

*Economics Department*  
*Working Papers in Economics*

---

*Boston College*

*Year 2005*

---

Does Financial Liberalization Improve  
the Allocation of Investment? Micro  
Evidence from Developing Countries

Arturo Galindo

Fabio Schiantarelli  
Boston College,

Andrew Weiss  
Boston University,

**DOES FINANCIAL LIBERALIZATION IMPROVE THE ALLOCATION  
OF INVESTMENT?**

**Micro Evidence from Developing Countries<sup>1</sup>**

Arturo Galindo - Universidad de los Andes

Fabio Schiantarelli - Boston College and IZA

Andrew Weiss - Boston University

September 28, 2005

**Abstract**

Using firm level panel data from twelve developing countries we explore if financial liberalization improves the efficiency with which investment funds are allocated. A summary index of the efficiency of investment allocation that measures whether investment funds are going to firms with a higher marginal return to capital is developed. We examine the relationship between this and various measures of financial liberalization and find that liberalization increases the efficiency with which investment funds are allocated. This holds after various robustness checks and is consistent with firm level evidence that a stronger association between investment and fundamentals after financial liberalization.

Keywords: Financial Liberalization, Investment, Efficiency, Reform, Development

JEL Classification: E22, E44, G28, O16

---

<sup>1</sup> We are grateful to two anonymous referees, to participants at seminars at the World Bank, NBER Summer Institute, NEUDC Conference, LACEA conference, and University of Bergamo for their comments. In particular we thank G. Anderson, T.Beck, G. Caprio Jr., L.Klapper, R. Levine, E.Lora , J. Minnier, N. Loayza, and D. Rodrik for useful suggestions and help with the data. Galindo thanks the Inter-American Development Bank where he worked during most of this research.

Corresponding author: Arturo Galindo. Department of Economics Universidad de los Andes. Cra 1e No.18a-10. Bogotá, Colombia..Phone: (571)339-4949 Ext.3193.. Fax: (571) 332-4021. Email: [ajgalindo@gmail.com](mailto:ajgalindo@gmail.com)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Since the mid 80's several developing countries have liberalized their financial systems. This liberalization has been characterized by greater scope granted to market forces in the determination of interest rates and in the allocation of credit. One crucial question that needs to be addressed is whether the financial reforms that have been implemented have lead to an improvement in the allocation of resources.

It is curious that while governments were moving away from state control toward a free market orientation, economists were focusing their research effort on the negative consequences caused by informational imperfections in a market system. Financial liberalization in general involves replacing one deeply flawed system characterized by heavy government intervention with another with different flaws. Whether these changes will improve the allocation of savings and investment is fundamentally an empirical question.

Several studies based on cross-country aggregate data find evidence of positive effects of various measures of financial development on growth.<sup>2</sup> Note that financial liberalization tends to be accompanied by an improvement in various measures of financial depth. At the same time, there is no evidence that financial reform increases

---

<sup>2</sup> Most of the studies are based on cross sectional growth regressions (see, for instance, King and Levine (1993a), King and Levine (1993b), Levine (1997), Levine and Zervos (1998)), others on pooled time series-cross sectional country level data (see Beck et al. (2000) and Levine et al.(2000)). For a different approach see Rajan and Zingales (1998) who rely on industry level data to show that industries with the greater need of external finance, grow faster in more financially developed countries. Demirguc-Kunt and Maksimovic (1998), instead, show that firms grow at a faster rate, relative to a benchmark growth rate that would hold in the absence of external finance, in countries with a more developed financial system. See also Galindo et al (2002) for evidence on the impact of financial liberalization on growth, and Bekaert et al. (2005) and Henry (2000) for evidence on the effect of stock market liberalization on growth and investment respectively.

private savings. Actually in some countries the effect may even be significantly negative.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, cross-country growth regressions also reveal that measures of financial development do not have a significant impact on the quantity of investment, but they positively and significantly affect measures of total factor productivity growth.<sup>4</sup> The results above raise the possibility that financial liberalization may have a positive effect on growth through its effect on the efficiency with which investment is allocated across firms and across sectors, and not mainly through the quantity of resources mobilized.<sup>5</sup>

However the precise channels through which finance exercises an effect on growth are not well understood empirically at present and there is little direct evidence on the effect of financial liberalization on the efficiency of resource allocation.<sup>6</sup> Using a panel of Ecuadorian firms during the 80's, Jaramillo, Schiantarelli and Weiss (1992) find that there was an increase in the flow of credit accruing to more efficient firms after liberalization, controlling for other firms' characteristics. Efficiency is defined in a narrow sense as purely technical efficiency, and it is calculated using panel data estimates of a Cobb Douglas production function. Similar results are also obtained by Siregar (1992) for Indonesian establishments in the 80's. Using firm level data for Jordan, Korea, Malaysia and Thailand, Chari and Henry (2002) show that the typical firm experiences an increase in both Tobin's  $q$  and investment after account liberalization. However the reallocation of investment is not significantly correlated to changes in systematic risk or investment opportunities. Other papers based on firm level data address the related, but

---

<sup>3</sup> See Bandiera et al. (2000).

<sup>4</sup> See Beck et al. (1999)

<sup>5</sup> See the theoretical contributions by Greenwood and Jovanovic (1990), Bencivenga and Smith (1991), King and Levine (1993a), Bencivenga, Smith and Starr (1995), and Almeida and Wolfenzon (2004).

<sup>6</sup> See Schiantarelli et al. (1994) for a more detailed review. See also Atiyas et al. (1994) and Fry (1995) for a comprehensive review of financial liberalization.

distinct question of whether financial constraints have been relaxed following financial liberalization (or financial development) and find that in most, but not all cases, smaller firms have improved their access to external resources following financial reform.<sup>7</sup> However, it is not obvious, without further considerations, what effect a relaxation of financial constraints for small firms has on the efficiency of resource allocation.

Wurgler (2000), using industry level data provides evidence that the rate of growth in investment is more closely associated with contemporaneous growth in value added, in countries with more developed financial systems. Country level financial development is measured by the average size of credit and equity markets relative to GDP. More specifically, countries which have a more developed financial system, both increase investment more in their growing industries and decrease investment more in their declining industries. The emphasis of that paper is on cross-country variation in time invariant measures of financial development and not on the changes resulting from the process of financial reform.<sup>8</sup> Finally, other papers (see Cho (1988) for Korea)) have focused on the change in the variance of expected marginal returns to capital across industries, as measured by an industry specific user cost of capital, before and after liberalization. A decrease in the variance is interpreted as suggesting that liberalization facilitates the process by which flows of capital equate returns.

Although these approaches provide useful insights on some of the consequences of financial development or of financial reform in different countries, they do not address

---

<sup>7</sup> This is the case for Indonesia in the 80's (see Harris et al. (1994)), but not for Ecuador (see Jaramillo et al. (1994)). See also Gelos and Werner (2002) for Mexico and Gallego and Loayza (2001) for Chile. See also Love (2003) and Laeven (2003) for micro evidence for several countries. The former focuses on financial development, the latter on financial reform

<sup>8</sup> Almeida and Wolfenzon (2004) adopt the approach in Wurgler (2000) and show that the need of external finance is positively correlated with the efficiency of capital allocation

directly and comprehensively the question of whether financial liberalization has resulted in a more efficient allocation of investment funds in developing countries.

In this paper, we develop a novel approach to evaluate whether financial liberalization has increased the share of investment going to firms with a higher marginal return to capital. More specifically, we develop a new summary index of the efficiency of allocation of investment. The index compares different measures of the marginal returns of investment summed across firms in each year with the hypothetical returns in a benchmark economy where investment funds had been allocated to firms in proportion to their share of capital in the economy. To implement this approach, we use a firm level panel data from twelve developing countries: Argentina, Brazil, Chile, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Taiwan, and Thailand. We discuss at length the simplifying assumptions needed to construct the index, as well as its potential drawbacks.

We then relate this index with different measures of financial liberalization based on a careful reconstruction of the timing of liberalization measures along several dimensions of financial development (see Laeven (2003)). These measures focus mainly on the banking sector. The methods used range from "ocular econometrics" to panel estimation, using the country-year specific measures of our efficiency index. We also control for other potential determinants of changes in the efficiency of resource allocation, such as trade liberalization and macroeconomic/financial shocks. Finally we allow the coefficient of financial reform to differ with country specific characteristics.

The results suggest that financial liberalization in the majority of cases leads to an improvement in resource allocation, although there are interesting exceptions. Panel

estimation suggests that on average there is a significant positive association between measures of liberalization and our index, which is robust to the inclusion of other controls. The econometric evidence on the determinants of cross-country differences in the efficacy of financial reform is less clear-cut.

Our basic results are robust to a set of variations and extension, including shifting the focus to the relocation of credit flows instead of investment. They also hold for a redefinition of the benchmark (to which the sum across firms of marginal returns of investment is compared) based on the pre-liberalization investment patterns. The conclusions obtained on the basis of our index are also concordant with those obtained from analyzing the strength of the association between individual firms' investment choices and fundamentals, measured by the sales to capital ratio. In particular econometric results based on firm level data suggest that the association between investment and the sales to capital ratio increases after financial liberalization.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In section II, we discuss the construction of the index of efficiency we propose. In Section III we describe the panel data set we use, we calculate the index for twelve developing countries, and we provide descriptive and econometric evidence on the relationship between the index and various measures of financial liberalization. This section also contains a set of robustness checks, as well as the micro-econometric results on firm level investment. Section V concludes the paper.

## II. MEASURING THE EFFICIENCY IN THE ALLOCATION OF INVESTMENT

In assessing the effect of financial liberalization we want to see whether it succeeds in directing resources towards those uses with the higher marginal returns. This is the concept of efficiency we focus on. In order to develop a synthetic measure of efficiency in the allocation of investment, we first need to measure the marginal return to investment. Our index approach measures marginal returns either by the sales to capital ratio or by the ratio of operating profits to capital. The former is appropriate if the production function is Cobb-Douglas in capital, labor and materials. In this case the marginal return to capital is proportional to the sales to capital ratio. The constant of proportionality equals the product between the elasticity of output with respect to capital and the inverse of one plus the markup of prices over marginal costs.<sup>9</sup> The operating profit-based measure is an appropriate proxy for the marginal return to capital under a generic constant return to scale production function and perfect competition in the output market. We then estimate the total return on investment for each firm by multiplying the firm's investment in a particular year by one of our measures of the firm's marginal return to investment. We sum the total return to investment for each firm across all firms to get an estimate of the total return to investment for the economy in a particular year.

To measure the efficiency of the allocation of investment in a year, each of our estimates of the total return on investment must be compared to a benchmark. The benchmark we use is an estimate of total returns if investment funds had been allocated to firms in proportion to their share of capital in the economy (so that a firm that is twice as

---

<sup>9</sup> See Abel and Blanchard (1986) and Gilchrist and Himmelberg (1998) for details.

large than another one would invest twice as much), independently from the returns to investment. We then multiply the investment generated in this way by actual returns for each firm and we sum across firms in order to obtain total returns for the benchmark allocation. We divide our measure of total return actually achieved, by this benchmark to obtain a measure of the efficiency with which investment funds were allocated in each year. Note that aggregate technological or other shocks that lead to an equi-proportionate change in the return to capital for all firms leave our index unchanged, since the numerator and the denominator increase in the same proportion.

This approach generates two different measures of the efficiency of the allocation of investment funds: one where sales per unit of capital is used as a measure of the marginal product of investment, the other where operating profits per unit of capital is used as the appropriate measure. Let us assume that investment becomes productive with one period delay. Moreover, let us use an individual firm's capital stock at the beginning of year t, as a fraction of total capital for all firms at the beginning of the same year, to measure the proportion of investment funds that the firm would receive if investment funds were assigned in the same proportion as in the past. The two versions of our index for year t are:

$$EI_t^S = \frac{\sum_i \frac{S_{i,t+1}}{K_{i,t+1}} I_{i,t}}{\sum_i \frac{S_{i,t+1}}{K_{i,t+1}} \cdot \frac{K_{i,t}}{K_t^T} \cdot I_t^T} \quad (1)$$

or:

$$EI_t^\pi = \frac{\sum_i \frac{\pi_{i,t+1}}{K_{i,t+1}} I_{i,t}}{\sum_i \frac{\pi_{i,t+1}}{K_{i,t+1}} \cdot \frac{K_{i,t}}{K_t^T} \cdot I_t^T} \quad (2)$$

where  $S_{it}$  denotes firm  $i$  sales at time  $t$ ,  $\pi_{it}$  operating profits,  $I_{it}$  fixed investment, and  $K_{i,t}$  beginning of period capital.  $I_t^T$  and  $K_t^T$  represent, instead, aggregate investment and aggregate capital at time  $t$ , respectively. Note that each unit of investment in year  $t$  increases the capital stock, and hence generates a return, in year  $t+1$ <sup>10</sup>.

There are a set of reasons that make the sales based index preferable to the profit-based index. First and foremost, sales are probably measured more accurately in the balance sheets than operating profits. Calculation of the latter requires a valuation of cost of goods sold, and hence of changes in inventories of raw materials, which is a tricky exercise, particularly in inflationary environments. Second, the sales based measure allows for a departure from perfect competition. However, the markup of prices over marginal costs is allowed to vary over time but not across firms, and the departure comes at the cost of making a parametric (Cobb Douglas) assumption about the production function. There is a third potential problem with the profit based measure of efficiency. Due to unionization or efficiency wage considerations, workers may be paid more than the reservation wage for their jobs. To the extent that the reallocation of capital induces a reallocation of labor, our profit measure may underestimate the gain in total surplus generated by such a reallocation.

---

<sup>10</sup> We also explored the possibility of using average Q as a measure of returns. However the information on stock market capitalization was not available for more than two thirds of the observations in our sample, rendering the exercise very uninformative.

A final problem with using operating profits as a measure of the return to capital is that operating profits are correlated with cash flow. Prior to financial liberalization, the correlation between cash flow and investment may be higher than after liberalization. Thus we would expect the operating profit measure of the efficiency of the allocation of investment might be biased in favor of the pre-liberalization periods. In fact, the previous literature in this field tends to find that financing constraints are relaxed for small establishments after financial liberalization. For medium and large establishments there is no significant change in the severity of constraints. However, if in spite of all this, we find that our profit based measure of efficiency increases after financial reform, this is a strong indication that there has been an improvement in the allocation of resources.

Both measures of efficiency in the allocation of investment funds have common potential drawbacks. First, we make the implicit assumption that the same marginal return to capital applies for the same firm in a given year to all units of investment. Second, we have ignored so far adjustment costs of investment. Given our procedure for computing the efficiency of the allocation of investment funds, allocative efficiency would be greatest if the firm with the highest ratio of operating profits or value added to capital were to get all the investment funds available for a given year. However, the discrepancy due to omitting adjustment costs may not be large. For instance, if adjustment costs are internal and additive, and take the form  $(b/2)(I/K)^2 K$ , the omitted

term is  $(b/2)(I/K)^2$ , which should be relatively small for a large range of realistic values of the investment rate.<sup>11</sup>

A third drawback is the implicit assumption that market prices reflect the social value of outputs and inputs. Presumably, there were social, political or even economic reasons for why governments favored particular industries or regions prior to liberalization. That bias in the allocation of investment funds *could* have been (2<sup>nd</sup> best) socially efficient given other distortions in the economy. For instance, if favored industries were producing exports, and if the currency was overvalued, then the domestic market price of their outputs, would understate the true value of their products (correct valuations would use the shadow price of foreign currency). Using the “wrong” exchange rate would lead the private return on investment in the export sector to be less than the social return. Therefore favoring export industries whose private returns are relatively low could actually increase the social productivity of investment. Similarly, government policies that encouraged investment with positive spillovers and discouraged investment with negative spillovers would enhance social efficiency. Finally, governments may want to favor particular regions in order to improve inter-regional income distribution. Programs of directed credit might be more efficient means of aiding those regions than would other programs intended to reduce inter-regional income disparities such as tax holidays for investments in economically depressed regions. Those tax exemptions encourage vertically integrated firms to use transfer prices to move profits into the subsidized region. In general programs of directed credit may be a second best solution to problems for which the first best solution is not politically feasible. Although we are

---

<sup>11</sup> See, for instance, Abel and Blanchard (1986), footnote 5.

well aware of the difference between market and social values we are convinced that our efficiency index is worth pursuing, because it contains interesting information and also because of the difficulty in measuring social returns to investment.

A fourth problem involves interpreting differences in the allocation of capital. In equilibrium, the marginal product of capital of a perfectly efficient economy would be the same in all firms. Consequently, random allocations of capital would do as well as any other allocation. No banking system could do better. This would be a serious problem for us if we were looking at the results of a financial liberalization that had been in effect for many years. However, we are observing the allocation of capital for the years immediately following the implementation of financial liberalization. For financial liberalization to eventually result in an equalization of the returns to capital across firms, it must have redirected investment funds toward the firms where the marginal product of capital was highest. This reallocation of investment is precisely what we are seeking to measure. In addition, even a cursory look at the data suggests that the potential problem outlined above is not a serious one in practice, since we observe great differences in the marginal revenue product of capital across firms.

### **III. EMPIRICAL RESULTS**

Has financial reform lead to an improvement in the allocation of resources as measured by our index? In order to answer this question we need firm level panel data to construct the index, and we need to be more precise in defining the evolution of financial

reform. After providing some background on the data used, we will present a set of empirical results that provide some answers to our central question.

### **III.1. The Data**

Our empirical investigation is based on firm level panel data for 12 developing countries that have introduced various measures of financial reform over the last several years: Argentina, Brazil, India, Indonesia, Korea, Malaysia, Mexico, Pakistan, Philippines, Taiwan, and Thailand. The source of the firm level information is the Worldscope database, which provides balance sheet information on publicly traded firms. The advantage of this data set is the cross-country comparability of the accounting information. The obvious drawback is the absence of information on non-publicly traded, which are, on average, smaller firms. Another limitation is that prior to the 90's, very little data is available for the subset of countries of interest to us.<sup>12</sup>

We use an unbalanced panel, but we require at least three consecutive years of observation on each firm, and a minimum of fifteen observations (firms) for each country-year. Moreover we have deleted outliers following the criteria summarized in the Data Appendix. Descriptive statistics for the main variables of interest are presented in Table A1, while the total number of firms available for each country is reported in Table A2.

---

<sup>12</sup> Although for some countries data are available also for the second half of the 80's, the number of firms included is very small.

We will rely on different measures of liberalization. They are all based on analysis of the timing of the introduction of various aspects of financial reform as discussed in Laeven (2003). Laeven provides a dating of interest rate deregulation, reduction of entry barriers, reduction of reserve requirements, reduction of credit controls, privatization of state banks, and strengthening of prudential regulation. These measures focus on the banking sector and correspond to the classification used also in Bandiera et al.(2000) for a smaller subset of countries.<sup>13</sup> Assume we associate a dummy equal to one (zero) to the years characterized by the more (less) liberalized regime. A first cardinal measure of liberalization is obtained by summing the six dummies (so that the index varies between zero and six). We will denote this measure by *Fli<sub>t</sub>*. Another measure is meant to distinguish in a discrete fashion country-years characterized by a more or less fully liberalized regime, versus one still characterized by many restrictions. As in Laeven (2003) we will divide observations depending upon whether the overall index is less than five, versus equal to five or six. This yields a partition of the years that is similar to the one proposed by Williamson and Mahar (1998). We will denote this dummy by *Libdummy1*.

In addition, we have experimented with alternative measures of liberalization that focus on different aspects of financial reform. We report here the results obtained when we construct a dummy variable, denoted by *Libdummy2* that equals one the year following the removal of the main restrictions on interest rates and credit allocation (the latter in the form of directed credit or credit ceilings). This measure enables us to focus on two of the dimensions of financial liberalization that are most likely to affect the

---

<sup>13</sup> Bandiera et al. (2000) also include information on securities market developments and international

allocation of investment funds. Since in all countries, but two, the removal of interest rate controls precedes or is contemporaneous to the removal of controls on credit flows, a dummy meant to capture only the latter aspect would be almost identical to *Libdummy2*.<sup>14</sup>

Finally note that all these measures of liberalization focus on financial intermediaries. All the countries in our sample have also introduced changes designed to promote the development of stock markets. However, stock market liberalization takes place in most countries at the end of the 80's and in the remaining countries in the very early nineties, while our firm level data set is basically limited to the nineties<sup>15</sup>. This is one of the reasons we have focused on the liberalization measures regarding financial intermediaries. Further investigation of the role of stock market development requires firm level data for the 80's as well, and is left for future research.

### **III.2. Descriptive evidence**

In this section we will present descriptive evidence on the effect of financial liberalization on the allocation of investment. We start by plotting in Figure 1 (a through m) our efficiency index for sales,  $EI_t^S$ , against the financial liberalization index,  $Fli_t$ . The vertical line in the graphs represents the year in which both interest rate and credit controls were removed. This exercise in “ocular econometrics” reveals some very interesting patterns. First, for a subset of countries, Brazil, Chile, India, Pakistan and

---

financial liberalization.

<sup>14</sup> We have also explored the possibility of using the index of liberalization of the domestic financial sector proposed by Kaminsky and Schmukler (2001), however for most countries in our sample their index reaches its maximum value in the late 80s or very early 90s, and therefore, it would not help us in explaining the reallocation of investment during our sample period.

<sup>15</sup> See for example Bekaert et al (2005) who report that stock market liberalization for the countries of our sample took place between 1987 and 1992.

Thailand, there is a clear and positive association between  $EI_t^S$  and  $Fli_t$ , suggesting that financial liberalization is associated with an improvement in the allocation of resources. One caveat is in order for Chile: by the beginning of the 90's many aspects of financial reforms have already been implemented, so that the most informative experiment would have been to analyze the behavior of the efficiency index over the 80's. It is interesting to note that the value of the index in Chile, a country with one of the most liberalized financial systems, tends to be higher than for the other countries.

For another group of countries, there is also evidence of an improvement of the efficiency index following the introduction of liberalization measures. This is true for Argentina, Korea and Mexico. For instance, in Korea, the index is below one (indicating an efficiency in investment allocation actually worse than one based purely on size) in the initial years and increases above one with the introduction of liberalization measures. However, in all these cases, there are significant reversals in the improvement, around periods of financial and currency crisis: 1995 for Argentina, 1998 for Korea and 1994 and 1998 for Mexico, and 1998 for Brazil. Finally, for a subset of countries, such as Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, the index shows no clear trend, while it is decreasing over time for Taiwan.<sup>16</sup>

The efficiency index based on profits,  $EI_t^\pi$ , paints a picture largely similar to the one for  $EI_t^S$ . Brazil, Chile India, Pakistan and Thailand are the countries for which one

---

<sup>16</sup> Schiantarelli and Weiss, with Siregar, in preliminary past research using a similar methodology to the one proposed in this paper, found that financial liberalization did not have a positive effect on the efficiency of the allocation of investment in Indonesia in the 80's. There are several reasons that could account for these results for Indonesia. For instance, Indonesian conglomerates, many owned by ethnic Chinese entrepreneurs, had access to overseas capital markets, which may have allowed them to circumvent the problems of a restricted domestic financial system. This may contribute to explain why internal financial liberalization has not generated large gains.

observes the clearer improvements. However, now  $EI_t^x$  decreases over time for Argentina and there is a worsening of the allocation of resources around periods of financial/currency crises in Mexico and Korea. Again, no clear pattern emerges for Indonesia, Malaysia, and Philippines, while the index shows a decrease in the latter years for Taiwan.

The overall pattern described above is confirmed and made more quantitatively precise by comparing the mean value of the index over sub-periods, defined as pre- and post- liberalization. The results are reported in Tables 1 (in part 1 for  $EI_t^s$  and in part 2 for  $EI_t^x$ ). In the first set of columns we use *Libdummy1*, to divide the 90's, i.e. the pre-liberalization (post-liberalization) period is the one for which the value of the overall index is less than five (equal to five or more).

In the second set of columns, we use *Libdummy2*, so that the pre-liberalization period is the one up to and including the year in which both interest rate and credit controls are removed. Looking at the sales based index, using *Libdummy1*, there are large and positive increases in its mean value in the post-reform period in six countries (Argentina, Brazil, India, Pakistan, Thailand and Korea). In three cases (Malaysia, Mexico and the Philippines) the means are virtually unchanged. In one case (Taiwan) one observes a decrease. When the interest rate and credit control dummy is used to partition the period, one observes an increase in the mean value of the efficiency index for Argentina, Brazil, India, Mexico and Pakistan, while there is basically no change for Korea. Note that for some countries, such as Chile, the difference in mean is not available, since the major changes in the financial deregulation process had already occurred by the beginning of the 90's. On average the index increases between 11% and

14% depending upon the exact criterion used to define the pre and post liberalization periods. The mean difference of the index across countries is significantly different from zero at the 5% level. These results are supportive of an improvement in the allocation of resources for the majority of countries, after financial reform. The results for the profit-based index confirm this overall pattern, but are not as strong as the ones based on sales. For instance, using *Libdummy2*, one observes an improvement in Brazil, Mexico, Pakistan and Thailand, but the increase is smaller than before. Moreover, the profit based index for India does not reveal any noticeable change in efficiency. Again, on average the index increases, but the increase is not significant at conventional levels.

### **III.3. Econometric evidence**

We now provide more formal econometric evidence on the effect of financial liberalization on the efficiency of resource allocation by utilizing the entire panel of firm-year observations. More specifically we regress our efficiency index on different measures of liberalization, allowing for country specific constants. Results are reported in Table 2. In Part 1, column I, we regress  $EI_t^S$  on the Laeven (2003) index. Actually, we use the value of the index lagged once,  $Fli_{t-1}$ , in order to minimize problems of endogeneity. However, we are fully conscious that it is difficult to fully address these problems. The results are very supportive of the idea that financial liberalization leads to an improvement in resource allocation: The coefficient of the liberalization index is positive and significant at the 5% level. Moreover the quantitative effects are quite large: the coefficient estimate suggest that going from a financially repressed index ( $Fli_t = 0$ ) to

a fully liberalized system ( $Fli_t = 6$ ) leads to an increase in  $EI_t^S$  of 19.8%.<sup>17</sup> In column II and III, the explanatory variables are *Libdummy1* and *Libdummy2*, respectively. The coefficients on the liberalization dummies are positive and significant at the 1% level. Again the effects are quantitatively significant. For instance, the efficiency index increases by 14.5 % when interest rate and credit controls are relaxed.<sup>18</sup>

Table 2, Part 2 contains the results for the profit-based measure of efficiency,  $EI_t^P$ . The results continue to suggest that financial liberalization improves efficiency, but the effect is not as strong and precisely estimated as the one observed using the sales based measure,  $EI_t^S$ . The coefficients of the liberalization dummies are always positive, but somewhat smaller now. The coefficients of  $Fli_{t-1}$  and *Libdummy2* are now significant at the 5% and 1% level, respectively, while the one for *Libdummy2* is not significant. Still, the results in column I imply that going from a completely repressed system to a fully liberalized one leads to a sizeable increase in efficiency of 12.6%.

One may legitimately wonder whether what we are capturing in these regressions is not only the effect of financial reform, but also the effect of other liberalization measures, such as trade liberalization or changes in macroeconomic conditions. Actually, it is not obvious a priori how trade liberalization should affect our particular measure of efficiency. Moreover, the main steps in trade liberalization were undertaken before the period we use for estimation.<sup>19</sup> However, in many countries, a decrease in trade barriers,

---

<sup>17</sup> If we include in the calculation of the liberalization index also a dummy for stock market liberalization, the results are virtually unchanged.

<sup>18</sup> Similar results are obtained using the contemporaneous value of the sales to capital ratio.

<sup>19</sup> For a review of empirical evidence of the effect of trade liberalization on growth see Edwards (1993). For more recent analysis, see Sachs and Warner (1995), Edwards (1998) and Rodriguez and Rodrik (2000). See also Lora (1997) for a discussion on trade liberalization in Latin America.

continues during the 1990's, and in at least one country (India), trade liberalization is accompanied by internal industrial deregulation, which can have a positive effect on the efficiency of resource allocation. In order to address these issues, we return to the full sample and we add to each specification the mean tariff rate as a measure of the degree of trade barriers. The results for  $EI_t^S$  are reported in Table 3. Its coefficient is negative, but not significant. Most importantly, from our point of view, the coefficients on two of the three proxies for financial reform ( $Fli_{t-1}$  and  $Libdummy2$ ) remain positive and statistically significant, although their magnitude is now a bit smaller.

In order to check the robustness of our results to the inclusion of other explanatory variables, we have conducted four other experiments (see Table 3 again). These exercises are also prompted by the observations that for some countries there are fluctuations in our efficiency index that occur at business cycle frequencies and in correspondence of financial crisis (see Figure 1). In the first experiment, we have included in the panel regression changes in the real exchange rate (an increase denotes an appreciation). These variables may capture general macro instability and the effects of financial and currency crisis that have occurred over the 90's. Moreover, since it is correlated with changes in the relative price of tradables versus non-tradables, it controls for changes in markups that may occur unevenly in the tradable and non-tradable sectors. Second, we have used a different and possibly more specific measure of the existence of speculative pressure that has resulted in currency crises in the last decade. This variable is the average of the percentage change in the nominal exchange rate, in reserves and in the interest rate (see Eichengreen et al. (1995) and Sachs et al. (1996)). Third, we have included as an additional regressor the inflation rate as a general proxy for

macroeconomic instability. During periods of macroeconomic instability it may be more difficult to identify where the good investment opportunities are and this may adversely affect the efficiency of allocation of investment funds.<sup>20</sup> Finally we include GDP growth in the equation to control for the effect of business cycles on the efficiency of resource allocation. It is not clear what the sign of the GDP growth coefficient should be. For instance, during recession credit risk increases and banks may become more careful in selecting the projects to be financed. At the same time uncertainty may be greater during recession, making it more difficult to identify good investment opportunities.

The crucial result here is that financial liberalization continues to exert a significant effect on the sales based index of efficiency. Across all specifications, the coefficients of all the proxies for financial liberalization remain significant at least at the 5% level in all cases, but two. Of the four additional variables, the coefficients on two of them (the measure of speculative pressure and the inflation rate) are negative and significant, while those of the remaining two (real appreciation and GDP growth) are insignificant. This suggests that lack of macroeconomic instability and financial crises are associated with a worsening of the allocation of resources.

The robustness of the link between allocative efficiency and financial liberalization, when we use the sales based measure of efficiency, does not carry over to the profit based measure of efficiency. More specifically, addition to the basic specification of the mean tariff rate, of real depreciation, of the measure of speculative pressure, of the inflation rate or of GDP growth, leaves the coefficient of the proxies for

---

<sup>20</sup> See Beaudry, Caglayan and Schiantarelli (2001) for an analysis of the effects of monetary uncertainty on the allocation of investment, using a different approach.

financial liberalization positive but insignificant at conventional levels.<sup>21</sup> However, the problems associated with the profit-based measure of efficiency suggest that more attention should be given to the results based on the sales based index.

#### **III.4. Additional Robustness Checks and Extensions**

In this sub-section we will first assess the robustness of the results in other dimensions, such as choice of estimation methods, definition of the capital stock, definition of investment, and replacing investment with new borrowing. All this will be done using the basic definition of the index we have relied upon so far. We will then ask whether our conclusion holds if we redefine more fundamentally the benchmark to which we compare the returns to investment in the actual economy.

In evaluating the effect of financial liberalization one may want to attribute more weights to those observations on the country-year efficiency index, when the latter is based on a larger number of firm-level observations, since in this case efficiency is measured more accurately. This could be achieved by weighting each country year observations of the variables included in the regression by the square root of the number of firm level observations available in each year in each country. However, this means attributing, *de facto*, greater weight to larger countries. In Table 4, Part 1, we report the results for the weighted least square regressions for  $EI_t^S$ . Our conclusion is largely unchanged, with the variables capturing liberalization exerting a positive and significant effect on the value of the efficiency index. Our conclusion also continues to hold if we Winsorize the data (and set extreme values equal to the 1<sup>th</sup> or 99<sup>th</sup> percentile) as opposed to trimming them (see Part 2 of Table).

---

<sup>21</sup> Of the additional variables, inflation, the average tariff and the speculative pressure measure remain

In the next experiment, we replace the gross investment with net investment, measured as difference of the real net capital stock, in calculating  $EI_t^S$ . It can be argued that, conceptually, it is more satisfactory to calculate the return on both net and replacement investment, as we have done. Moreover there is the risk that this measure of net investment may be more affected by measurement error, since it relies on an accounting measure of depreciation that is likely to reflect fiscal rules more than economic depreciation. Still, it is worthwhile to verify the robustness of the results to this change. The results are reported in Table 4, Part 3. The coefficient of  $Fli_{t-1}$  is smaller and not significant than the one reported in Table 2. However, the coefficient of *Libdummy1* is significant at the 5% level and the one of *Libdummy2* at the 10% level. Both of them are similar in size to those obtained before.

One may wonder whether the results obtained so far are robust to changes in the definition of the capital stock. In Part 4 of Table 4 we report the regression results for  $EI_t^S$ , for a definition of the capital stock, identical to the one used in Love (2003). In this case beginning of period capital is measured as end of period capital minus investment plus depreciation. As Love suggests, this measure may be a better measure, in those years in which firms undergo mergers or acquisitions. However, it may exacerbate measurement problems in years in which firms are allowed to revalue their capital stock in order to take account of inflation. Although the coefficients tend to be somewhat smaller, they remain significant for all the three measures of financial liberalization at least at the 5% level. The fundamental conclusions we have reached so far are, therefore, robust to changes in the definition of the capital stock.

---

significant and have negative signs. Results available from the authors upon request.

Given the emphasis in this paper on the reallocation of resources due to credit market liberalization., another experiment of interest is to see whether our results hold if we replace investment with the new borrowing,<sup>22</sup> The idea is to capture the improvement in efficiency due to the reallocation of credit flows. The potential drawback is that new debt will be used to finance not only investment in fixed capital (which is our focus here), but also working capital and other firm's needs. Moreover, for the index to continue to make sense, we have to limit ourselves to firm that experience a positive change in debt. The results are reported in Part 5 of Table 4. In two cases out of three (using *Libdummy1* and *Libdummy2*) financial liberalization leads to a statistically significant increase (respectively at the 1% and 5% level) in the index. Actually the coefficients are almost twice as large as the ones we had obtained before.<sup>23</sup>The size of the coefficient of  $Fli_{t-1}$  is similar to the one obtained before, but it is less precisely determined. In summary, it appears that the reallocation of credit plays an important role in improving the efficiency of allocation of investment funds.

A very interesting question one may ask is whether the changes in the efficiency index are due to a intra or inter-sectorial reallocation of investment, that is a reallocation of investment funds between firms in the same sector or in different sectors. Our data set includes publicly traded firms in agriculture, mineral industries, construction, manufacturing, transportation, communication and utilities, wholesale and retail trade. Unfortunately the coverage at the sectoral level is quite spotty and makes comparisons across time or countries a very dubious exercise. Even for manufacturing, for some of the

---

<sup>22</sup> Defined as change in total financial debt .

<sup>23</sup> Similar conclusions hold for the index based on profits. In this case the coefficient of *Libdummy1* is significant at the 5% level, while the one for *Libdummy2* is significant at the 10% level. Their size is approximately twice the one obtained with the basic version of the index.

countries in some of the years we do not have enough information to make the construction of the efficiency index meaningful. The investigation of this issue, therefore, will have to be postponed until data sets richer, and with more extensive coverage than the one used here become available to researchers.

A very important issue to address is whether our results would survive a redefinition of the benchmark to which actual returns are compared. So far the benchmark has been an economy in which investment is allocated purely according to firm size, measured by the capital stock. Another possibility is to compare the actual returns to the returns that would be realized in an economy in which investment for each firm in is set at the average pre-liberalization level. More specifically, for the post liberalization period, we will calculate average returns for each firm and multiply it by average investment after liberalization in the numerator and by average investment before liberalization in the denominator. Summing across firms in the numerator and the denominator, we obtain for the post liberalization period the modified index based on sales,  $MEI_{post}^S$  :

$$MEI_{post}^S = \frac{\sum_i \left( \frac{\overline{S_{i,post}}}{\overline{K_{i,post}}} \right) \left( \overline{I_{i,post}} \right)}{\sum_i \left( \frac{\overline{S_{i,post}}}{\overline{K_{i,post}}} \right) \left( \overline{I_{i,pre}} \right)} \quad (3)$$

where upper bars denote post or pre period averages.  $MEI_{pre}^S$  equals one by definition in the pre liberalization period. The modified index based on profits simply replaces the sales to capital ratio with the profit to capital ratio. Results for the change in the index for each country between the post and pre liberalization periods are reported in Table 5. For

all countries we observe an improvement in the allocation of resources and the average difference is significantly different from zero. In certain cases like Korea, the improvement appears to be unrealistically too large. This is perhaps due to the fact that we are taking averages over a very limited number of years, which could lead to distortions. Summing up, the overall qualitative conclusion that financial liberalization leads to an improvement in resource allocations also holds when using the revised index. If anything, this result becomes even stronger.

Finally, the descriptive evidence presented in Table 1 suggests that country level changes in the mean value of the efficiency index between the pre and post liberalization period differs across countries. This could occur for many reasons. First, other factors, besides financial liberalization affect the efficiency of resource allocations. Second, the intensity of the liberalization measures may differ across countries, and this is not fully captured by our index. Third, the effect of financial liberalization may differ depending upon initial conditions, upon other liberalization measures, and upon the macro context and the general institutional environment in which it takes place. The results presented in Table 3 have already suggested that measures of speculative pressure and of macro instability (such as the inflation rate) have an independent adverse effect on the allocation of investment. We have also experimented with interacting all the additional variables included in Table 3 (average tariffs,<sup>24</sup> change in the real exchange rate, speculative pressure, inflation, and GDP growth) with our measures of financial reform, but the interaction terms are never significant. We have also experimented with introducing interactions of the liberalization measures with measures of dispersion of the macro

variables over the period used for estimation. In order to investigate whether financial liberalization has had a greater impact on the allocation of resources in countries where it has led to greater financial deepening, we have interacted the financial liberalization index with a dummy that equals one in countries where the correlation of private credit to GDP and financial liberalization is greater than its median value. In both cases we have not had much success.

Moreover, we have investigated whether the effectiveness of financial reform depends upon initial conditions and other variables that reflect institutional quality and political stability. For instance, one may think that the effect of financial reform may be more beneficial in countries with a well-developed legal system that affords a better protection to creditor rights. Moreover, when incentives are highly distorted, financial liberalization might tend to hurt the allocation of credit, not improve it. For this reason we have interacted our liberalization measures with the initial level of financial development, the initial black market premium, initial GDP per capita, and several institutional variables, such as rule of law, creditor rights, risk of expropriation, risk of contract repudiation, efficiency of the judiciary, country of origin of the legal system, quality of accounting standards, measures of supervisory power and quality, corruption, and political risk.<sup>25</sup>

Again, it is difficult to find statistically significant differences in the financial liberalization coefficients, due probably to the limited number of countries in our sample. The only statistically significant interaction is the one with the measure of official

---

<sup>24</sup> On the issue of the sequencing of reforms see, for instance, McKinnon (1991). See also Arteta et al. (2003) for growth regression results.

supervisory power over financial intermediaries from Barth et al (2001 and 2004).<sup>26</sup> Results are reported in Table 6. A greater degree of supervisory power is associated with a stronger effect of financial liberalization and the differences are economically significant. At low levels of supervision the effect of financial liberalization is basically zero, while it becomes large and positive at mean levels of supervision (or higher). Finally, we also report the regression results when the effect of financial reform is allowed to differ between countries with a legal system based on the English one and the rest. The coefficient of financial liberalization is twice as large for the former and more precisely determined (.043 versus .022, with a t-ratio equal to 2.39 and 1.16 respectively). This is consistent with the contention that protection of investor's rights tends to be better in the English common law system (see La Porta et. al.(1998)). However, one cannot reject the hypothesis that the two coefficients are identical. This is also the case when more direct measures of property right protection, creditor right protection, etc. are used.

---

<sup>25</sup> See la Porta et al (1997) and (1998) on the relationship between institutions and finance. Note that all the institutional variables we use are country specific, but time invariant and that all our regressions contain country specific constants.

<sup>26</sup> The data in Barth et al. (2001a) reflect the situation at the end of the 90's. The measure of official supervisory power varies in our sample between nine and fifteen. See also Barth et al. (2001b) for an analysis of the effects of regulation and supervision.

### III.5. Econometric Evidence Estimating Micro Level Investment Equations

The last robustness check on the validity of our conclusion moves away from trying to summarize the efficiency of resource allocation in a single number for each country in each time period and uses the firm level information to assess the strength of association between investment and fundamentals in the pre and post liberalization periods.

More specifically, we measure fundamentals (expected marginal returns) by the sales to capital ratio and analyze whether its coefficient changes with financial liberalization in a simple investment equation that has the investment rate as the dependent variable<sup>27</sup>. This exercise with firm level data is similar in spirit to the one (using industry data and focused on financial development) contained in Wurgler (2000). The results obtained using the Within estimator are reported in Table 7. In Table 8 we report results obtained using the GMM estimator for the model in differences. In this case we also include the lagged investment rate as an additional explanatory variable. In both cases we include country-specific year dummies. In both cases, the coefficient of the sales to capital ratio increases significantly with financial liberalization (see column (1) for the interaction with  $Fli_{t-1}$ , column (3) for the interaction with  $Libdummy1$  and column (5) for the interaction with  $Libdummy2$ ). So it appears that firms become more reactive to changes in fundamentals with financial liberalization. The change in the sales to capital coefficient is quite large. For instance, the GMM results suggest that going from a fully repressed system ( $Fli_t = 0$ ) to a fully liberalized system ( $Fli_t = 6$ ) leads to an increase of approximately 50% in the sales to capital ratio coefficient. In the remaining columns of

Table 7 and 8 (columns (2), (4) and (6)) we include the stock of cash (relative to the capital stock) as an additional regressor.<sup>28</sup> We do this to control for potential changes that financial liberalization may have on the severity of financing constraints.<sup>29</sup> In this particular specification the coefficient of the cash stock variable is not very precisely determined, although one tends to see a decrease in its size in the post liberalization period. For our purpose here what matters is that the conclusion regarding the coefficient of the sales to capital ratio still hold.<sup>30</sup> The strength of the association between investment and fundamentals increases with financial liberalization. The greater responsiveness of firms to changes in their profit opportunities is an indication that resources are allocated more efficiently after financial liberalization and could explain the increase in the summary index of financial liberalization.

#### **IV. CONCLUSIONS**

The results presented in this paper provide empirical support for the idea that financial liberalization has lead to an improvement in the efficiency with which investment funds have been allocated. Both the informal "ocular econometric" exercise and the comparison of mean values of our efficiency index in the pre- and post-liberalization regimes suggests that the index has improved for many (although not for all) countries, following the introduction of financial reform. Moreover, the econometric

---

<sup>27</sup> We assume that the sales to capital ratio follows an AR(1) process so that the present discounted value of the marginal revenue product of capital is proportional to  $S_t/K_t$ .

<sup>28</sup> The cash variable is defined as the sum of the most liquid of the firm's assets (cash on hand, cash in banks, money orders, central bank deposits, demand deposits, etc.)

<sup>29</sup> See the references in footnote 7.

<sup>30</sup> This basic conclusion holds if we replace cash stock with cash flow.

results on the panel of country-years observations strongly supports a positive, significant and sizeable effect of financial liberalization on the efficiency with which investment funds are allocated. This conclusion holds for different measures of marginal returns and of financial liberalization, although are stronger when returns are assumed to be proportional to the sales to capital ratio. Moreover, the results for the sales based index are robust to the inclusion of other potential determinants of the efficiency of resource allocation, such as trade liberalization, and macro or financial stability or of GDP growth. They are also robust to variations in the estimation method, to changes in the definition of investment or of the capital stock, and to replacing investment with new borrowing.

Our qualitative conclusions on the positive effect of financial liberalization on the efficiency of resource allocation continue to hold when we modify the definition of the benchmark economy to one based on the pre liberalization pattern of investment. The conclusions based on the aggregate index are also supported by the evidence of a stronger association between investment and return opportunities in the post-liberalization period, based on estimating a simple investment equation on firm level micro data.

Finally, there is also evidence that the effects of financial liberalization, as measured by our aggregate index, is enhanced by greater official supervisory power, and some indication that the effects may be greater in countries whose legal system is based on the English one. However, the statistical significance of the interaction terms with various measure of institutional quality tends to be weak.

Obviously more work needs to be done. Extending the number of developing countries included in the analysis would obviously be useful. Moreover, one could gain additional insights on this issue by conducting a similar analysis on larger data sets for

individual countries that contain also observations on smaller establishments. The use of larger data sets would allow one to assess more fully whether the improvement in the efficiency in the allocation of investment funds is due to an intra-industry or inter-industry reallocation. The main difficulty in pursuing these extensions is the lack of good quality, firm level data, over long enough periods. Still, the evidence presented here provides the first comprehensive micro-based answer concerning the effect of financial liberalization on the allocation of investment in developing countries.

## DATA APPENDIX

### Variable definitions

#### Firm level variables

$K_t$ : Beginning of period capital stock, measured as the lagged value of end of period value of property plant and equipment, net of depreciation.

$I_t$ : Fixed capital expenditure.

$S_t$ : Gross sales and other operating revenue during the period, less discounts, returns and allowances.

$cogs_t$ : cost of goods sold.

$\pi_t$ : operating profits =  $S_t - cogs_t$ .

#### Country level variables

$fli_t$ : Financial liberalization index, based on Laeven (2003), see Table 1 his Appendix and Annex 1. It is calculated as the sum of zero-one dummies representing six dimensions of liberalization (interest rate deregulation, reduction of entry barriers, reduction of reserve requirements, reduction of credit controls, privatization of state banks, strengthening of prudential regulation). One (zero) denotes the post (pre) reform regime.

$Libdummy1$ : A dummy variable that equals one (zero), when  $fli_t$  equals or exceeds five (is less than five).

$Libdummy2$ : A dummy variable that equals one in the year following the introduction of interest rate liberalization and the removal of credit controls. It is zero otherwise.

*Average Tariff*: Un-weighted average of tariff rates. Source: World Bank - World Development Indicators.

$\Delta Real\ exchange\ rate$ : domestic prices divided by US prices multiplied by the exchange rate (in units of domestic currency per US Dollar). Source: International Financial Statistics.

*Inflation*:  $\log(1 + \text{CPI inflation rate})$ . Source: International Financial Statistics.

*Real GDP Growth*: Real GDP growth rate. Source: World Development Indicators

*Supervision*: Measure of official supervisory power. Source: Barth et al. (2001 and 2004).

*Speculative pressure*: Average of exchange rate depreciation, real interest rate variation and the negative of the variation in international reserves. Source: Eichengreen et al. (1995) and Sachs et al (1996)

### **Sample selection criteria**

We deleted the following observations:

- Financial sector firms, that is firms with SIC codes 60 and higher.
- Years with less than 15 firms
- Firms with less than 3 years of observations.
- Observations without investment, capital stock, profits or sales data.
- Observations with  $I \leq 0$
- Observations with  $S/K \leq 0$
- Observations with  $K \leq 0$
- Observations with cost of goods sold  $\leq 0$
- Observations where  $S/K > 20$
- Observations where Cost of goods sold  $> 20$
- Observations where  $I/K > 2.5$
- Observations where Profits/ $K > 5$

**Table A1: Descriptive Statistics**

<b>Variable</b>	<b>Observations</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Median</b>	<b>Std.Dev</b>	<b>Min</b>	<b>Max</b>
I/K	9495	0.257	0.164	0.294	0.000	2.482
S/K	9495	2.988	1.934	3.082	0.000	19.968
Profits/K	9495	0.654	0.434	0.715	-2.925	5.000

**Table A2: Number of Firms, by Country**

<b>Country</b>	<b>Total Non - financial Firms<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Manufacturing Firms<sup>b</sup></b>
<b>Argentina</b>	40	31
<b>Brazil</b>	141	120
<b>Chile</b>	73	58
<b>India</b>	296	284
<b>Indonesia</b>	115	91
<b>Korea</b>	256	195
<b>Malaysia</b>	287	204
<b>Mexico</b>	74	55
<b>Pakistan</b>	87	83
<b>Philippines</b>	67	47
<b>Taiwan</b>	202	173
<b>Thailand</b>	184	139

Notes: <sup>a</sup> Total number of firms excluding those with SIC codes greater than 60. <sup>b</sup> Firms with SIC codes between 20 and 50.

## References

Abel, A.B., Blanchard, O.J., 1986. The Present value of Profits and Cyclical Movements in Investment. *Econometrica* 54(2), 249--273.

Almeida, H, Wolfenzon, D., 2004 . The Effect of External Finance on the Equilibrium Allocation of Capital. *Journal of Financial Economics* 75, 133--164.

Arteta, C., B. Eichengreen, Wyplosz, C., 2003. When Does Capital Account Liberalization Help More Than Hurts?. In: Eichengreen, B.. (Ed). *Capital flows and crises*. MIT Press, Cambridge and London. 71--96

Atiyas, I., Caprio, G., Hanson, J. ,1994. An Overview of Financial Reform Episodes, in: Caprio, G, Atiyas,I, and Hanson,J. (Eds.) .*Financial Reform, Theory and Experience* , Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Bandiera, O., Caprio, G. Honohan, P., Schiantarelli, F., 2000. Does Financial Reform Raise or reduce Saving? *Review of Economics and Statistics* 82(2), 239--263.

Barth, J.R., Caprio, G., Levine, R., 2001. The Regulation and Supervision of Banks Around the World: A New Database. *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Financial Services* 0, 183--240

Barth, J.R., Caprio, G., Levine, R., 2004. Bank Regulation and Supervision: What Works Best? *Journal of Financial Intermediation* 13(2), 205-249.

Beaudry, P., Caglayan, M. , Schiantarelli, F., 2001. Monetary Instability, the Predictability of Prices and the Allocation of Investment; An Empirical Investigation using UK Panel Data. *American Economic Review* 91(3), 648--662

Bekaert , G., Harvey, C.H. Lundblad, C., 2005. Does Financial Liberalization Spur Growth? *Journal of Financial Economics* 77, 3--56

Beck,T., Levine, R. Loayza, N., 2000. Finance and the Sources of Growth. *Journal of Financial Economics* 58, 261--300.

Beck, T., Clarke, G., Groff, A., Keefer, P., Walsh, P., 2000. New Tools and New Tests in Comparative Political Economy: The Database of Political Institutions. The World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper, 2283.

Bencivenga, V., Smith, B., 1991. Financial Intermediation and Endogenous Growth. *The Review of Economic Studies* 58(2), 195--209

Bencivenga V., Smith, B., Starr, R. , 1995. Transaction Costs, Technological Choice and Endogenous Growth. *Journal of Economic Theory* 67. 153--177

- Chari, A. Henry, P., 2002. Capital Account Liberalization: Allocative Efficiency or Animal Spirits?. NBER Working Paper No. 8908.
- Cho, Y., 1988. The Effect of Financial Liberalization on the Efficiency of Credit Allocation: some evidence for Korea. *Journal of Development Economics* 29. 101--110.
- Demirguc-Kunt, A., Maksimovic, V., 1998. Law, Finance, and Firm Growth, *Journal of Finance* 53, 2107--2137.
- Eichengreen, B., Rose, A., Wyplosz, C., 1995. Exchange Market Mayhem: the Antecedents and Aftermath of Speculative Attacks. *Economic Policy*. 21, 249--312.
- Edwards, S., 1993. Openness, Trade Liberalization, and Growth in Developing Countries, *Journal of Economic Literature* XXXI (3), 1358--1393.
- Edwards, S., 1998. Openness, Productivity and Growth: What Do we Really Know? *Economic Journal* 108, 383--398.
- Fry, M. J., 1995. Money, Interest, and Banking in Economic Development. The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Galindo, A., Micco, A., Ordoñez, G., 2002. Financial Liberalization: Does it Pay to Join the Party?. *Economia* 3(1), 231—261.
- Gallego, F., Loayza, N., 2001. Financial Structure in Chile: Macroeconomic Developments and Microeconomic Effects. In: Demirguc Kunt, a., Levine, R. (Eds.) *Financial structure and economic growth: A cross-country comparison of banks, markets, and development*. MIT Press, Cambridge and London. 299--346
- Gelos, G., Werner, A., 2002. Financial Liberalization, Credit Constraints, and Collateral: Investment in the Mexican Manufacturing Sector. *Journal of Development Economics* 67(1), 1-- 27.
- Greenwood, J, Jovanovic, B., 1990. Financial Development, Growth, and the Distribution of Income. *Journal of Political Economy* 98(5), 1076--1107
- Gilchrist, S., Himmelberg, C.P., 1998. Investment, Fundamentals and Finance. NBER *Macroeconomics Annual* 13, 223--261.
- Harris, J., Schiantarelli, F., Siregar, M., 1994. The Effect of Financial Liberalization on Firms' Capital Structure and Investment Decisions: Evidence from a Panel of Indonesian Manufacturing Establishments, 1981-1988. *World Bank Economic Review* 8(1), 17--47.
- Henry, P.B., 2000. Do Stock Market Liberalizations Cause Investment Booms? *Journal of Financial Economics*. 58(1-2), 301--334.

- Jaramillo F., Schiantarelli, F., Weiss,A., 1992 The Effect of Financial Liberalization on the Allocation of Credit: Panel Data Evidence for Ecuador. Policy Research Working Papers, The World Bank, WPS 1092.
- Jaramillo, F., Schiantarelli,F. Weiss, A., 1994. Capital Market Imperfections Before and After Financial Liberalization: An Euler Equation Approach to Panel data for Ecuadorian Firms, *Journal of Development Economics* 51, 367--386.
- King, R. , Levine, R., 1993a. Finance, Entrepreneurship and Growth: Theory and Evidence. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 32, 513--542.
- King, R., Levine, R. , 1993b. Finance and Growth: Schumpeter May Be Right. *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 108, 717--737.
- Laeven, L., 2003., Does Financial liberalization Reduce Financial Constraints? *Financial Management* 32(1),5--35
- La Porta, R., Lopez de Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. Vishny, R.,1997. Legal Determinants of External Finance. *Journal of Finance* 52, 1131--1150.
- La Porta, R., Lopez de Silanes, F., Shleifer, A. Vishny, R., 1998. Law and Finance. *Journal of Political Economy* 106(6), 1113--1155.
- Levine, R., Loayza, N. ,Beck,T., 2000., Financial Intermediation and Growth: Causality and Causes. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 46, 31--77.
- Levine, R., 1997. Financial Development and Economic Growth: Views and Agenda. *Journal of Economic Literature* 35(2). 688--726.
- Levine, R. , Zervos, S., 1998. Stock market , Banks, and economic Growth. *American Economic Review* 88, 537--558.
- Lora, E., 1997. A Decade of Structural Reform in Latin America: What Has Been Reformed and How to Measure It. Inter-American Development Bank. Working Paper . WP-348.
- Love, I., 2003. Financial Development and Financing Constraints: International Evidence from the Structural Investment Model. *Review of Financial Studies* 16(3), 765--791
- McKinnon, R., 1991. The order of Economic Liberalization: Financial Control in the Transition to a Market Economy. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore.
- Rajan, R. , Zingales, L., 1998. Financial Dependence and Growth. *American economic Review* 88, 559--586.

Rodriguez, F., Rodrik, D., 2000. Trade Policy and Economic Growth: A Skeptic's Guide to the Cross-National Evidence. NBER Macroeconomics Annual 15, 261--325

Sachs, J., Werner, A., 1995. Economic Reform and the Process of Global Integration, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 1, 1--118.

Sachs, J., Tornell, A., Velasco, A., 1996. Financial Markets in Emerging Markets: the Lessons from 1995, Brookings Papers on Economic Activity 1, 147--215.

Schiantarelli, F., Atiyas, A., Caprio, G., Harris, J., Weiss, A., 1994. Credit where it is due? A Review of the Macro and Micro Evidence on the Real Effects of Financial Reform. In: Caprio, G., Atiyas, I., Hanson, J. (Eds.) Financial Reform, Theory and Experience. Cambridge University press, Cambridge.

Schmukler, S., Kaminsky, G., 2001. On Booms and Crashes: Financial Liberalization and Stock Market Cycles. World Bank. mimeo.

Siregar, M. 1994. Financial Liberalization, Investment, and Debt Allocation, unpublished Pd.D. Dissertation, Boston University.

Williamson, J., Mahar, M., 1998. A Survey of Financial Liberalization. Essays in International Finance No. 211, Department of Economics, Princeton University.

Wurgler, J., 2000. Financial Markets and the Allocation of Capital, Journal of Financial Economics 58, 187--214.

Tables

**Table 1 : Differences in Mean Value of  $EI^S$  and  $EI^P$  Between Pre and Post liberalization Periods.**

Country	Libdummy1 <sup>a</sup>			Libdummy <sup>b</sup>		
	Pre Liberalization	Post Liberalization	Difference	Pre Liberalization	Post Liberalization	Difference
<b>Part 1: <math>EI^S</math> [Index Based on Sales]</b>						
Argentina	0.996	1.105	0.109	0.996	1.105	0.109
Brazil	1.072	1.357	0.285	0.964	1.323	0.359
Chile						
India	1.072	1.247	0.175	1.101	1.261	0.159
Indonesia						
Korea	0.985	1.033	0.048	1.000	1.005	0.005
Malaysia	1.096	1.064	-0.032	1.213	1.056	-0.157
Mexico	1.208	1.185	-0.023	1.050	1.211	0.160
Pakistan	0.859	1.077	0.217	0.886	0.968	0.081
Philippines	1.071	1.063	-0.008			0.000
Taiwan						
Thailand	0.973	1.174	0.202	0.883	1.137	0.254
<b>Average Difference</b>			0.108			0.121
<b>t-stat</b>			2.760			2.210
<b>Part 2: <math>EI^P</math> [Index Based on Profits]</b>						
Argentina	1.124	1.063	-0.061	1.124	1.063	-0.061
Brazil	1.061	1.273	0.212	0.972	1.256	0.284
Chile						
India	1.056	1.080	0.024	1.064	1.073	0.008
Indonesia	0.941	1.116	0.175			
Korea	1.074	1.040	-0.034	1.082	0.996	-0.086
Malaysia	1.046	1.017	-0.029	1.031	1.027	-0.004
Mexico	1.292	1.165	-0.127	1.147	1.203	0.056
Pakistan	0.817	1.045	0.227	0.848	0.927	0.079
Philippines	1.121	1.137	0.016			
Taiwan						
Thailand	0.938	1.182	0.244	0.880	1.120	0.239
<b>Average Difference</b>			0.053			0.064
<b>t-stat</b>			1.140			1.370

Notes: <sup>a</sup> Libdummy1 = 1 (0) when at least 5 of the following requirements were met (not met): interest rate deregulation, entry barriers removed, reserve requirements reduced, credit controls eliminated, privatization, prudential regulation adopted. <sup>b</sup> Libdummy2 = 1 starting from the year after the liberalization of interest rates and the removal of credit controls (0 otherwise). Source: Laeven (2000).

**Table 2: Panel Regression for  $EI^S$  and  $EI^P$ : Basic Specification <sup>a</sup>**

<b>Part 1: Dependent Variable: <math>EI^S</math> [Index based on sales]</b>				
	I	II	III	
<i>Fli (-1)</i> <sup>b</sup>	0.033 <i>0.013</i>	**		
<i>Libdummy1</i> <sup>c</sup>		0.107 <i>0.040</i>	***	
<i>Libdummy2</i> <sup>d</sup>			0.145 <i>0.050</i>	***
<b>R2</b>	0.33	0.32	0.34	
<b>Obs</b>	90	90	90	
<b>Part 2: Dependent Variable: <math>EI^P</math> [Index based on Profits]</b>				
	I	II	III	
<i>Fli (-1)</i> <sup>b</sup>	0.021 <i>0.012</i>	*		
<i>Libdummy1</i> <sup>c</sup>		0.058 <i>0.039</i>		
<i>Libdummy2</i> <sup>d</sup>			0.087 <i>0.044</i>	**
<b>R2</b>	0.35	0.34	0.34	
<b>Obs</b>	90	90	90	

Notes: <sup>a</sup> i) All specifications include country dummies; ii) Standard errors reported in *italics*; iii) \*\*\* Significant at 1%, \*\* Significant at 5%, \* Significant at 10%. <sup>b</sup> Source: Laeven(2000) <sup>c</sup> Libdummy1 = 1 (0) when at least 5 of the following requirements were met (not met): interest rate deregulation, entry barriers removed, reserve requirements reduced, credit controls eliminated, privatization, prudential regulation adopted. Source: Laeven(2000). <sup>d</sup> Libdummy2 = 1 starting from the year after the liberalization of interest rates and the removal of credit controls (0 otherwise). Source: Laeven(2000).

**Table 3 : Panel Regression for  $EF^S$ :**

**Controlling for Trade Liberalization, Real Exchange Rate Changes, Speculative Pressure, Inflation and GDP Growth<sup>a</sup>**

Dependent Variable: $EI^S$ [Index based on sales].						
	I	II	III	IV	V	
<b><math>Fli (-1)^b</math></b>	0.028 **	0.035 ***	0.032 **	0.029 **	0.034 ***	0.034 ***
<b>Average Tariff<sup>c</sup></b>	0.013	0.013	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
<b><math>\Delta</math> Real Exchange Rate<sup>d</sup></b>	-0.004					
	0.004					
<b>Speculative Pressure<sup>e</sup></b>		0.161				
		0.156				
<b>Inflation<sup>f</sup></b>			-0.014 ***			
			0.005			
<b>GDP Growth<sup>g</sup></b>				-0.014 ***		
				0.004		
<b>R2</b>						-0.326
<b>Obs</b>						0.437
<b>R2</b>	0.37	0.42	0.43	0.43	0.37	0.37
<b>Obs</b>	83	80	80	83	83	83
<b>Libdummy1<sup>h</sup></b>	0.070	0.102 **	0.098 **	0.083 **	0.095 **	0.095 **
	0.044	0.039	0.039	0.038	0.039	0.039
<b>Average Tariff<sup>c</sup></b>	-0.006					
	0.005					
<b><math>\Delta</math> Real Exchange Rate<sup>d</sup></b>		0.123				
		0.168				
<b>Speculative Pressure<sup>e</sup></b>			-0.016 ***			
			0.004			
<b>Inflation<sup>f</sup></b>				-0.014 ***		
				0.004		
<b>GDP Growth<sup>g</sup></b>						-0.418
						0.451
<b>R2</b>	0.37	0.40	0.42	0.42	0.35	0.35
<b>Obs</b>	83	80	80	83	83	83
<b>Libdummy2<sup>i</sup></b>	0.110 **	0.118 **	0.106 **	0.093 *	0.134 **	0.134 **
	0.048	0.049	0.049	0.051	0.051	0.051
<b>Average Tariff<sup>c</sup></b>	-0.005					
	0.004					
<b><math>\Delta</math> Real Exchange Rate<sup>d</sup></b>		0.073				
		0.159				
<b>Speculative Pressure<sup>e</sup></b>			-0.011 ***			
			0.004			
<b>Inflation<sup>f</sup></b>				-0.011 **		
				0.005		
<b>GDP Growth<sup>g</sup></b>						-0.398
						0.051
<b>R2</b>	0.38	0.40	0.41	0.42	0.38	0.38
<b>Obs</b>	83	80	80	83	83	83

Notes:<sup>a</sup> i) All specifications include country dummies; ii) Standard errors reported in *italics*; iii) \*\*\* Significant at 1%, \*\* Significant at 5%, \* Significant at 10%. <sup>b</sup> Source: Laeven(2000) <sup>c</sup> Average import tariff. Source: World Bank WDI. <sup>d</sup> Depreciation of real exchange rate against US dollar (Negative values=depreciation). Source:IFS/IMF. <sup>e</sup> Speculative pressure index equal to average of changes in nominal exchange rate, changes in the interest rate and the negative of changes in international reserves. Source: Sachs et al. (1996). <sup>f</sup> Inflation is defined as the rate of change of CPI. Source: IFS/IMF. <sup>g</sup> GDP growth is defined as the rate of change of real GDP. Source:WDI/World Bank. <sup>h</sup> Libdummy1 = 1 (0) when at least 5 of the following requirements were met (not met): interest rate deregulation, entry barriers removed, reserve requirements reduced, credit controls eliminated, privatization, prudential regulation adopted. Source: Laeven(2000).i Libdummy2 = 1 starting from the year after the liberalization of interest rates and the removal of credit controls (0 otherwise). Source:Laeven (2000).

**Table 4: Additional Robustness Tests**

Dependent Variable: $EI^S$ [Index based on sales] <sup>a</sup>						
Part 1: Weighted Least Squares				Part 2: Winsorizing		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
<i>Fli (-1)</i> <sup>b</sup>	0.037 *** <i>0.012</i>			0.230 <i>0.020</i>		
<i>Libdummy1</i> <sup>c</sup>		0.091 ** <i>0.037</i>			0.153 ** <i>0.061</i>	
<i>Libdummy2</i> <sup>d</sup>			0.095 ** <i>0.046</i>			0.201 *** <i>0.069</i>
R2	0.40	0.38	0.37	0.33	0.37	0.38
Obs	90	90	90	90	90	90
Part 3: Using Net Investment				Part 4: Alternative Definition of the Capital Stock		
	I	II	III	I	II	III
<i>Fli (-1)</i> <sup>b</sup>	0.004 <i>0.018</i>			0.019 ** <i>0.010</i>		
<i>Libdummy1</i> <sup>c</sup>		0.133 ** <i>0.055</i>			0.074 ** <i>0.003</i>	
<i>Libdummy2</i> <sup>d</sup>			0.120 * <i>0.061</i>			0.081 ** <i>0.040</i>
R2	0.14	0.21	0.37	0.57	0.58	0.58
Obs	74	74	74	90	90	90
Part 5: Using Debt						
	I	II	III			
<i>Fli (-1)</i> <sup>b</sup>		0.039 <i>0.031</i>				
<i>Libdummy1</i> <sup>c</sup>			0.282 *** <i>0.103</i>			
<i>Libdummy2</i> <sup>d</sup>				0.273 ** <i>0.121</i>		
R2		0.19	0.24	0.21		
Obs		90	90	90		

Notes: a i) All specifications include country dummies; ii) Standard errors reported in italics; iii) \*\*\* Significant at 1%, \*\* Significant at 5%, \* Significant at 10%. b Source: Laeven(2000). c Libdummy1 = 1 (0) when at least 5 of the following requirements were met (not met): interest rate deregulation, entry barriers removed, reserve requirements reduced, credit controls eliminated, privatization, prudential regulation adopted. Source: Laeven(2000).d Libdummy2 = 1 starting from the year after the liberalization of interest rates and the removal of credit controls (0 otherwise). Source:Laeven( 2000).

**Table 5: Alternative Definition of the Benchmark**

Country	Difference [Post - Pre]	
	Libdummy1 <sup>a</sup>	Libdummy <sup>b</sup>
	<b>Part 1: <math>MEI^S</math> [Index Based on Sales]</b>	
Argentina	0.750	0.750
Brazil	0.144	0.201
Chile		
India	1.306	0.355
Indonesia		
Korea	3.839	2.014
Malaysia	0.183	2.724
Mexico	0.122	0.750
Pakistan	1.497	0.866
Philippines	0.691	
Taiwan		
Thailand	0.509	0.512
<b>Average Difference</b>	1.005	1.022
<b>t-stat</b>	2.570	3.280
	<b>Part 2: <math>MEI^P</math> [Index Based on Profits]</b>	
Argentina	0.947	0.947
Brazil	0.196	0.230
Chile		
India	1.215	0.371
Indonesia		
Korea	3.701	2.065
Malaysia	0.179	2.092
Mexico	0.244	0.934
Pakistan	1.336	0.671
Philippines	0.672	
Taiwan		
Thailand	0.572	0.526
<b>Average Difference</b>	1.007	0.979
<b>t-stat</b>	2.750	3.830

Notes: a Libdummy1 = 1 (0) when at least 5 of the following requirements were met (not met): interest rate deregulation, entry barriers removed, reserve requirements reduced, credit controls eliminated, privatization, prudential regulation adopted. b Libdummy2 = 1 starting from the year after the liberalization of interest rates and the removal of credit controls (0 otherwise). Source: Laeven (2000).

**Table 6: Panel Regression for  $EP^S$ :  
Interactions with, Supervisory Power  
and Legal Origin<sup>a</sup>**

<b>Dependent Variable: <math>EP^S</math> [Index based on sales].</b>		
	I	II
<i>Fli (-1)</i> <sup>b</sup>	-0.170 *	
	<i>0.105</i>	
<i>Fli(-1)*SUPERVISOR</i> <sup>c</sup>	0.019 **	
	<i>0.010</i>	
<i>Fli(-1)*English Origin</i> <sup>d</sup>		0.043 **
		<i>0.018</i>
<i>Fli(-1)*Non English Origin</i> <sup>d</sup>		0.022
		<i>0.019</i>
<b>R2</b>	0.33	0.32
<b>Obs</b>	83	90

Notes: <sup>a</sup>i) All specifications include country dummies; ii) Standard errors reported in *italics*; iii) \*\*\* Significant at 1%, \*\* Significant at 5%, \* Significant at 10%; iv) The square root of the number of firms in each country-year is used as weight. <sup>b</sup> Source: Laeven(2000) <sup>c</sup> Supervisor power. Source Caprio (et.al) 2001. <sup>d</sup> Legal origin of country. Source: La Porta et al.(1998).

**Table 7: Firm level results: Within Estimator**

<b>Dependent Variable: I/K</b>						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<b>S/K</b>	0.032 [0.0042]***	0.03 [0.0044]***	0.052 [0.0023]***	0.0507 [0.0024]***	0.0508 [0.0024]***	0.0499 [0.0026]***
<b>S/K*Fli(-1)<sup>a</sup></b>	0.0059 [0.0009]***	0.0062 [0.0009]***				
<b>S/K*Libdummy1<sup>b</sup></b>			0.0123 [0.0022]***	0.0132 [0.0023]***		
<b>S/K*Libdummy2<sup>c</sup></b>					0.0131 [0.0025]***	0.0136 [0.0025]***
<b>Cash/K</b>		0.0251 [0.0158]		0.013 [0.0071]*		0.0084 [0.0087]
<b>Cash/K*Fli(-1)</b>		-0.004 [0.0026]				
<b>Cash/K*Libdummy1</b>				-0.0121 [0.0071]*		
<b>Cash/K*Libdummy2</b>						-0.0075 [0.0087]
<b>Observations</b>	8504	8501	8504	8501	8504	8501
<b>Number of firm</b>	1851	1851	1851	1851	1851	1851
<b>R-squared</b>	0.2041	0.2046	0.2021	0.2027	0.2017	0.202
<b>Firm Fixed Effect</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<b>Country-Year Effects</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Standard errors reported in brackets; \*\*\* Significant at 1%, \*\* Significant at 5%, \* Significant at 10%. <sup>a</sup> Source: Laeven(2000). <sup>b</sup> Libdummy1 = 1 (0) when at least 5 of the following requirements were met (not met): interest rate deregulation, entry barriers removed, reserve requirements reduced, credit controls eliminated, privatization, prudential regulation adopted. Source: Laeven(2000). <sup>c</sup> Libdummy2 = 1 starting from the year after the liberalization of interest rates and the removal of credit controls (0 otherwise). Source: Laeven(2000).

**Table 8: Firm level results: GMM-Difference estimator**

<b>Dependent Variable: I/K</b>						
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<b>I/K (-1)</b>	0.2816 [0.0349]***	0.2818 [0.0349]***	0.2831 [0.0352]***	0.2838 [0.0351]***	0.2929 [0.0352]***	0.2932 [0.0352]***
<b>S/K</b>	0.0679 [0.0123]***	0.0662 [0.0128]***	0.0836 [0.0066]***	0.0819 [0.0069]***	0.0827 [0.0064]***	0.0836 [0.0067]***
<b>S/K*Fli(-1)<sup>a</sup></b>	0.0048 [0.0023]**	0.005 [0.0023]**				
<b>S/K*Libdummy1<sup>b</sup></b>			0.011 [0.0047]**	0.0123 [0.0049]**		
<b>S/K*Libdummy2<sup>c</sup></b>					0.0127 [0.0045]***	0.0119 [0.0046]***
<b>Cash/K</b>		0.0175 [0.0289]		0.0165 [0.0161]		-0.0104 [0.0117]
<b>Cash/K*Fli(-1)</b>		-0.0029 [0.0048]				
<b>Cash/K*Libdummy1</b>				-0.0164 [0.0161]		
<b>Cash/K*Libdummy2</b>						0.0107 [0.0116]
<b>Observations</b>	4660	4658	4660	4658	4660	4658
<b>Number of firm</b>	1450	1450	1450	1450	1450	1450
<b>P-Value AR(2)</b>	0.885	0.910	0.863	0.898	0.768	0.759
<b>P-Value Sargan</b>	0.740	0.743	0.792	0.801	0.790	0.789
<b>Country-Year Effects</b>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: Standard errors reported in brackets; \*\*\* Significant at 1%, \*\* Significant at 5%, \* Significant at 10%. <sup>a</sup> Source: Laeven(2000). <sup>b</sup> Libdummy1 = 1 (0) when at least 5 of the following requirements were met (not met): interest rate deregulation, entry barriers removed, reserve requirements reduced, credit controls eliminated, privatization, prudential regulation adopted. Source: Laeven(2000). <sup>c</sup> Libdummy2 = 1 starting from the year after the liberalization of interest rates and the removal of credit controls (0 otherwise). Source: Laeven(2000). Variables lagged twice or more are used as instruments.

**Figures**  
**Figure 1: Efficiency Indices and Financial Liberalization**



