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Economics D11-1  
Christiano

1. This question explores the restrictions on preferences and technology that the existence of balanced growth path requires. Consider the following growth model:

\[ \max \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t u(c_t, 1 - n_t) \]

subject to the resource constraint:

\[ c_t + k_{t+1} - (1 - \delta)k_t \leq f(k_t, \gamma n_t), \ 0 < \alpha < 1, \]
\[ k_{t+1}, c_t \geq 0, 0 \leq n_t \leq 1, \gamma > 1. \]

Also,

\[ u(c_t, 1 - n_t) = \begin{cases} 
(1 - \sigma)c_t^{\frac{\rho - 1}{\rho}} + \sigma (1 - n_t)^{\frac{\rho - 1}{\rho}} \frac{\psi}{\nu}, & \text{for } \rho > 0, \neq 1 \\
[c_t^{(1-\sigma)}(1-n_t^{\sigma})]^{\psi}/\psi, & \text{for } \rho = 1 
\end{cases} \]

where the (constant) elasticity of substitution between \( c_t \) and \( 1 - n_t \) is \( \rho \), and

\[ f(k, n) = \begin{cases} 
(1 - \alpha)k^{\frac{\nu - 1}{\nu}} + \alpha n^{\frac{\nu - 1}{\nu}} \frac{\nu}{k^{1-\alpha}n^{\alpha}}, & \text{for } \nu > 0, \neq 1 \\
k^{(1-\alpha)n^\alpha}, & \text{for } \nu = 1 
\end{cases} \]

where \( \nu \) is the elasticity of substitution between \( n \) and \( k \) in production.

(a) Define a balanced growth path as an equilibrium in which

\[ n_t = n, \quad \frac{k_{t+1}}{k_t} = \frac{c_{t+1}}{c_t} = \gamma. \]

Show that \( \rho = 1 \) is required for there to be a balanced growth path for this economy.

(b) Show that when \( \rho = 1 \), there is a scaling of the variables for this problem, in which the problem boils down to the standard growth model with no steady state growth.
2. We have not worried about how investment is financed. That’s because we have always considered decentralizations in which the household buys additions to capital using current income, so there is no need for ‘finance’. This way of organizing things makes it impossible for us to think about an asset market variable like the rate of return on equity. In this question we consider a decentralization in which the accumulation of capital is financed by entrepreneurs who put the capital to work with hired labor to produce output. The entrepreneurs issue equity and debt to finance their acquisition of capital. As a result, the environment in this question facilitates thinking about the equilibrium rate of return on equity and on other assets such as a one-period-ahead sure loan (our version of corporate debt).

The environment below has three properties: First, the equilibrium consumption, labor and capital stock quantities in this model are not dependent on the debt-to-equity ratio of the firm. This is a version of the celebrated Modigliani-Miller theorem in finance. Second, the equilibrium rate of return on equity does depend on the debt-to-equity ratio. This is because equity has to absorb all the uncertainty in the firm’s revenue stream, and that is riskier as the firm is more leveraged with debt. The premium on the rate of return on equity over debt increases as the debt to equity ratio increases. Third, for this model to account for the empirically observed equity premium requires an implausibly high debt-to-equity ratio (this is consistent with the findings of a celebrated paper, Mehra and Prescott ‘The Equity Premium: A Puzzle,’ Journal of Monetary Economics, 1985).

Consider the following economy with households and firms.

Households

We suppose there are many identical households. The typical household takes prices, wages and rates of return as given. In a sequence-of-markets competitive environment, the household seeks at time $t$ to maximize expected utility:

$$E_t \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \beta^j u(c_{t+j})$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)
subject to the sequence of budget constraints,

\[ a_{t+j} + z_{t+j+1} + b_{t+j+1} = w_{t+j}n + R_{t+j}b_{t+j} + n_{t+j}z_{t+j}, \]  

(2)
j ≥ 0, and subject to initial levels of the stock of debt and equity, \( b_t \) and \( z_t \). Here, \( c_t \) denotes consumption and household supply of labor, \( n \), is assumed to be fixed. Equity and debt acquired in period \( t \), \( z_{t+1} \) and \( b_{t+1} \), have rates of return \( r_{t+1} \) and \( R_{t+1} \), respectively. The return, \( r_{t+1} \), is a function of date \( t + 1 \) (and possibly earlier) economic shocks, while \( R_{t+1} \) is only a function of shocks dated \( t \) and earlier. Thus, from the perspective of time \( t \), the time \( t + 1 \) rate of return on debt is constant across date \( t + 1 \) states of nature, while the rate of return on \( r_{t+1} \) varies across date \( t + 1 \) states of nature. This feature of the return on government debt leads us to refer to it as ‘conditionally sure’. The household takes \( r_t, w_t \) (wages) and \( R_t \) as given and beyond its control.

(a) Write out the first order necessary conditions associated with the household’s choice of \( z_{t+1} \) and \( b_{t+1} \).

(b) Define the date \( t \) equity premium, \( P_t \), to be the excess of the date \( t \) conditionally expected return on equity, \( E_tr_{t+1} \), over the conditional sure return on bonds, \( R_{t+1} \):

\[ P_t = \frac{E_tr_{t+1}}{R_{t+1}}. \]

(c) Show that

\[ P_t = 1 - Cov_t(m_{t+1}, r_{t+1}), \]

where \( m_{t+1} = \beta u_{c,t+1}/u_{c,t} \), is the intertemporal marginal rate of substitution in consumption and \( u_{c,t} \) is the date \( t \) marginal utility of consumption. (Hint: use the fact, \( Cov_t(x_{t+1}, y_{t+1}) = E_t x_{t+1}y_{t+1} - E_t x_{t+1}E_t y_{t+1} \), and the first order conditions developed in (a).)

(d) Suppose the conditional covariance in the above expression were positive. Then \( P_t \) is less than 1, i.e., the conditionally expected rate of return on equity is less than that on debt. This seems peculiar. Why should people be willing to hold equity when its payoff
is uncertain, and lower in expected value than debt? Explain in intuitive terms.

**Firms**

We suppose there are many firms, all of which are identical. The typical firm takes prices, \( w_t \) and rates of return, \( R_t, r_t \), as given. In period \( t+1 \) the firm uses capital, \( K_{t+1} \), and labor, \( N_{t+1} \), to produce output, \( Y_{t+1} \), using the following production function:

\[
Y_{t+1} = F(K_{t+1}, N_{t+1}, \epsilon_{t+1}),
\]

where \( F \) is linear homogeneous in its first two arguments and \( \epsilon_{t+1} \) is a stationary random shock to technology. An entrepreneur who wishes to operate the firm in period \( t + 1 \) must during period \( t \) acquire the purchasing power needed to purchase \( K_{t+1} \) from the current firm. The entrepreneur acquires this purchasing power by selling equity shares, \( Z_{t+1} \), and debt, \( B_{t+1} \), to the household. The entrepreneur’s period \( t \) financing constraint is:

\[
Z_{t+1} + B_{t+1} = K_{t+1}.
\]

Next period, the entrepreneur brings \( Y_{t+1} + (1 - \delta)K_{t+1} \) to the goods market to sell. This includes new production, \( Y_{t+1} \), and the capital stock that remains after depreciation at the end of next period, \( (1 - \delta)K_{t+1} \). The entrepreneur’s expenses next period include the wage bill, \( w_{t+1}N_{t+1} \), and the obligations on debt, \( R_{t+1}B_{t+1} \), and equity, \( r_{t+1}Z_{t+1} \). Thus, the entrepreneur’s total profit at the end of \( t+1 \) is \( \pi_{t+1} \), where,

\[
\pi_{t+1} = Y_{t+1} + (1 - \delta)K_{t+1} - w_{t+1}N_{t+1} - R_{t+1}B_{t+1} - r_{t+1}Z_{t+1}
\]

The entrepreneur’s objective is to maximize \( \pi_{t+1} \). However, at the time \( Z_{t+1} \) and \( B_{t+1} \) are chosen, \( \epsilon_{t+1} \) is not known. The entrepreneur weighs the different \( \pi_{t+1} \’s \) corresponding to different realizations of \( \epsilon_{t+1} \) by the product of the probability of that realization and the associated marginal utility of consumption.

\( e \) Suppose that at date \( t \) there were markets for date \( t + 1 \) state-contingent goods. Show that the weights that we apply to profits across states of nature correspond to the prices that would obtain in such markets for state-contingent goods.
(f) The entrepreneur in our model is concerned with $E_t u_{c,t+1} \pi_{t+1}$, where $u_{c,t+1}$ is treated as exogenous. The entrepreneur solves

$$\max_{Z_{t+1}, B_{t+1}} E_t \left\{ u_{c,t+1} \max_{N_{t+1}} \pi_{t+1} \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

The maximization inside the braces reflects that the firm’s employment decision is made after the realization of $\epsilon_{t+1}$. The maximization outside the braces reflects that the financing decision is made before the realization of $\epsilon_{t+1}$. Make sure you understand this point.

(g) write out the first order necessary conditions associated with the firm’s choice of $Z_{t+1}$, $B_{t+1}$, and $N_{t+1}$.

Suppose that there is free entry, so that, in equilibrium, $E_t \{ u_{c,t+1} \pi_{t+1} \} = 0$. Suppose, in addition, that the equilibrium process, $r_t$, has the property that ex post profits are zero, i.e., $\pi_t = 0$.

(h) Define a sequence of markets equilibrium and a recursive competitive equilibrium for this economy.

(i) Show that the debt-to-equity ratio, $b_{t+1}/z_{t+1}$, is not pinned down in equilibrium. In particular, if there is an equilibrium in which some particular value of $\gamma = b_{t+1}/z_{t+1}$ holds, then there exists an equilibrium with the same allocations of consumption, output and capital, for all other values of $\gamma$.

(j) Show, using the linear homogeneity assumption on $F$, the firm’s first order condition on labor, the entrepreneur’s financing constraint, and the zero ex post profit condition, that

$$r_{t+1} = (F_{k,t+1} + 1 - \delta)(1 + \gamma) - \gamma R_{t+1}.$$  

Use this to show, using your result in (v), that the equity premium, $P_t$, increases with $\gamma$.

(k) Let $u(c_t) = \log(c_t)$ and resource constraint, $c_t + k_{t+1} = k_t^{1-\alpha} n_t^{\alpha} \exp(x_t)$, where $x_t$ has a first order autoregressive representation: $x_t = \rho x_{t-1} + \varepsilon_t$, where $\varepsilon_t$ iid over time and independent of $x_{t-1}$.  
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Show that the equity premium, $P_t$, reduces to:

$$P_t = 1 - Cov_t(\exp(-\varepsilon_{t+1}), \exp(\varepsilon_{t+1}))(1 + \gamma),$$

where $\gamma$ is the debt/equity ratio, assumed to be fixed.

Suppose $\varepsilon_t$ is iid over time with $\varepsilon_t = \sigma$ with probability $1/2$ and $\varepsilon_t = -\sigma$ with probability $1/2$. It is easily verified that $Var(\varepsilon_t) = (\sigma)^2$, so that $\sigma$ is the standard deviation of $\varepsilon_t$. Based on his analysis of quarterly U.S. data, Prescott (1986, Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Quarterly Review) has argued that an empirically plausible value for this quantity is .00763. Compute $P_t$ for the case $\gamma = 0$.

Mehra and Prescott argued that the equity premium in the U.S. averages 1.07 percent per annum, or, 1.017 per quarter. What value of $\gamma$ is necessary to make $P_t$ this large?