

Resende, Marcelo

**Working Paper**

## Capital structure and regulation in US local telephony: an exploratory econometric study

CESifo Working Paper, No. 2681

**Provided in Cooperation with:**

Ifo Institute – Leibniz Institute for Economic Research at the University of Munich

*Suggested Citation:* Resende, Marcelo (2009) : Capital structure and regulation in US local telephony: an exploratory econometric study, CESifo Working Paper, No. 2681, Center for Economic Studies and ifo Institute (CESifo), Munich

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/30461>

**Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:**

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

**Terms of use:**

*Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.*

*You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.*

*If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.*

# Capital Structure and Regulation in U.S. Local Telephony: An Exploratory Econometric Study

MARCELO RESENDE

CESIFO WORKING PAPER NO. 2681  
CATEGORY 11: INDUSTRIAL ORGANISATION  
JUNE 2009

*An electronic version of the paper may be downloaded*

- *from the SSRN website:* [www.SSRN.com](http://www.SSRN.com)
- *from the RePEc website:* [www.RePEc.org](http://www.RePEc.org)
- *from the CESifo website:* [www.CESifo-group.org/wp](http://www.CESifo-group.org/wp)

# Capital Structure and Regulation in U.S. Local Telephony: An Exploratory Econometric Study

## Abstract

The paper aims at empirically investigating the relationship between regulation and the capital structure of the regulated firm. A key aspect of the referred relationship pertains a leverage effect according to which debt could be increased as a response to previous physical capital investment with an ultimate goal of inducing higher rates. Theoretical models like Spiegel and Spulber [1997, RAND Journal of Economics] highlight that effect. The present paper considers a panel data set of local exchange carriers-LECs in the U.S. and investigate Granger causality between changes in long-term debt (NDEBT) and gross investment (INV) in physical capital. The evidence accruing from a dynamic panel data estimation indicates an uni-directional causality from INV to NDEBT and therefore is, to a large extent, consistent with a leverage effect and with the notion that the size of the firm's investment project can impose a restriction on the amount of new debt. The result prevails independent of a control variable that indicates the regulatory regime.

JEL Code: G32, L51, L96.

Keywords: regulation, capital structure, dynamic panel data.

*Marcelo Resende  
Instituto de Economia  
Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro  
Av. Pasteur 250, Urca, 22290-240  
Brazil – Rio de Janeiro  
mresende@ie.ufrj.br*

Financial support from FAPERJ is gratefully acknowledged.

## **1. Introduction**

A relatively small body of literature has emerged in terms of empirical studies on the incentive properties of different regulatory regimes. In the context of telecommunications, salient aspects include the assessment of productive efficiency as given, for example, by Majumdar (1997), Resende (1999, 2000) and Uri (2001) and studies on service-quality that include Ai and Sappington (2002), Banerjee (2003), and Resende and Façanha (2005). The actual regulatory practice mostly revealed a gradual substitution of traditional rate-of-return regulation by regimes involving earnings sharing or price caps. The evidence, however, is mixed in what concerns the different incentive properties of the different regulatory regimes [see Kridel et al. (1996) and Sappington (2002) for an overview of the related issues and earlier empirical works].

A different regulatory aspect referring to the impact on capital structure has received scarce empirical attention in the literature. Bradley et al. (1984) have obtained evidence that regulated industries would appear among the most leveraged sectors but the bulk on the literature concentrates in the theoretical front, and studies by Spiegel (1994, 1996) and Spiegel and Spulber (1994, 1997) pinpointed the possible relevance of a leverage effect according to which firm could induce higher rates by the regulator. In fact, by becoming more leveraged the regulated firm can induce a more favorable rate setting by the regulator who wants to avoid risks of bankruptcy following expressive previous investments in physical capital. Philips (1988) suggests that the phenomenon appears to be empirically relevant but a clear quantitative investigation is still lacking in the literature.

The present paper aims at providing an initial exploratory effort in connection to the investigation of the leverage effect. For that purpose, Granger causality tests between changes in debt and investment in physical capital are conducted for a panel of local exchange carriers-LECs.

The paper is organized as follows. The second section discusses some conceptual aspects referring to the relationship between regulation and capital structure and presents the basic aspects of the econometric framework. The third section discusses the construction of the data and presents the empirical results for the dynamic panel data empirical model. The fourth section brings some final comments.

## **2. Regulation and Capital Structure**

### **2.1- Conceptual aspects**

The strategic interaction between the regulator and the regulated firm is complex in the context of the latter capital structure. A central aspect pertains the relevance of a leverage effect that had already been highlighted by the theoretical literature by Spiegel (1994, 1996) and Spiegel and Spulber (1994) in the case of symmetric information between the parts. The logic of the leverage effect is that the regulated firm could have an incentive to become leveraged and ultimately induce a more favorable rate setting by the regulator, whereas the latter would be willing to accommodate to a certain extent to avoid the possibility of bankruptcy by the firm.

The aforementioned strategic relationship becomes even more complex in the presence of asymmetric information between the regulator and the regulated firm. Spiegel and Spulber (1997) advance a sequential model that partially builds on Banks (1992) and Besanko and Spulber (1992) that

highlights the limited commitment ability by the regulator that is captured by taking the regulated firm as the first mover. The three stages game begins with the regulated firm choosing the capital structure in terms of the mix between debt and equity to outside investors that will provide funds for investment in physical capital. In the second stage, the prices of the firms securities will be defined in the capital market and will also reflect expectations associated to the future regulatory policy. In the third stage, the regulator will set the rates in accordance with some welfare maximization criterion that considers consumer surplus and profits.

In addition to the leverage effect, the asymmetric information context brings a complex signalling problem as there are two receivers (regulator and outside investors) for which the firm has conflicting incentives. In fact, the firm would like to send a positive signal to the capital market so as to indicate low expected costs to the outside investors and good profits prospects but also would be willing to signal high costs to the regulator so as to induce higher rates. Possible equilibria will reflect those various aspects. The present paper intends to conduct an initial empirical investigation on aspects favouring the first aspect of the problem namely that of the leverage effect, but of course the theoretical literature warrants a far deeper investigation in the future.

## 2.2- Econometric framework

The present application will consider a panel of firms and verify whether there is evidence that new debt is caused by gross investment in physical capital. A dynamic panel data structure will preclude the utilization of traditional panel data estimators given well known biases [for and overview

of consistent and efficient estimators for dynamic panel data see Baltagi (2001) and Bond (2002)].

A simple dynamic model for is given by:

$$y_{it} = \alpha y_{i,t-1} + \beta x_{it} + \mu_i + v_{it} \quad (1)$$

The model could also include time effects ( $\lambda_t$ ) that would capture non-observed heterogeneities that only depend on the time period and typically are considered by means of period dummy variables. The lagged dependent variable induces significant biases in traditional panel data estimators and therefore Arellano and Bond-AB (1991) have suggested a consistent and efficient estimator for short panels based on the first difference of the dynamic model. The estimator is generalized method of moment estimator that uses orthogonality condition on the appropriate instruments and the error (henceforth GMM-DIF). The first differencing of expression (1) would readily lead to:

$$\Delta y_{it} = \alpha \Delta y_{i,t-1} + \beta \Delta x_{it} + \Delta v_{it} \quad (2)$$

The lag structure of the equation in differences will reflect the chosen lag structure of the equation in levels. The first-differencing transformation therefore eliminates the fixed effect. It can be verified that appropriate instruments for  $\Delta y_{i,t-1}$ , in terms of lagged dependent variable in levels, become increasingly available starting with  $y_{i1}$  at  $T=3$ ,  $y_{i1}$  and  $y_{i2}$  at  $T=4$  up to  $y_{i1}, \dots, y_{i,T-2}$  for  $T$ . The remaining elements of the instrument matrix will depend on the assumptions regarding additional regressors  $x_{it}$ . In the simplest case where they are assumed to be strictly exogenous (uncorrelated with past, current and future errors) the variables can be readily used as instruments whereas in the case of endogeneity, an

instrumenting procedure with lagged variables in levels that is analogous to the previous procedure would be implemented. The validity of the instruments is important for the consistency of the GMM-DIF estimator. Sargan's test for overidentifying restrictions in terms of the joint significance of the instruments in excess to the minimum necessary for identification and would be distributed as a chi-square with the number of degrees of freedom given by the difference between the number of instruments and the number of endogenous variables, under the null hypothesis. Additionally, even in the absence of serial correlation for the model in levels, the first-differencing procedure would induce first-order serial correlation but not second-order serial correlation. Tests for AR(1) and AR(2) were suggested by AB and the latter is important to assure adequate properties to the estimator. Under the null hypothesis of no serial correlation, the test statistics would follow a standard normal distribution.

The focus of the paper will be on tests for Granger causality. The concept is largely widespread since Granger (1969). Let  $x$  and  $y$  denote two stationary stochastic processes,  $x$  is said to Granger cause  $y$  if the inclusion of past values of  $x$  help to explain  $y$  by reducing the variance of the prediction error, that is:

$$\sigma^2(y_t, y_{t-1}, \dots, x_{t-1}, \dots) < \sigma^2(y_t, y_{t-1}, \dots) \quad (3)$$

Applications for time series became routine whereas applications for dynamic panels data are becoming increasingly common as exemplified by Banerjee (2003) in the context of regulation. In operational terms, one runs a regression of  $y$  on past values of  $y$  and past values of  $x$ , and  $x$  would cause  $y$  if one obtains jointly significant coefficients for the lagged  $x$  variables. A causality in the opposite direction would, of course, be



evaluated in terms of the reverse regression and assessment of the joint significance of lagged y variables. In the context of the present GMM-DIF application, Wald type tests will be conducted.

### **3. Empirical Analysis**

#### **3.1- Data Sources**

The paper relies on different data sources. First, the data on debt and physical investment are obtained from the annual report given by the Statistics of Communication Common Carriers from the Federal Communications Commission-FCC. In fact, that is a traditional and comprehensive source for accounting and plant data for U.S. local exchange carriers-LECs. A consistent balanced panel was constructed so as to avoid merging problems. The final sample comprised 31 firms that are listed in the appendix. The data construction can be summarized as follows:

- . NDEB: defined by the change in long-term debt, where the values were deflated by the telecommunications implicit price deflator [1996=100, provided by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis]. Excluding the possibility of debt renegotiations, the change in long-term debt appears to be a sensible approximation to the change of debt more connected with physical capital changes;
- . INV: defined by the change in physical capital as indicated by the change in gross communication plant. In the deflating procedure, an average of the telecommunications implicit price deflator [1996=100, provided by the U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis] was considered. The averaging process intends to account for the presence of different capital vintages coexisting in a

given time. The time horizon for the calculated average was set in 10 years. The weighting scheme considers geometrically declining weights given by  $(1-\delta_A)$  where  $\delta_A$  stands for the average (across time and firms) of the depreciation rate (depreciation expenses divided by communication plant). The procedure is summarized by the following expression: <sup>1</sup>

$$ATIMP_t = \frac{\sum_{i=0}^9 (1 - \delta_A)^{i+1} TIMP_{t-i}}{\sum_{i=0}^9 (1 - \delta_A)^{i+1}} \quad (3)$$

. REG: indicates the proportion of the firm's activities that is subject to price cap regulation. The state level information on regulatory regimes was obtained from Abel and Clements (1998). In order to obtain firm-level variables in the case of LECs operating in different states, I made use of the number of local loops for the firms at state level as provided by the *Monitoring Report-FCC*. That information allowed to generate state-level weights. The procedure had been used by Resende and Façanha (2005) and is used here for some additional LECs. The information provided by Abel and Clements (1998) that served as the basis of the construction of REG led to the focus on the sample period of 1989-1998 after constructing the aforementioned variables defined in term of first-differences.

The analysis of the U.S. local telephony provides an important potential for comparing regulatory regimes that are mostly defined at the state level. <sup>2</sup>

In the present application, the possibility of controlling for the regulatory regime can be interesting given that the more strict controls that prevail under

---

<sup>1</sup> A similar procedure was considered by Resende (1999). However, the focus of the analysis of the present paper is on changes in gross communication plant as one wants to investigate whether changes in debt are induced by changes in physical capital of whatever nature even if it involves replacements associated to depreciation.

<sup>2</sup> Previously explored in terms of the construction of a regulatory regime variable as in Resende (1999, 2000) and Resende and Façanha (2005)

rate-of-return could, in principle, induce different impacts on capital structure.

The reasons for the chosen sample period

- a) Detailed information on regulatory regimes are only available until 1998 as provided by Abel and Clements (1998);
- b) The Telecommunications Act of 1996 and the growing penetration of VoIP delineates a more competitive environment a few years after;
- c) The contrast between regulatory regimes becomes less evident over time as price-cap regimes gradually prevail;
- d) After 1998 the coverage of the referred FCC report displays some reduction as some smaller LECs no longer reported data in that publication and also one observes the decline of total access lines in the case of some LECs what may reflect the possibility that traditional fixed telephony becomes growingly subject of alternative competition

Altogether, the sample period of 1989-1998 appears as especially relevant for establishing suitable controls for the regulatory regime prevailing at the state level.

### 3.2- Empirical Results

Tables 1 and 2 present the estimation results for the GMM-DIF model. The results were obtained with the software DPD 1.21 that runs in the platform Ox 3.0. In order to ascertain desirable properties for the estimator one needs to verify the validity of the chosen instruments in terms of the overidentifying Sargan's test. The test assesses the joint significance of the instruments in excess to the minimum necessary for identification. As mentioned before, valid instruments would become increasingly available in terms of level lagged values starting at lag 2 and including subsequent lags.

In the present application, lagged levels for  $\Delta NDEB$  and  $\Delta INV$  are considered for  $t-2$  until  $t-4$  as instruments as well as the constant, time dummies ( $D94, \dots, D98$ ) whenever available, and the regulatory regime variable  $\Delta REG$ . Moreover, the parcimonious choice of the lag structure (at most  $p = 4$ ) reflected the relatively limited number of time periods. The evidence, in all cases, favored the non-rejection of the null hypothesis of Sargan's test and therefore favors the validity of the chosen instruments.

Moreover, an important diagnostic pertains the assessment of the presence of second order serial correlation in the error term. In fact, even in the absence of serial correlation in the level model, first-differencing would induce first-order serial correlation but not second-order serial correlation. That property is important to guarantee the consistency of the GMM-DIF estimator. In all cases, the corresponding tests are satisfactory and one cannot reject the null hypothesis of the absence of second-order serial correlation.

Even though the analysis of specific coefficients is not the focus of the analysis, it is possible to highlight some salient results. First, the regulatory regime variable as given by  $\Delta REG$  does not exert any significant effect as a control in the dynamic relationships that include  $\Delta NDEBT$  and  $\Delta INV$ . In principle, could be the case that a leverage effect could be more likely to prevail under rate-of-return regulation where strategic behavior by the regulated firm could more clearly influence rate-setting. However, even under light-handed price-cap regulation the setting of lower productivity offset factor  $X$  could in principle reflect, to some extent, concerns for bankruptcy in leveraged contexts that extrapolate expected productivity gains.

Second, the coefficients of time dummies are often not statistically significant when considered individually.

Table 1  
Causality analysis INV → NDEBT: results from GMM-DIF estimation

Regressors	Dependent variable: $\Delta$ NDEBT			
	p=1	p=2	p=3	p=4
<b>Constant</b>	-25912.9 (0.281)	1163.18 (0.973)	-34968.6 (0.491)	98866.4 (0.057)
<b><math>\Delta</math>NDEBT<sub>-1</sub></b>	-0.372 (0.000)	-0.427 (0.000)	-0.501 (0.000)	-0.463 (0.000)
<b><math>\Delta</math>NDEBT<sub>-2</sub></b>	-	-0.136 (0.397)	-0.242 (0.308)	-0.114 (0.653)
<b><math>\Delta</math>NDEBT<sub>-3</sub></b>	-	-	-0.086 (0.453)	0.095 (0.559)
<b><math>\Delta</math>NDEBT<sub>-4</sub></b>	-	-	-	-0.351 (0.848)
<b><math>\Delta</math>INV<sub>-1</sub></b>	0.545 (0.008)	0.018 (0.951)	-6.375 (0.049)	-1.268 (0.859)
<b><math>\Delta</math>INV<sub>-2</sub></b>	-	-0.995 (0.000)	-3.721 (0.090)	-5.008 (0.416)
<b><math>\Delta</math>INV<sub>-3</sub></b>	-	-	0.891 (0.451)	0.093 (0.981)
<b><math>\Delta</math>INV<sub>-4</sub></b>	-	-	-	-0.351 (0.848)
<b><math>\Delta</math>REG</b>	66136.9 (0.407)	36362.4 (0.756)	7407.37 (0.940)	56496.2 (0.688)
<b>D1992</b>	20883.5 (0.627)	-	-	-
<b>D1993</b>	-22286.6 (0.622)	-49262.4 (0.270)	-	-
<b>D1994</b>	135734 (0.006)	113648 (0.081)	126614 (0.121)	-
<b>D1995</b>	-52831.6 (0.209)	-75322.2 (0.104)	-27355.6 (0.601)	-162903 (0.089)
<b>D1996</b>	106060 (0.009)	98412.2 (0.043)	134324 (0.074)	-27773.4 (0.647)
<b>D1997</b>	4682.62 (0.901)	-33455.0 (0.458)	36031 (0.466)	-134501 (0.020)
<b>D1998</b>	-71642.9 (0.107)	-97187 (0.105)	-66548.7 (0.524)	-192032 (0.025)
<b>Sargan test</b>	$\chi^2(39) = 18.68$ (0.998)	$\chi^2(31) = 18.35$ (0.991)	$\chi^2(29) = 23.50$ (0.753)	$\chi^2(21) = 15.78$ (0.782)
<b>AR(1) test</b>	-2.389 (0.017)	-2.152 (0.031)	-1.955 (0.051)	15.78 (0.782)
<b>AR(2) test</b>	-0.924 (0.355)	-0.156 (0.876)	-0.041 (0.967)	-0.227 (0.821)

Table 2  
Causality analysis NDEBT → INV: results from GMM-DIF estimation

Regressors	Dependent variable: $\Delta INV$			
	p=1	p=2	p=3	p=4
<b>Constant</b>	7187.11 (0.248)	999.255 (0.271)	214.54 (0.751)	-446.521 (0.556)
$\Delta INV_{-1}$	-0.466 (0.000)	-0.622 (0.000)	-3.67E-04 (0.995)	-0.052 (0.581)
$\Delta INV_{-2}$	-	-0.302 (0.000)	-0.007 (0.867)	0.014 (0.819)
$\Delta INV_{-3}$	-	-	-0.009 (0.632)	-0.004 (0.917)
$\Delta INV_{-4}$	-	-	-	-0.014 (0.291)
$\Delta NDEBT_{-1}$	0.003 (0.125)	-0.001 (0.824)	0.001 (0.408)	0.004 (0.004)
$\Delta NDEBT_{-2}$	-	-0.005 (0.420)	-5.08E-04 (0.814)	0.001 (0.619)
$\Delta NDEBT_{-3}$	-	-	4.62E-04 (0.747)	0.002 (0.505)
$\Delta NDEBT_{-4}$	-	-	-	0.001 (0.753)
<b><math>\Delta REG</math></b>	-6672.62 (0.337)	-5137.77 (0.235)	1304.72 (0.376)	1266.3 (0.447)
<b>D1992</b>	-6598.2 (0.252)	-	-	-
<b>D1993</b>	-8172.33 (0.313)	-341.289 (0.727)	-	-
<b>D1994</b>	-7111.28 (0.216)	-2255.57 (0.055)	-1029.60 (0.242)	-
<b>D1995</b>	-4518.52 (0.263)	1117.99 (0.603)	140.572 (0.885)	611.234 (0.484)
<b>D1996</b>	-5532.19 (0.361)	985.848 (0.551)	655.498 (0.562)	1344.33 (0.310)
<b>D1997</b>	-7102.47 (0.237)	-982.458 (0.401)	-1219.7 (0.379)	-789.462 (0.517)
<b>D1998</b>	-6621.28 (0.270)	293.021 (0.824)	913.786 (0.215)	1532.77 (0.024)
<b>Sargan test</b>	$\chi^2(39) = 17.39$ (0.999)	$\chi^2(35) = 23.74$ (0.926)	$\chi^2(29) = 19.45$ (0.909)	$\chi^2(21) = 18.08$ (0.644)
<b>AR(1) test</b>	-0.6219 (0.534)	-1.228 (0.220)	-1.438 (0.150)	-1.352 (0.176)
<b>AR(2) test</b>	-1.067 (0.286)	-0.923 (0.356)	0.067 (0.946)	-0.406 (0.685)

Next, I consider joint significant tests that will enable in the end conclusions in terms of Granger causality. The corresponding test are presented in table 3.

Table 3  
Joint significance tests

Test	Dependent variable: $\Delta$ NDEBT			
	p=1	p=2	p=3	p=4
<b>overall significance</b>	47.21 (0.000)	156.8 (0.000)	1760 (0.000)	1516 (0.000)
<b>time dummies</b>	34.91 (0.000)	16.21 (0.023)	13.77 (0.032)	12.52 (0.028)
<b>lag p</b>	46.893 (0.000)	14.9373 (0.001)	1.064 (0.588)	3.652 (0.161)
<b>INV <math>\rightarrow</math> NDEBT</b>	7.151 (0.008)	55.898 (0.000)	165.324 (0.000)	418.729 (0.000)
Test	Dependent variable: $\Delta$ INV			
	p=1	p=2	p=3	p=4
<b>overall significance</b>	1.519E04 (0.000)	4.476E04 (0.000)	80.49 (0.000)	73.87 (0.000)
<b>time dummies</b>	26.43 (0.001)	12.51 (0.085)	10.21 (0.116)	10.08 (0.073)
<b>lag p</b>	2072.85 (0.000)	9757.75 (0.000)	0.391 (0.822)	3.273 (0.195)
<b>NDEBT <math>\rightarrow</math> INV</b>	2.365 (0.124)	3.298 (0.192)	1.925 (0.5882)	13.507 (0.009)

The inspection of table 3 indicates that in all cases overall joint significance prevails for the totality of coefficients (excluding the constant). Moreover, joint significance prevails for the time dummies in the majority of the cases, Next, one needs to select a configuration for the lag structure before considering the causality tests. The joint significance tests of the coefficients of the p-th lag favors p=2 for regressions in both directions. However, the results are robust for different lags. Essentially one observes that past values of  $\Delta$ INV are significant in explaining  $\Delta$ NDEBT whereas the reverse is not the case. The evidence thus indicate a uni-directional causality from INV

to NDEBT and therefore is in part consistent with a leverage effect and with the notion that the size of the firm's investment project can impose a restriction on the amount of new debt.

#### **4. Final Comments**

The paper aimed at investigating the relationship between regulation and the capital structure of the regulated firm. Causality tests were carried out between new debt (NBEDT) as proxied by change in long-term debt and investment in physical capital (INV) as proxied by change in gross communication plant. The evidence indicated a uni-directional causality from INV to NDEBT and therefore is consistent with a possibly relevant leverage effect. The result is sustained whatever regulatory regime prevails at the state level. It appears that even though traditional rate-of-return regulation regimes are more strict in their controls than more flexible regimes. The paper focused on the change in debt but it would also be interesting to investigate the issue of new stock, though the related data is not readily available.

The paper aimed at an initial empirical investigation of the topic but an ambitious and timely project would be the structural modelling that explicitly considers the role of asymmetric information. Empirical studies are still scarce and include, for example, Wolak (1994) and Gagnepain and Ivaldi (2002). However, technologically dynamic sectors like telecommunications place an important challenge and structural investigations on the relationship between regulation and capital structure are still absent in the literature. Clearly it is not trivial to empirically disentangle leverage and signalling effects in terms of a sound and meaningful theoretical framework.



## References

- Abel, J.R., Clements, M.E. (1998), A time-series and cross-sectional classification of state regulatory regimes adopted for local exchange carriers: divestiture to present (1984-1998), *National Regulatory Research Institute* 98-25
- Ai, C., Sappington, D.E.M. (2002), The impact of state incentive regulation on the US telecommunications industry, *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 22, 133–160
- Arellano, M., Bond, S. (1991), Some tests of specification for panel data: Monte Carlo evidence and an application to employment equations, *Review of Economic Studies*, 58, 277-297
- Banerjee, A. (2003), Does incentive regulation “cause” degradation of retail telephone service quality?, *Information Economics and Policy*, 15, 243–269.
- Bradley, M., Jarrel, G.A., Kim, E.H. (1984), On the existence of an optimal capital structure: theory and evidence, *Journal of Finance*, 39, 857-878
- Baltagi, B. H. (2001), *Econometric Analysis of Panel Data*, New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Banks, J.S. (1992), Monopoly piecing and regulatory insight, *Journal of Economics and Management Strategy*, 1, 203-234
- Besanko, D., Spulber, D.F. (1992), Sequential equilibrium investment by regulated firms, *RAND Journal of Economics*, 23, 153-170
- Bond, S. (2002), Dynamic panel data models: a guide to micro data methods and practice, *Portuguese Economic Journal*, 1, 141-162
- Gagnepain, P., Ivaldi, M. (2002), Incentive regulatory policies: the case of public transit systems in France, *RAND Journal of Economics*, 33, 605-629

- Granger, C.W.J. (1969), Investigating causal relations by econometric models and cross-spectral methods, *Econometrica*, 37, 424-438
- Kridel, D.J., Sappington, D.E.M., Weisman, D.L. (1996), The effects of incentive regulation in the telecommunications industry: a survey, *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 9, 269-306
- Majumdar, S. (1997), Incentive regulation and productive efficiency in the US telecommunications industry, *Journal of Business*, 70, 547–576.
- Phillips, C.F. (1988), *The Regulation of Public Utilities: Theory and Practice*, Arlington, V.A.: Public Utilities Report Inc., 2<sup>nd</sup> ed.
- Resende, M. (1999), Productivity growth and regulation in U.S. local telephony, *Information Economics and Policy*, 11, 23-44
- Resende, M., Façanha, L.O. (2005), Price cap regulation and service-quality in telecommunications: an empirical study, *Information Economics and Policy*, 17, 1-12
- Sappington, D.E.M. (2002), Price regulation, In M. Cave, S. Majumdar and I. Vogelsang (eds.), *Handbook of Telecommunications Economics*, Amsterdam: Elsevier Science Publishers, 225-293
- Spiegel, Y. (1994), The capital structure and investment of regulated firms under alternative regulatory regimes, *Journal of Regulatory Economics*, 6, 297-319
- Spiegel, Y. (1996), The choice of technology and capital structure under rate regulation, *International Journal of Industrial Organization*, 15, 191-216
- Spiegel, Y. , Spulber, D.F. (1994), The capital structure of a regulated firm, *RAND Journal of Economics*, 25, 424-440
- Spiegel, Y. , Spulber, D.F. (1997), Capital structure with countervailing incentives, *RAND Journal of Economics*, 28, 1-24
- Uri, N., (2001), The effect of incentive regulation on productive efficiency in telecommunications, *Journal of Policy Modeling*, 23, 825–846

Wolak, F. (1994), An econometric analysis of the asymmetric information, regulator-utility interaction, *Annales d'Economie et de Statistique*. 34, 13-69

## Appendix 1

### List of local exchange carriers-LECs

- 1) Illinois Bell Telephone Company
- 2) Indiana Bell Telephone Company
- 3 )Michigan Bell Telephone Company
- 4) Ohio Bell Telephone Company
- 5) Wisconsin Bell Inc.
- 6) Carolina Telephone and Telegraph Company
- 7) Central Telephone Company of Florida
- 8) Verizon Washington D.C. Inc.
- 9) Verizon Maryland
- 10) Verizon Virginia
- 11) Verizon West Virginia
- 12) Verizon Delaware
- 13) Verizon Pennsylvania
- 14) Verizon New Jersey
- 15) Verizon New England
- 16) Verizon New York
- 17) Nevada Bell
- 18) Pacific Bell
- 19) Southwestern Bell Telephone Company
- 20) Cincinatti Bell Telephone Compoany
- 21) Southern New England Telephone Company
- 22) Central Telephone Company of Virginia
- 23) Verizon California Inc.
- 24) Verizon Florida Inc.
- 25) Verizon Hawaii Inc.
- 26) Verizon North Inc.
- 27) Verizon Northwest Inc.
- 28) Verizon Southwest Inc.
- 29) United Telephone Company of Indiana
- 30) United Telephone Company of Ohio
- 31) United Telephone Company of Pennsylvania

# CESifo Working Paper Series

for full list see [www.cesifo-group.org/wp](http://www.cesifo-group.org/wp)

(address: Poschingerstr. 5, 81679 Munich, Germany, [office@cesifo.de](mailto:office@cesifo.de))

---

- 2617 Axel Dreher, Peter Nunnenkamp, Hannes Öhler and Johannes Weisser, Acting Autonomously or Mimicking the State and Peers? A Panel Tobit Analysis of Financial Dependence and Aid Allocation by Swiss NGOs, April 2009
- 2618 Guglielmo Maria Caporale, Roman Matousek and Chris Stewart, Rating Assignments: Lessons from International Banks, April 2009
- 2619 Paul Belleflamme and Martin Peitz, Asymmetric Information and Overinvestment in Quality, April 2009
- 2620 Thomas Dohmen, Armin Falk, David Huffman and Uwe Sunde, Are Risk Aversion and Impatience Related to Cognitive Ability?, April 2009
- 2621 Yin-Wong Cheung and Xingwang Qian, The Empirics of China's Outward Direct Investment, April 2009
- 2622 Frédérique Bec and Christian Gollier, Assets Returns Volatility and Investment Horizon: The French Case, April 2009
- 2623 Ronnie Schöb and Marcel Thum, Asymmetric Information Renders Minimum Wages Less Harmful, April 2009
- 2624 Martin Ruf and Alfons J. Weichenrieder, The Taxation of Passive Foreign Investment – Lessons from German Experience, April 2009
- 2625 Yao Li, Borders and Distance in Knowledge Spillovers: Dying over Time or Dying with Age? – Evidence from Patent Citations, April 2009
- 2626 Jim Malley and Ulrich Woitek, Technology Shocks and Aggregate Fluctuations in an Estimated Hybrid RBC Model, April 2009
- 2627 Jin Cao and Gerhard Illing, Endogenous Systemic Liquidity Risk, April 2009
- 2628 Thiess Buettner and Bjoern Kauder, Revenue Forecasting Practices: Differences across Countries and Consequences for Forecasting Performance, April 2009
- 2629 Håkan Selin, The Rise in Female Employment and the Role of Tax Incentives – An Empirical Analysis of the Swedish Individual Tax Reform of 1971, April 2009
- 2630 Nick Johnstone and Ivan Hascic, Environmental Policy Design and the Fragmentation of International Markets for Innovation, April 2009
- 2631 Spiros Bougheas, Richard Kneller and Raymond Riezman, Optimal Education Policies and Comparative Advantage, April 2009

- 2632 Jay Pil Choi and Heiko Gerlach, Multi-Market Collusion with Demand Linkages and Antitrust Enforcement, April 2009
- 2633 Thor O. Thoresen, Income Mobility of Owners of Small Businesses when Boundaries between Occupations are Vague, April 2009
- 2634 Guido Schwerdt and Amelie C. Wuppermann, Is Traditional Teaching really all that Bad? A Within-Student Between-Subject Approach, April 2009
- 2635 Kurt R. Brekke, Luigi Siciliani and Odd Rune Straume, Hospital Competition and Quality with Regulated Prices, April 2009
- 2636 Peter Diamond, Taxes and Pensions, April 2009
- 2637 Shoshana Grossbard, How “Chicagoan” are Gary Becker’s Economic Models of Marriage?, May 2009
- 2638 Roland Strausz, Regulatory Risk under Optimal Incentive Regulation, May 2009
- 2639 Holger Zemanek, Ansgar Belke and Gunther Schnabl, Current Account Imbalances and Structural Adjustment in the Euro Area: How to Rebalance Competitiveness, May 2009
- 2640 Harald Hau and Marcel Thum, Subprime Crisis and Board (In-)Competence: Private vs. Public Banks in Germany, May 2009
- 2641 Martin Halla, Mario Lackner and Friedrich G. Schneider, An Empirical Analysis of the Dynamics of the Welfare State: The Case of Benefit Morale, May 2009
- 2642 Balázs Égert, Infrastructure Investment in Network Industries: The Role of Incentive Regulation and Regulatory Independence, May 2009
- 2643 Christian Gollier, Expected Net Present Value, Expected Net Future Value, and the Ramsey Rule, May 2009
- 2644 Sören Blomquist and Håkan Selin, Hourly Wage Rate and Taxable Labor Income Responsiveness to Changes in Marginal Tax Rates, May 2009
- 2645 Dominique Demougin, Oliver Fabel and Christian Thomann, Implicit vs. Explicit Incentives: Theory and a Case Study, May 2009
- 2646 Francesco C. Billari and Vincenzo Galasso, What Explains Fertility? Evidence from Italian Pension Reforms, May 2009
- 2647 Kjell Arne Brekke, Karen Evelyn Hauge, Jo Thori Lind and Karine Nyborg, Playing with the Good Guys – A Public Good Game with Endogenous Group Formation, May 2009
- 2648 Guglielmo Maria Caporale and Luis A. Gil-Alana, Multi-Factor Gegenbauer Processes and European Inflation Rates, May 2009

- 2649 Henning Bohn, A Static Model for Voting on Social Security, May 2009
- 2650 Markus Haavio and Kaisa Kotakorpi, The Political Economy of Sin Taxes, May 2009
- 2651 Augusto de la Torre, María Soledad Martínez Pería and Sergio L. Schmukler, Drivers and Obstacles to Banking SMEs: The Role of Competition and the Institutional Framework, May 2009
- 2652 Tobias Lindhe and Jan Södersten, Dividend Taxation, Share Repurchases and the Equity Trap, May 2009
- 2653 Assaf Razin and Edith Sand, Migration-Regime Liberalization and Social Security: Political-Economy Effect, May 2009
- 2654 Yin-Wong Cheung and Hiro Ito, A Cross-Country Empirical Analysis of International Reserves, May 2009
- 2655 Bart Cockx and Bruno Van der Linden, Flexicurity in Belgium. A Proposal Based on Economic Principles, May 2009
- 2656 Michael Melvin, Lukas Menkhoff and Maik Schmeling, Exchange Rate Management in Emerging Markets: Intervention via an Electronic Limit Order Book, May 2009
- 2657 Susanne Neckermann, Reto Cueni and Bruno S. Frey, What is an Award Worth? An Econometric Assessment of the Impact of Awards on Employee Performance, May 2009
- 2658 Steven Brakman, Harry Garretsen and Charles van Marrewijk, Economic Geography within and between European Nations: The Role of Market Potential and Density across Space and Time, May 2009
- 2659 Giovanni Facchini and Cecilia Testa, Reforming Legislatures: Is one House better than two?, May 2009
- 2660 Carsten Kowalczyk and Raymond Riezman, Trade Agreements, May 2009
- 2661 Oliver Falck, Stephan Heblich and Elke Luedemann, Identity and Entrepreneurship, May 2009
- 2662 Christian Lessmann and Gunther Markwardt, One Size Fits All? Decentralization, Corruption, and the Monitoring of Bureaucrats, May 2009
- 2663 Felix Bierbrauer, On the Legitimacy of Coercion for the Financing of Public Goods, May 2009
- 2664 Alessandro Cigno, Agency in Family Policy: A Survey, May 2009
- 2665 Claudia M. Buch and Christian Pierdzioch, Low Skill but High Volatility?, May 2009

- 2666 Hendrik Jürges, Kerstin Schneider, Martin Senkbeil and Claus H. Carstensen, Assessment Drives Learning: The Effect of Central Exit Exams on Curricular Knowledge and Mathematical Literacy, June 2009
- 2667 Eric A. Hanushek and Ludger Woessmann, Schooling, Cognitive Skills, and the Latin American Growth Puzzle, June 2009
- 2668 Ourania Karakosta, Christos Kotsogiannis and Miguel-Angel Lopez-Garcia, Does Indirect Tax Harmonization Deliver Pareto Improvements in the Presence of Global Public Goods?, June 2009
- 2669 Aleksandra Riedl and Silvia Rocha-Akis, Testing the Tax Competition Theory: How Elastic are National Tax Bases in OECD Countries?, June 2009
- 2670 Dominique Demougin and Carsten Helm, Incentive Contracts and Efficient Unemployment Benefits, June 2009
- 2671 Guglielmo Maria Caporale and Luis A. Gil-Alana, Long Memory in US Real Output per Capita, June 2009
- 2672 Jim Malley and Ulrich Woitek, Productivity Shocks and Aggregate Cycles in an Estimated Endogenous Growth Model, June 2009
- 2673 Vivek Ghosal, Business Strategy and Firm Reorganization under Changing Market Conditions, June 2009
- 2674 Francesco Menoncin and Paolo M. Panteghini, Retrospective Capital Gains Taxation in the Real World, June 2009
- 2675 Thomas Hemmelgarn and Gaëtan Nicodème, Tax Co-ordination in Europe: Assessing the First Years of the EU-Savings Taxation Directive, June 2009
- 2676 Oliver Himmler, The Effects of School Competition on Academic Achievement and Grading Standards, June 2009
- 2677 Rolf Golombek and Michael Hoel, International Cooperation on Climate-Friendly Technologies, June 2009
- 2678 Martin Cave and Matthew Corkery, Regulation and Barriers to Trade in Telecommunications Services in the European Union, June 2009
- 2679 Costas Arkolakis, A Unified Theory of Firm Selection and Growth, June 2009
- 2680 Michelle R. Garfinkel, Stergios Skaperdas and Constantinos Syropoulos, International Trade and Transnational Insecurity: How Comparative Advantage and Power are Jointly Determined, June 2009
- 2681 Marcelo Resende, Capital Structure and Regulation in U.S. Local Telephony: An Exploratory Econometric Study; June 2009