 70-89.

[65] Schundeln, Matthias. 2007. “Testing for the Existence of Financing Constraints in Developing Countries’ Manufacturing Firms”, manuscript, Harvard University.

[66] Stiglitz, Joseph E., and Andrew Weiss. 1981, “Credit Rationing in Markets with Imperfect Information.” *American Economic Review 71*, pp. 393-410.

[67] Strebulaev, Ilya A. 2007. "Do Tests of Capital Structure Theory Mean What They Say?" *Journal of Finance*, forthcoming.

[68] Svensson, Jacob. 2000. "Is the Bad News Principle for Real?" *Economics Letters 66(3)*, pp. 327– 331.

[69] U.S. Department of Energy, Energy Information Administration. 2004. *International Energy Annual (2004),* electronic version available at http://www.eia.doe.gov/iea

[70] Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2002. *"Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data."* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[71] World Bank. 2005. *"World Development Report 2005: A Better Investment Climate for Everyone."* The World Bank and Oxford University Press.

[72] World Bank, and International Financial Corporation. 2007. *"Doing Business 2007: How to Reform?"* The World Bank publication.

Appendix 1

Table 1: 3 Countries Dataset - Tabulation by Country

Country	**Frequency**	**Share**
Kenya	205	31.11%
Tanzania	189	28.68%
Uganda	265	40.21%
Total	659	100.00%

Table 2: 3 Countries Dataset - Tabulation by Industry

Industry	**Frequency**	**Share**
Garments and Textiles	117	17.75%
Food and Beverages	173	26.25%
Metals and Machinery	123	18.66%
Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals	89	13.51%
Wood, Pulp and Furniture	157	23.82%
Total	659	100.00%

Table 3: 3 Countries Dataset - Tabulation by Size

Size	**Frequency**	**Share**
Less than 10 Employees	153	23.22%
10 - 50 Employees	296	44.92%
50 - 100 Employees	96	14.57%
More than 100 Employees	114	17.30%
Total	659	100.00%

Table 4: 3 Countries Dataset - Tabulation by Ownership

Ownership	**Frequency**	**Percent**
Domestic	517	78.45%
Foreign	142	21.55%
Total	659	100.00%

Table 5: 12 Countries Dataset - Tabulation by Country

Country	**Frequency**	**Share**
Benin	119	9.09%
Eritrea	21	1.60%
Kenya	78	5.96%
Madagascar	160	12.22%
Malawi	94	7.18%
Mali	80	6.11%
Mauritius	67	5.12%
Senegal	122	9.32%
South Africa	154	11.76%
Tanzania	129	9.85%
Uganda	202	15.43%
Zambia	83	6.34%
Total	1309	100.00%

Table 6: 12 Countries Dataset - Tabulation by Industry

Industry	**Frequency**	**Share**
Garments and Textiles	172	13.14%
Food and Beverages	349	26.66%
Metals and Machinery	137	10.47%
Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals	107	8.17%
Construction	56	4.28%
Wood, Pulp and Furniture	225	17.19%
Non-metallic and Plastic Materials	73	5.58%
Paper	54	4.13%
Other Manufacturing	63	4.81%
Hotels and Restaurants	73	5.58%
	1309	100.00%

Table 7: 12 Countries Dataset - Tabulation by Size

Size	**Frequency**	**Share**
Less than 10 Employees	244	18.64%
10 - 50 Employees	630	48.13%
50 - 100 Employees	199	15.20%
100-250 Employees	127	9.70%
More than 250 Employees	109	8.33%
Total	1309	100.00%

Table 8: 12 Countries Dataset - Tabulation by Ownership

Ownership	**Frequency**	**Share**
Domestic	989	75.55%
Foreign	320	24.45%
Total	1309	100.00%

Table 9a Switching Regession Models (Firms with External Financing of Working Capital)

Model	Exogenous switching (d1 = 0)		Endogenous switching (d1 = 0)	
	coeff.	**p-value**	**coeff.**	**p-value**
Days of Power Outages (log)	0.08	0.08	0.19	0.00
Country: Kenya	0.84	0.00	-0.06	0.82
Country: Tanzania	0.13	0.41	0.07	0.75
Industry: Garments and Textiles	-0.02	0.91	0.04	0.87
Industy: Food and Beverages	0.24	0.19	0.26	0.29
Industry: Metals and Machinery	0.29	0.12	0.51	0.05
Industry: Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals	0.36	0.08	0.21	0.43
Firm's Size: Less than 10 Employees	-1.31	0.00	-1.31	0.00
Firm's Size: 10 - 49 Employees	-0.50	0.00	-0.78	0.00
Firm's Size: 50 - 99 Employees	0.13	0.49	-0.11	0.69
Foreign Ownership (1 = "Yes")	0.46	0.00	0.10	0.62
Constant	-1.01	0.00	0.63	0.18
Number of Observations	659		659	

Table 9b Switching Regession Models (Firms with Internal Financing of Working Capital)

Model	Exogenous switching (d1 = 1)		Endogenous switching (d1 = 1)	
	coeff.	**p-value**	**coeff.**	**p-value**
Days of Power Outages (log)	0.05	0.08	0.02	0.25
Country: Kenya	-0.44	0.00	-0.19	0.01
Country: Tanzania	0.18	0.41	0.31	0.20
Industry: Garments and Textiles	0.25	0.91	0.31	0.19
Industy: Food and Beverages	0.08	0.19	0.16	0.64
Industry: Metals and Machinery	0.14	0.12	0.25	0.44
Industry: Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals	0.02	0.08	0.08	0.93
Firm's Size: Less than 10 Employees	-0.96	0.00	-1.37	0.00
Firm's Size: 10 - 49 Employees	-0.35	0.00	-0.71	0.02
Firm's Size: 50 - 99 Employees	-0.10	0.49	-0.08	0.61
Foreign Ownership (1 = "Yes")	0.13	0.00	0.60	0.34
Constant	-0.62	0.00	-0.30	0.02
Number of Observations	659		659	

Table 10: Difference-in-Differences Approach (Model 1)

Variable	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value
Country: Benin	-1.07	0.00	-1.11	0.00	-0.97	0.00
Country: Eritrea	-0.02	0.97	-0.02	0.96	-0.02	0.97
Country: Kenya	0.26	0.33	0.29	0.28	0.21	0.43
Country: Madagascar	-2.19	0.00	-2.17	0.00	-2.17	0.00
Country: Malawi	-0.96	0.00	-0.97	0.00	-0.97	0.00
Country: Mali	0.23	0.48	0.25	0.43	0.25	0.43
Country: Mauritius	-1.07	0.00	-1.07	0.00	-1.07	0.00
Country: Senegal	0.15	0.58	0.15	0.59	0.17	0.52
Country: South Africa	-2.33	0.00	-2.33	0.00	-2.33	0.00
Country: Uganda	-0.61	0.02	-0.61	0.02	-0.61	0.02
Country: Zambia	-1.66	0.00	-1.66	0.00	-1.66	0.00
Industry: Garments and Textiles	-0.58	0.11	-0.58	0.11	-0.58	0.11
Industry: Food and Beverages	-0.01	0.97	-0.01	0.97	-0.01	0.97
Industry: Metals and Machinery	-0.65	0.08	-0.65	0.08	-0.66	0.08
Industry: Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals	-0.10	0.78	-0.10	0.78	-0.10	0.78
Industry: Construction	-0.54	0.20	-0.54	0.20	-0.54	0.20
Industry: Wood, Pulp and Furniture	-1.08	0.01	-1.08	0.01	-1.08	0.01
Industry: Non-metallic and Plastic Materials	-0.16	0.68	-0.16	0.68	-0.16	0.68
Industry: Paper	-0.11	0.80	-0.11	0.80	-0.11	0.80
Industry: Other Manufacturing	-0.06	0.91	-0.06	0.91	-0.06	0.91
Firm's Size: Less than 10 Employees	-1.32	0.00	-1.32	0.00	-1.32	0.00
Firm's Size: 10 - 50 Employees	-0.34	0.11	-0.34	0.11	-0.34	0.11
Firm's Size: 50 - 100 Employees	0.11	0.66	0.11	0.66	0.11	0.66
Firm's Size: More than 250 Employees	0.28	0.35	0.28	0.35	0.28	0.35
Foreign Ownership (1 = "Yes")	0.76	0.00	0.76	0.00	0.76	0.00
Power Outages (1 = "Yes")	0.07	0.26	0.09	0.10	0.09	0.09
Registry Coverage > 0 X Power Outages	0.17	0.09				
Registry Coverage > 3% X Power Outages			0.22	0.05		
Credit Information Index > 1 X Power Outages					0.47	0.00
Constant	-0.28	0.48	-0.28	0.47	-0.28	0.48
Wald chi2(27)	263.36	0.00	263.35	0.00	272.62	0.00
Number of obs	8201		8201		8201	

Dependent variable: Firm owns a generator (1 = "Yes")

Table 11: Difference-in-Differences Approach (Model 2)

Variable	Coef.	P-value
Country: Benin	-1.21	0.00
Country: Eritrea	0.09	0.88
Country: Kenya	0.43	0.15
Country: Madagascar	-2.52	0.00
Country: Malawi	-1.34	0.00
Country: Mali	0.25	0.48
Country: Mauritius	-1.29	0.00
Country: Senegal	0.21	0.49
Country: South Africa	-2.60	0.00
Country: Uganda	-0.74	0.01
Country: Zambia	-1.71	0.00
Industry: Garments and Textiles	-0.69	0.08
Industry: Food and Beverages	-0.002	1.00
Industry: Metals and Machinery	-0.77	0.06
Industry: Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals	-0.09	0.81
Industry: Construction	-0.41	0.36
Industry: Wood, Pulp and Furniture	-1.18	0.01
Industry: Non-metallic and Plastic Materials	-0.08	0.85
Industry: Paper	-0.06	0.90
Industry: Other Manufacturing	-0.14	0.81
Firm's Size: Less than 10 Employees	-1.52	0.00
Firm's Size: 10 - 50 Employees	-0.48	0.04
Firm's Size: 50 - 100 Employees	0.05	0.86
Firm's Size: More than 250 Employees	0.35	0.28
Foreign Ownership (1 = "Yes")	0.71	0.00
Year: 1991	-2.76	0.00
Year: 1992	-1.87	0.00
Year: 1993	-2.03	0.00
Year: 1994	-1.49	0.00
Year: 1995	-1.46	0.00
Year: 1996	-1.36	0.00
Year: 1997	-0.87	0.00
Year: 1998	-0.37	0.00
Year: 2000	0.36	0.00
Year: 2001	0.63	0.00
Year: 2002	0.79	0.00
Year: 2003	0.91	0.00
Year: 2004	1.29	0.00
Power Outages X Domestic Credit Growth	0.43	0.01
Constant	-0.25	0.56
Wald chi2(39)	441.06	0.00
Number of obs	8166	

Dependent variable: Firm owns a generator (1 = "Yes")

Table 12: Difference-in-Differences Approach (Model 3)

Variable	Regression coeff.		Marginal effect (d=1)		Marginal effect (d=2)		Marginal effect (d=3)	
	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value
Country: Benin	-0.90	0.01	-0.07	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.001	0.00
Country: Eritrea	-0.24	0.62	-0.02	0.59	-0.01	0.58	-0.0004	0.58
Country: Kenya	0.19	0.42	0.02	0.44	0.01	0.45	0.0004	0.46
Country: Madagascar	-1.96	0.00	-0.12	0.00	-0.03	0.00	-0.002	0.00
Country: Malawi	-0.75	0.01	-0.06	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.001	0.01
Country: Mali	0.03	0.90	0.003	0.90	0.00	0.90	0.0001	0.90
Country: Mauritius	-1.01	0.00	-0.07	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.001	0.00
Country: Senegal	0.06	0.81	0.01	0.81	0.002	0.81	0.0001	0.81
Country: South Africa	-2.41	0.00	-0.13	0.00	-0.03	0.00	-0.002	0.00
Country: Uganda	-0.71	0.00	-0.06	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.001	0.00
Country: Zambia	-1.66	0.00	-0.10	0.00	-0.03	0.00	-0.002	0.00
Industry: Garments and Textiles	-0.49	0.11	-0.04	0.08	-0.01	0.07	-0.001	0.08
Industry: Food and Beverages	0.07	0.80	0.01	0.81	0.002	0.81	0.0002	0.81
Industry: Metals and Machinery	-0.56	0.09	-0.05	0.05	-0.01	0.04	-0.001	0.06
Industry: Chemicals and Pharmaceuticals	-0.01	0.97	-0.001	0.99	-0.0003	0.97	-0.00002	0.97
Industry: Construction	-0.40	0.29	-0.03	0.23	-0.01	0.21	-0.001	0.22
Industry: Wood, Pulp and Furniture	-1.03	0.00	-0.08	0.00	-0.02	0.00	-0.002	0.01
Industry: Non-metallic and Plastic Materials	-0.09	0.77	-0.01	0.77	-0.003	0.77	-0.0002	0.77
Industry: Paper	-0.06	0.87	-0.01	0.87	-0.002	0.87	-0.0001	0.87
Industry: Other Manufacturing	0.03	0.96	0.003	0.96	0.001	0.96	0.0001	0.96
Firm's Size: Less than 10 Employees	-1.28	0.00	-0.10	0.00	-0.03	0.00	-0.002	0.00
Firm's Size: 10 - 50 Employees	-0.33	0.10	-0.03	0.09	-0.01	0.09	-0.001	0.12
Firm's Size: 50 - 100 Employees	0.07	0.75	0.01	0.76	0.002	0.76	0.0001	0.76
Firm's Size: More than 250 Employees	0.30	0.26	0.03	0.30	0.01	0.32	0.001	0.33
Foreign Ownership (1 = "Yes")	0.71	0.00	0.08	0.00	0.03	0.00	0.002	0.00
Domestic Credit Growth	0.68	0.00	0.07	0.00	0.02	0.00	0.001	0.00
mu1	1.98							
mu2	4.74							
Wald chi2(26)	313.30	0.00						
Number of obs					8464			

Dependent variable: Firm bought a generator at stable power supply (1 = "Yes"), Firm bought a generator during outages (2 = "Yes"), Firm bought a generator after consecutive outages (3 = "Yes")