

## 1.5 Long run contracts with limited enforcement

- See Hopenhayn and Clementi (2006) for something close to the moral-hazard model of Holmstrom and Tirole
- Here follow Lorenzoni and Walentin (2007)
- Process  $A_t = \Gamma (A_{t-1}, \epsilon_t)$
- Consumers and entrepreneurs, unit mass of each
- Consumers have endowment of labor  $l_C$
- Risk neutral, discount factor  $\beta_E < \beta_C$

- Entrepreneurs die and replaced with prob  $\gamma$
- Newborn entrepreneur supply  $l_E$ , start with  $n = wl_E$
- Offer long-term financial contract  $\{d_t\}_{t=t_0}^{\infty}$
- Market for used capital  $q_t^o$
- Total adjustment cost  $G(k_{t+1}, k_t^o)$

Budget constraint:

- first period of life

$$c_t^E + G(k_{t+1}, k_t^o) + q_t^o k_t^o \leq w_t l_E - d_t$$

- continuation period

$$c_t^E + G(k_{t+1}, k_t^o) + q_t^o (k_t^o - k_t) \leq A_t F(k_t, l_t) - w_t l_t - d_t$$

- last period

$$c_t^E = A_t F(k_t, l_t) - w_t l_t + q_t^o k_t - d_t.$$

Same trick as above (CRS)

- first period of life

$$c_t^E + q_t^m k_{t+1} + q_t^o k_t^o \leq w_t l_E - d_t$$

- continuation period

$$\begin{aligned} c_t^E + q_t^m k_{t+1} &\leq [A_t F(k_t, l_t) - w_t l_t + q_t^o k_t] - d_t \\ &= R_t k_t - d_t \end{aligned}$$

- last period

$$c_t^E = R_t k_t - d_t.$$

## 1.5.1 Limited enforcement

- Entrepreneur controls firm's assets
- In each period, can run away, diverting a fraction  $(1 - \theta)$
- If he does so, he re-enters the financial market as a young entrepreneur, with initial wealth

$$(1 - \theta) R_t k_t$$

and no debt

## 1.5.2 Recursive competitive equilibrium

- Aggregate state variables

$$X_t \equiv (A_t, K_t, B_t)$$

- Conjecture: positive consumers' consumption
- Present value of the liabilities of individual entrepreneur

$$b_t = \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \sum_{s=0}^{\infty} \beta_C^s d_{t+s} \right]$$

- $B_t$  economy-wide aggregate of these liabilities

- Recursive CE: law of motions for the endogenous state variables

$$\begin{aligned}K_t &= \mathcal{K}(X_{t-1}), \\B_t &= \mathcal{B}(X_{t-1}, \epsilon_t),\end{aligned}$$

and maps

$$w(X_t), q^o(X_t)$$

- Use compact notation

$$X_t = H(X_{t-1}, \epsilon_t).$$

### 1.5.3 Optimal financial contracts

- Continuing entrepreneur, in state  $X$ , who controls a firm with capital  $k$  and outstanding liabilities  $b$
- $V(k, b, X)$  expected utility computed
  - after production takes place
  - assuming the entrepreneur has chosen no default
  - before new investment and consumption



- Budget constraint

$$c^E + q^m(X) k' \leq R(X) k - d$$

- Promise-keeping constraint

$$b = d + \beta_C \left( (1 - \gamma) \sum \pi(\epsilon') b'(\epsilon') + \gamma \sum \pi(\epsilon') b'_L(\epsilon') \right)$$

- $b'(\epsilon'), b'_L(\epsilon')$  PV of liabilities next period

- No-default condition

$$V(k', b'(\epsilon'), X') \geq V((1 - \theta)k', 0, X')$$

for all  $\epsilon'$  and  $X' = H(X, \epsilon')$ .

- If tomorrow final period, no-default

$$R(X')k' - b'_L(\epsilon') \geq (1 - \theta)R(X')k'$$

## Conjecture: linear value function

$$V(k, b, X) = \phi(X) (R(X)k - b)$$

linear in *net worth*:

$$R(X)k - b$$

- Then no default becomes

$$\begin{aligned} b'(\epsilon') &\leq \theta R(H(X, \epsilon')) k' \\ b'_L(\epsilon') &\leq \theta R(H(X, \epsilon')) k' \end{aligned}$$

for all  $\epsilon'$

## Bellman equation

$$V(k, b, X) = \max_{c^E, k', b'(\cdot), b'_L(\cdot)} c^E + \beta_E (1 - \gamma) \sum \pi(\epsilon') V(k', b'(\epsilon'), H(X, \epsilon')) - \\ + \beta_E \gamma \sum \pi(\epsilon') [R(H(X, \epsilon')) k' - b'_L(\epsilon')]$$

$$c^E + q^m(X) k' \leq R(X) k - d$$

$$b = d + \beta_C \left( (1 - \gamma) \sum \pi(\epsilon') b'(\epsilon') + \gamma \sum \pi(\epsilon') b'_L(\epsilon') \right)$$

$$b'(\epsilon') \leq \theta R(H(X, \epsilon')) k'$$

$$b'_L(\epsilon') \leq \theta R(H(X, \epsilon')) k'$$

## Assumptions

- profitability

$$\beta_E \mathbb{E} \left[ R \left( H \left( X, \epsilon' \right) \right) \right] > q^m (X) \quad (\text{a})$$

- limited pledgeability

$$\theta \beta_C \mathbb{E} \left[ R \left( H \left( X, \epsilon' \right) \right) \right] < q^m (X) \quad (\text{b})$$

- finite utility

$$\frac{(1 - \gamma) (1 - \theta) \mathbb{E} \left[ R \left( H \left( X, \epsilon' \right) \right) \right]}{q^m (X) - \theta \beta_C \mathbb{E} \left[ R \left( H \left( X, \epsilon' \right) \right) \right]} < 1 \quad (\text{c})$$

Then find

$$\phi(X) = \frac{\beta_E (1 - \theta) \mathbb{E} [(\gamma + (1 - \gamma) \phi(H(X, \epsilon')))] R(H(X, \epsilon'))}{q^m(X) - \theta \beta_C \mathbb{E} [R(H(X, \epsilon'))]}$$

and guess and verify that:

$$V(k, b, X) = \phi(X) (R(X)k - b)$$

## Optimal solution

- no consumption until final date

$$c^E = 0,$$

- maximum borrowing

$$b'(\epsilon') = b'_L(\epsilon') = \theta R(H(X, \epsilon')) k'.$$

- dynamics for capital accumulation

$$k' = \frac{R(X)k - b}{q^m(X) - \theta\beta_C \mathbb{E}[R(H(X, \epsilon'))]}$$

Need one extra assumption (no delay):

$$\phi(X) > \frac{\beta_E}{\beta_C} \phi(H(X, \epsilon')) \quad (d)$$



## 1.5.4 Aggregation

$$N_t = (1 - \gamma)(R_t K_t - B_t) + \gamma w_t l_E$$

$$K_{t+1} = \frac{(1 - \gamma)(R_t K_t - B_t) + \gamma w_t l_E}{q_t^m - \theta \beta_C \mathbb{E}_t [R_{t+1}]}$$

$$B_{t+1} = \beta_C \theta R_{t+1} K_{t+1}$$

$$w_t = A_t \frac{\partial F(K_t, 1)}{\partial L_t}$$

$$q_t^o = - \frac{\partial G(K_{t+1}, K_t)}{\partial K_t}$$

- This confirms that the state variables in  $X$  are sufficient to characterize the dynamics of prices
- Aggregation relies on linearity
- Trades of used capital:
  - entering entrepreneurs buy

$$\frac{\gamma w_t l_E}{q_t^m - \theta \beta_C \mathbb{E}_t [R_{t+1}]} \frac{k_t^o}{k_{t+1}}$$

- exiting entrepreneurs sell

$$(1 - \gamma) K_t$$

## Computation

2nd order stoch. difference equation in  $K_t$

$$K_{t+1} = \frac{(1 - \gamma)(1 - \theta) R_t K_t + \gamma w_t l_E}{q_t^m - \theta \beta_C \mathbb{E}_t [R_{t+1}]}$$

with

$$w_t = A_t \frac{\partial F(K_t, 1)}{\partial L_t}$$

$$R_t = A_t \frac{\partial F(K_t, 1)}{\partial K_t} - \frac{\partial G(K_{t+1}, K_t)}{\partial K_t}$$

$$q_t^m = \frac{\partial G(K_{t+1}, K_t)}{\partial K_{t+1}}$$

- Remember to check that (a)-(d) are satisfied!

$$A_t F(k_t, l_t) = A_t k_t^\alpha l_t^{1-\alpha},$$
$$G(k_{t+1}, k_t) = k_{t+1} - (1 - \delta) k_t + \frac{\xi (k_{t+1} - k_t)^2}{2 k_t}.$$

## 1.5.5 Steady state

$$A_t = 1$$

$$(1 - \theta\beta_C R^S) K^S = (1 - \gamma)(1 - \theta) R^S K^S + \gamma w^S l_E$$

$$R^S = \alpha (K^S)^{\alpha-1} + 1 - \delta$$

$$K^S = \left( \frac{\alpha (\theta\beta_C + (1 - \gamma)(1 - \theta)) + \gamma(1 - \alpha) l_E}{1 - (\theta\beta_C + (1 - \gamma)(1 - \theta))(1 - \delta)} \right)^{\frac{1}{1-\alpha}}$$

Parameters such that (a)

$$\beta_E R^S > 1$$

then (b) and (c)

$$\theta\beta_C R^S < 1 \text{ and } \frac{(1-\gamma)(1-\theta)R^S}{1-\theta\beta_C R^S} < 1$$

follow from  $\gamma w^S l_E > 0$

$$1 - \beta_C \theta R^S - (1 - \gamma)(1 - \theta) R^S > 0.$$

In steady state  $\phi(X)$  is

$$\phi^S = \frac{(1-\theta)\beta_E R^S}{1-\theta\beta_C R^S} (\gamma + (1-\gamma)\phi^S)$$

Condition (d) is why  $\beta_E < \beta_C$  is needed.

## 1.5.6 Frictionless benchmark

Very close to Hayashi (1982)

- entrepreneurs consume  $w_t l_E$  in first period of life
- all investment financed with outside funds
- capital stock dynamics

$$\beta_C \mathbb{E}_t [R_t] = q_t^m$$

- 

$$q_t^m = q_t$$

## 1.5.7 Q theory

- value of the firm (end of period)

$$\begin{aligned} p_t &= V(k_t, b_t, X_t) + b_t - c_t^E - d_t = \\ &= \phi_t (R_t k_t - b_t) + b_t - d_t \\ &= (\phi_t - 1) (R_t k_t - b_t) + q_t^m k_{t+1} \end{aligned}$$

- Tobin's  $q$

$$q_t = (\phi_t - 1) \frac{R_t k_t - b_t}{k_{t+1}} + q_t^m > q_t^m.$$

Recall that  $\phi_t$  is forward looking variable capturing future excess returns

$$\phi_t = \frac{\beta_E (1 - \theta) \mathbb{E}_t \left[ \left( \gamma + (1 - \gamma) \phi_{t+1} \right) R_{t+1} \right]}{q_t^m - \theta \beta_C \mathbb{E}_t [R_{t+1}]}$$



	$a_1$	$a_2$
Model with financial friction	0.018	0.444
Frictionless model	0.118	0.000
Gilchrist and Himmelberg (1995)	0.033 (0.016)	0.242 (0.038)

Image removed due to copyright restrictions.

Image removed due to copyright restrictions.

## 1.5.8 Wrapping up on q theory

- financial frictions can help explain failure of q-theory equations
- disconnect between when funds available and when profitable investment opportunities arise
- related ideas: growth options (Abel and Eberly)

Image removed due to copyright restrictions.