

EC372 Bond and Derivatives Markets

Financial Intermediation, II

R. E. Bailey

Department of Economics
University of Essex

University week 25

Outline

- 1 Financial Intermediation as Delegated Monitoring
 - Principal-Agent relationships
- 2 The Holmstrom & Tirole (HT) Model
- 3 Fixed Investment
 - Direct finance
 - Indirect finance
 - Interpretation
 - Credit Market Equilibrium
- 4 Variable Investment

Reading: **Lecture notes** (available online in the CMR)

Delegated Monitoring

- ▶ Investors delegate responsibility for monitoring borrowers to intermediaries.
- ▶ Aspects of delegated monitoring:
 - Screening – assess borrower's creditworthiness
 - Prevention – check borrower's behaviour
 - Auditing – penalise borrower's misbehaviour

Delegated Monitoring

- ▶ Investors delegate responsibility for monitoring borrowers to intermediaries.

- ▶ Aspects of delegated monitoring:
 - 1 Screening – assess borrower's creditworthiness
 - 2 Prevention – check borrower's behaviour
 - 3 Auditing – penalise borrower's misbehaviour

Delegated Monitoring

- ▶ Investors delegate responsibility for monitoring borrowers to intermediaries.
- ▶ Aspects of delegated monitoring:
 - 1 **Screening** – assess borrower's creditworthiness
 - 2 Prevention – check borrower's behaviour
 - 3 Auditing – penalise borrower's misbehaviour

Delegated Monitoring

- ▶ Investors delegate responsibility for monitoring borrowers to intermediaries.
- ▶ Aspects of delegated monitoring:
 - 1 Screening – assess borrower's creditworthiness
 - 2 **Prevention** – check borrower's behaviour
 - 3 Auditing – penalise borrower's misbehaviour

Delegated Monitoring

- ▶ Investors delegate responsibility for monitoring borrowers to intermediaries.
- ▶ Aspects of delegated monitoring:
 - 1 Screening – assess borrower's creditworthiness
 - 2 Prevention – check borrower's behaviour
 - 3 **Auditing** – penalise borrower's misbehaviour

Principal-Agent theory: a sketch

- ▶ The principal seeks to control the actions of an agent in the interests of the principal.
- ▶ Suppose principal has complete control over the agent:
 - treat as a single decision-making unit
- ▶ Suppose principal has incomplete control over the agent:
 - scope for genuine principal-agent relationship
- ▶ The principal designs rules to give incentives to the agent to act in the principal's interests
- ▶ Why does the principal have incomplete control over the agent?
 - Hidden actions \Rightarrow Moral hazard
 - Hidden information \Rightarrow Adverse selection

Principal-Agent theory: a sketch

- ▶ The principal seeks to control the actions of an agent in the interests of the principal.
- ▶ Suppose principal has complete control over the agent:
 - treat as a single decision-making unit
- ▶ Suppose principal has incomplete control over the agent:
 - scope for genuine principal-agent relationship
- ▶ The principal designs rules to give incentives to the agent to act in the principal's interests
- ▶ Why does the principal have incomplete control over the agent?
 - Hidden actions \Rightarrow Moral hazard
 - Hidden information \Rightarrow Adverse selection

Principal-Agent theory: a sketch

- ▶ The principal seeks to control the actions of an agent in the interests of the principal.
- ▶ Suppose principal has complete control over the agent:
 - treat as a single decision-making unit
- ▶ Suppose principal has **incomplete** control over the agent:
 - scope for genuine principal-agent relationship
- ▶ The principal designs rules to give incentives to the agent to act in the principal's interests
- ▶ Why does the principal have incomplete control over the agent?
 - Hidden actions \Rightarrow Moral hazard
 - Hidden information \Rightarrow Adverse selection

Principal-Agent theory: a sketch

- ▶ The principal seeks to control the actions of an agent in the interests of the principal.
- ▶ Suppose principal has complete control over the agent:
 - treat as a single decision-making unit
- ▶ Suppose principal has incomplete control over the agent:
 - scope for genuine principal-agent relationship
- ▶ The principal designs rules to give **incentives** to the agent to act in the principal's interests
- ▶ Why does the principal have incomplete control over the agent?
 - Hidden actions \Rightarrow Moral hazard
 - Hidden information \Rightarrow Adverse selection

Principal-Agent theory: a sketch

- ▶ The principal seeks to control the actions of an agent in the interests of the principal.
- ▶ Suppose principal has complete control over the agent:
 - treat as a single decision-making unit
- ▶ Suppose principal has incomplete control over the agent:
 - scope for genuine principal-agent relationship
- ▶ The principal designs rules to give incentives to the agent to act in the principal's interests
- ▶ Why does the principal have incomplete control over the agent?
 - 1 Hidden actions \Rightarrow Moral hazard
 - 2 Hidden information \Rightarrow Adverse selection

Principal-Agent theory: a sketch

- ▶ The principal seeks to control the actions of an agent in the interests of the principal.
- ▶ Suppose principal has complete control over the agent:
 - treat as a single decision-making unit
- ▶ Suppose principal has incomplete control over the agent:
 - scope for genuine principal-agent relationship
- ▶ The principal designs rules to give incentives to the agent to act in the principal's interests
- ▶ Why does the principal have incomplete control over the agent?
 - 1 Hidden actions \Rightarrow Moral hazard
 - 2 Hidden information \Rightarrow Adverse selection

Principal-Agent theory: a sketch

- ▶ The principal seeks to control the actions of an agent in the interests of the principal.
- ▶ Suppose principal has complete control over the agent:
 - treat as a single decision-making unit
- ▶ Suppose principal has incomplete control over the agent:
 - scope for genuine principal-agent relationship
- ▶ The principal designs rules to give incentives to the agent to act in the principal's interests
- ▶ Why does the principal have incomplete control over the agent?
 - 1 Hidden actions \Rightarrow Moral hazard
 - 2 Hidden information \Rightarrow Adverse selection

Principal-Agent: Financial Intermediation

- ▶ **Financial intermediation: principal \Leftrightarrow bank; agent \Leftrightarrow borrower**
- ▶ Principals (banks) elicit information from or influence the behaviour of agents (borrowers)
- ▶ Key assumptions in the 'moral hazard' approach:
 - Incomplete contracts: lender cannot specify borrower's action in every circumstance.
 - Divergent objectives: lender cares only about cash payoff; borrower prefers to shirk.
- ▶ Alternative approach: depositors are principals that monitor banks (agents) (not studied in EC372)

Principal-Agent: Financial Intermediation

- ▶ Financial intermediation: principal \Leftrightarrow bank; agent \Leftrightarrow borrower
- ▶ Principals (banks) elicit information from or influence the behaviour of agents (borrowers)
- ▶ Key assumptions in the 'moral hazard' approach:
 - ▣ Incomplete contracts: lender cannot specify borrower's action in every circumstance.
 - ▣ Divergent objectives: lender cares only about cash payoff; borrower prefers to shirk.
- ▶ Alternative approach: depositors are principals that monitor banks (agents) (not studied in EC372)

Principal-Agent: Financial Intermediation

- ▶ Financial intermediation: principal \Leftrightarrow bank; agent \Leftrightarrow borrower
- ▶ Principals (banks) elicit information from or influence the behaviour of agents (borrowers)
- ▶ Key assumptions in the 'moral hazard' approach:
 - 1 Incomplete contracts: lender cannot specify borrower's action in every circumstance.
 - 2 Divergent objectives: lender cares only about cash payoff; borrower prefers to shirk.
- ▶ Alternative approach: depositors are principals that monitor banks (agents) (not studied in EC372)

Principal-Agent: Financial Intermediation

- ▶ Financial intermediation: principal \Leftrightarrow bank; agent \Leftrightarrow borrower
- ▶ Principals (banks) elicit information from or influence the behaviour of agents (borrowers)
- ▶ Key assumptions in the 'moral hazard' approach:
 - 1 **Incomplete contracts**: lender cannot specify borrower's action in every circumstance.
 - 2 Divergent objectives: lender cares only about cash payoff; borrower prefers to shirk.
- ▶ Alternative approach: depositors are principals that monitor banks (agents) (not studied in EC372)

Principal-Agent: Financial Intermediation

- ▶ Financial intermediation: principal \Leftrightarrow bank; agent \Leftrightarrow borrower
- ▶ Principals (banks) elicit information from or influence the behaviour of agents (borrowers)
- ▶ Key assumptions in the 'moral hazard' approach:
 - 1 Incomplete contracts: lender cannot specify borrower's action in every circumstance.
 - 2 **Divergent objectives**: lender cares only about cash payoff; borrower prefers to shirk.
- ▶ Alternative approach: depositors are principals that monitor banks (agents) (not studied in EC372)

Principal-Agent: Financial Intermediation

- ▶ Financial intermediation: principal \Leftrightarrow bank; agent \Leftrightarrow borrower
- ▶ Principals (banks) elicit information from or influence the behaviour of agents (borrowers)
- ▶ Key assumptions in the 'moral hazard' approach:
 - 1 Incomplete contracts: lender cannot specify borrower's action in every circumstance.
 - 2 Divergent objectives: lender cares only about cash payoff; borrower prefers to shirk.
- ▶ Alternative approach: depositors are principals that monitor banks (agents) (not studied in EC372)

The Holmstrom & Tirole (HT) Model

- ▶ HT model is based on **moral hazard**
- ▶ Three groups of decision-makers (all risk-neutral):
 - 1 Firms – issue bonds or borrow from banks
 - 2 Investors – hold bonds issued by firms but cannot monitor them
 - 3 Financial intermediaries (banks) – lend to firms and monitor them
- ▶ Alternative asset has a fixed payoff equal to $\gamma > 0$
- ▶ HT model has two varieties:
 - 1 Fixed investment: scale of each firm's investment is exogenous
 - 2 Variable investment: firms choose scale of investment project

The Holmstrom & Tirole (HT) Model

- ▶ HT model is based on moral hazard
- ▶ Three groups of decision-makers (all risk-neutral):
 - 1 Firms – issue bonds or borrow from banks
 - 2 Investors – hold bonds issued by firms but cannot monitor them
 - 3 Financial intermediaries (banks) – lend to firms and monitor them
- ▶ Alternative asset has a fixed payoff equal to $\gamma > 0$
- ▶ HT model has two varieties:
 - 1 Fixed investment: scale of each firm's investment is exogenous
 - 2 Variable investment: firms choose scale of investment project

The Holmstrom & Tirole (HT) Model

- ▶ HT model is based on moral hazard
- ▶ Three groups of decision-makers (all risk-neutral):
 - 1 **Firms** – issue bonds or borrow from banks
 - 2 Investors – hold bonds issued by firms but cannot monitor them
 - 3 Financial intermediaries (banks) – lend to firms and monitor them
- ▶ Alternative asset has a fixed payoff equal to $\gamma > 0$
- ▶ HT model has two varieties:
 - 1 Fixed investment: scale of each firm's investment is exogenous
 - 2 Variable investment: firms choose scale of investment project

The Holmstrom & Tirole (HT) Model

- ▶ HT model is based on moral hazard
- ▶ Three groups of decision-makers (all risk-neutral):
 - 1 Firms – issue bonds or borrow from banks
 - 2 **Investors** – hold bonds issued by firms but cannot monitor them
 - 3 Financial intermediaries (banks) – lend to firms and monitor them
- ▶ Alternative asset has a fixed payoff equal to $\gamma > 0$
- ▶ HT model has two varieties:
 - 1 Fixed investment: scale of each firm's investment is exogenous
 - 2 Variable investment: firms choose scale of investment project

The Holmstrom & Tirole (HT) Model

- ▶ HT model is based on moral hazard
- ▶ Three groups of decision-makers (all risk-neutral):
 - 1 Firms – issue bonds or borrow from banks
 - 2 Investors – hold bonds issued by firms but cannot monitor them
 - 3 Financial **intermediaries** (banks) – lend to firms and monitor them
- ▶ Alternative asset has a fixed payoff equal to $\gamma > 0$
- ▶ HT model has two varieties:
 - 1 Fixed investment: scale of each firm's investment is exogenous
 - 2 Variable investment: firms choose scale of investment project

The Holmstrom & Tirole (HT) Model

- ▶ HT model is based on moral hazard
- ▶ Three groups of decision-makers (all risk-neutral):
 - 1 Firms – issue bonds or borrow from banks
 - 2 Investors – hold bonds issued by firms but cannot monitor them
 - 3 Financial intermediaries (banks) – lend to firms and monitor them
- ▶ Alternative asset has a fixed payoff equal to $\gamma > 0$
- ▶ HT model has two varieties:
 - 1 Fixed investment: scale of each firm's investment is exogenous
 - 2 Variable investment: firms choose scale of investment project

The Holmstrom & Tirole (HT) Model

- ▶ HT model is based on moral hazard
- ▶ Three groups of decision-makers (all risk-neutral):
 - 1 Firms – issue bonds or borrow from banks
 - 2 Investors – hold bonds issued by firms but cannot monitor them
 - 3 Financial intermediaries (banks) – lend to firms and monitor them
- ▶ Alternative asset has a fixed payoff equal to $\gamma > 0$
- ▶ HT model has two varieties:
 - 1 Fixed investment: scale of each firm's investment is exogenous
 - 2 Variable investment: firms choose scale of investment project

The Holmstrom & Tirole (HT) Model

- ▶ HT model is based on moral hazard
- ▶ Three groups of decision-makers (all risk-neutral):
 - 1 Firms – issue bonds or borrow from banks
 - 2 Investors – hold bonds issued by firms but cannot monitor them
 - 3 Financial intermediaries (banks) – lend to firms and monitor them
- ▶ Alternative asset has a fixed payoff equal to $\gamma > 0$
- ▶ HT model has two varieties:
 - 1 **Fixed** investment: scale of each firm's investment is exogenous
 - 2 **Variable** investment: firms choose scale of investment project

The Holmstrom & Tirole (HT) Model

- ▶ HT model is based on moral hazard
- ▶ Three groups of decision-makers (all risk-neutral):
 - 1 Firms – issue bonds or borrow from banks
 - 2 Investors – hold bonds issued by firms but cannot monitor them
 - 3 Financial intermediaries (banks) – lend to firms and monitor them
- ▶ Alternative asset has a fixed payoff equal to $\gamma > 0$
- ▶ HT model has two varieties:
 - 1 Fixed investment: scale of each firm's investment is exogenous
 - 2 **Variable** investment: firms choose scale of investment project

Firms' investment payoffs

- ▶ Firms differ only in the amount of initial capital, A .
- ▶ Cost of project: I (from own funds, loans or bonds)
- ▶ Investment payoffs: R^* = success; 0 = failure.
- ▶ Each firm chooses effort, H (no shirking) or L (shirking), with probabilities of success p_H and p_L : $\Delta p \equiv p_H - p_L > 0$.
- ▶ Private benefits: $H \Rightarrow \text{Nil}$;
 $L \Rightarrow B^*$ if not monitored, b^* if monitored; with $B^* > b^*$

Firms' investment payoffs

- ▶ Firms differ only in the amount of initial capital, A .
- ▶ Cost of project: I (from own funds, loans or bonds)
- ▶ Investment payoffs: R^* = success; 0 = failure.
- ▶ Each firm chooses effort, H (no shirking) or L (shirking), with probabilities of success p_H and p_L : $\Delta p \equiv p_H - p_L > 0$.
- ▶ Private benefits: $H \Rightarrow \text{Nil}$;
 $L \Rightarrow B^*$ if not monitored, b^* if monitored; with $B^* > b^*$

Firms' investment payoffs

- ▶ Firms differ only in the amount of initial capital, A .
- ▶ Cost of project: I (from own funds, loans or bonds)
- ▶ Investment payoffs: R^* = success; 0 = failure.
- ▶ Each firm chooses effort, H (no shirking) or L (shirking), with probabilities of success p_H and p_L : $\Delta p \equiv p_H - p_L > 0$.
- ▶ Private benefits: $H \Rightarrow \text{Nil}$;
 $L \Rightarrow B^*$ if not monitored, b^* if monitored; with $B^* > b^*$

Firms' investment payoffs

- ▶ Firms differ only in the amount of initial capital, A .
- ▶ Cost of project: I (from own funds, loans or bonds)
- ▶ Investment payoffs: R^* = success; 0 = failure.
- ▶ Each firm chooses effort, H (no shirking) or L (shirking), with probabilities of success p_H and p_L : $\Delta p \equiv p_H - p_L > 0$.
- ▶ Private benefits: $H \Rightarrow \text{Nil}$;
 $L \Rightarrow B^*$ if not monitored, b^* if monitored; with $B^* > b^*$

Firms' investment payoffs

- ▶ Firms differ only in the amount of initial capital, A .
- ▶ Cost of project: I (from own funds, loans or bonds)
- ▶ Investment payoffs: R^* = success; 0 = failure.
- ▶ Each firm chooses effort, H (no shirking) or L (shirking), with probabilities of success p_H and p_L : $\Delta p \equiv p_H - p_L > 0$.
- ▶ Private benefits: $H \Rightarrow \text{Nil}$;
 $L \Rightarrow B^*$ if not monitored, b^* if monitored; with $B^* > b^*$

Firms' investment opportunities

▶ **Assumptions about expected payoffs:**

▶ $p_H R^* - \gamma I > 0$

▶ $p_L R^* - \gamma I + B^* < 0$

▶ Note: $p_L R^* - \gamma I + b^* < 0$ because $b^* < B^*$

▶ Expected payoffs are split between firms, bond holders and banks

▶ 'Direct' finance obtained from issuing bonds;
'Indirect finance' obtained from bank loans

▶ Firms borrow from banks only if bond finance is not available because banks will monitor them.

Firms' investment opportunities

- ▶ Assumptions about expected payoffs:

- ▶ $p_H R^* - \gamma I > 0$

- ▶ $p_L R^* - \gamma I + B^* < 0$

- ▶ Note: $p_L R^* - \gamma I + b^* < 0$ because $b^* < B^*$

- ▶ Expected payoffs are split between firms, bond holders and banks

- ▶ 'Direct' finance obtained from issuing bonds;
'Indirect finance' obtained from bank loans

- ▶ Firms borrow from banks only if bond finance is not available because banks will monitor them.

Firms' investment opportunities

- ▶ Assumptions about expected payoffs:
 - ▶ $p_H R^* - \gamma I > 0$
 - ▶ $p_L R^* - \gamma I + B^* < 0$
- ▶ Note: $p_L R^* - \gamma I + b^* < 0$ because $b^* < B^*$
- ▶ Expected payoffs are split between firms, bond holders and banks
- ▶ 'Direct' finance obtained from issuing bonds;
'Indirect finance' obtained from bank loans
- ▶ Firms borrow from banks only if bond finance is not available because banks will monitor them.

Firms' investment opportunities

- ▶ Assumptions about expected payoffs:
 - ▶ $p_H R^* - \gamma I > 0$
 - ▶ $p_L R^* - \gamma I + B^* < 0$
- ▶ **Note:** $p_L R^* - \gamma I + b^* < 0$ because $b^* < B^*$
- ▶ Expected payoffs are split between firms, bond holders and banks
- ▶ 'Direct' finance obtained from issuing bonds;
'Indirect finance' obtained from bank loans
- ▶ Firms borrow from banks only if bond finance is not available because banks will monitor them.

Firms' investment opportunities

- ▶ Assumptions about expected payoffs:
 - ▶ $p_H R^* - \gamma I > 0$
 - ▶ $p_L R^* - \gamma I + B^* < 0$
- ▶ Note: $p_L R^* - \gamma I + b^* < 0$ because $b^* < B^*$
- ▶ Expected payoffs are split between firms, bond holders and banks
- ▶ 'Direct' finance obtained from issuing bonds;
'Indirect finance' obtained from bank loans
- ▶ Firms borrow from banks only if bond finance is not available because banks will monitor them.

Firms' investment opportunities

- ▶ Assumptions about expected payoffs:
 - ▶ $p_H R^* - \gamma I > 0$
 - ▶ $p_L R^* - \gamma I + B^* < 0$
- ▶ Note: $p_L R^* - \gamma I + b^* < 0$ because $b^* < B^*$
- ▶ Expected payoffs are split between firms, bond holders and banks
- ▶ 'Direct' finance obtained from issuing bonds;
'Indirect' finance' obtained from bank loans
- ▶ Firms borrow from banks only if bond finance is not available because banks will monitor them.

Firms' investment opportunities

- ▶ Assumptions about expected payoffs:
 - ▶ $p_H R^* - \gamma I > 0$
 - ▶ $p_L R^* - \gamma I + B^* < 0$
- ▶ Note: $p_L R^* - \gamma I + b^* < 0$ because $b^* < B^*$
- ▶ Expected payoffs are split between firms, bond holders and banks
- ▶ 'Direct' finance obtained from issuing bonds;
'Indirect finance' obtained from bank loans
- ▶ Firms borrow from banks only if bond finance is not available because banks will monitor them.

Direct finance

- ▶ $R^* = R_f + R_u$: firm's payoff = R_f ; investors' payoff = R_u
- ▶ Non-shirking (H) requires:

$$p_H R_f \geq p_L R_f + B^* \quad \text{or} \quad R_f \geq B^* / \Delta p$$

- ▶ Payoff to investors from an investment of I_u :

$$\gamma I_u = \gamma [I - A] \leq p_H \left[R^* - \frac{B^*}{\Delta p} \right]$$

- ▶ Minimum capital required to obtain bond finance:

$$\bar{A}(\gamma) = I - \frac{p_H}{\gamma} \left[R^* - \frac{B^*}{\Delta p} \right]$$

Direct finance

- ▶ $R^* = R_f + R_u$: firm's payoff = R_f ; investors' payoff = R_u
- ▶ Non-shirking (H) requires:

$$p_H R_f \geq p_L R_f + B^* \quad \text{or} \quad R_f \geq B^* / \Delta p$$

- ▶ Payoff to investors from an investment of I_u :

$$\gamma I_u = \gamma [I - A] \leq p_H \left[R^* - \frac{B^*}{\Delta p} \right]$$

- ▶ Minimum capital required to obtain bond finance:

$$\bar{A}(\gamma) = I - \frac{p_H}{\gamma} \left[R^* - \frac{B^*}{\Delta p} \right]$$

Direct finance

- ▶ $R^* = R_f + R_u$: firm's payoff = R_f ; investors' payoff = R_u
- ▶ Non-shirking (H) requires:

$$p_H R_f \geq p_L R_f + B^* \quad \text{or} \quad R_f \geq B^* / \Delta p$$

- ▶ Payoff to investors from an investment of I_u :

$$\gamma I_u = \gamma [I - A] \leq p_H \left[R^* - \frac{B^*}{\Delta p} \right]$$

- ▶ Minimum capital required to obtain bond finance:

$$\bar{A}(\gamma) = I - \frac{p_H}{\gamma} \left[R^* - \frac{B^*}{\Delta p} \right]$$

Direct finance

- ▶ $R^* = R_f + R_u$: firm's payoff = R_f ; investors' payoff = R_u
- ▶ Non-shirking (H) requires:

$$p_H R_f \geq p_L R_f + B^* \quad \text{or} \quad R_f \geq B^* / \Delta p$$

- ▶ Payoff to investors from an investment of I_u :

$$\gamma I_u = \gamma [I - A] \leq p_H \left[R^* - \frac{B^*}{\Delta p} \right]$$

- ▶ Minimum capital required to obtain bond finance:

$$\bar{A}(\gamma) = I - \frac{p_H}{\gamma} \left[R^* - \frac{B^*}{\Delta p} \right]$$

Indirect finance

- ▶ Even if $A < \bar{A}(\gamma)$, a firm may still be able obtain a bank loan
- ▶ But, because monitoring is costly, loan finance is costly: $\beta > \gamma$, where β is the required return on bank loans.
- ▶ Now: $R^* = R_f + R_u + R_m$, where R_m is the bank's payoff.
- ▶ As banks monitor loans, shirking is lower: $b^* < B^*$. Hence:

$$R_f \geq b^* / \Delta p$$

- ▶ Assume monitoring costs c^* per firm (project). Then:

$$p_H R_m - c^* \geq p_L R_m \quad \text{or} \quad R_m \geq c^* / \Delta p$$

Indirect finance

- ▶ Even if $A < \bar{A}(\gamma)$, a firm may still be able obtain a bank loan
- ▶ But, because monitoring is costly, loan finance is costly: $\beta > \gamma$, where β is the required return on bank loans.
- ▶ Now: $R^* = R_f + R_u + R_m$, where R_m is the bank's payoff.
- ▶ As banks monitor loans, shirking is lower: $b^* < B^*$. Hence:

$$R_f \geq b^* / \Delta p$$

- ▶ Assume monitoring costs c^* per firm (project). Then:

$$p_H R_m - c^* \geq p_L R_m \quad \text{or} \quad R_m \geq c^* / \Delta p$$

Indirect finance

- ▶ Even if $A < \bar{A}(\gamma)$, a firm may still be able obtain a bank loan
- ▶ But, because monitoring is costly, loan finance is costly: $\beta > \gamma$, where β is the required return on bank loans.
- ▶ Now: $R^* = R_f + R_u + R_m$, where R_m is the bank's payoff.
- ▶ As banks monitor loans, shirking is lower: $b^* < B^*$. Hence:

$$R_f \geq b^* / \Delta p$$

- ▶ Assume monitoring costs c^* per firm (project). Then:

$$p_H R_m - c^* \geq p_L R_m \quad \text{or} \quad R_m \geq c^* / \Delta p$$

Indirect finance

- ▶ Even if $A < \bar{A}(\gamma)$, a firm may still be able obtain a bank loan
- ▶ But, because monitoring is costly, loan finance is costly: $\beta > \gamma$, where β is the required return on bank loans.
- ▶ Now: $R^* = R_f + R_u + R_m$, where R_m is the bank's payoff.
- ▶ As banks monitor loans, shirking is lower: $b^* < B^*$. Hence:

$$R_f \geq b^* / \Delta p$$

- ▶ Assume monitoring costs c^* per firm (project). Then:

$$p_H R_m - c^* \geq p_L R_m \quad \text{or} \quad R_m \geq c^* / \Delta p$$

Indirect finance

- ▶ Even if $A < \bar{A}(\gamma)$, a firm may still be able obtain a bank loan
- ▶ But, because monitoring is costly, loan finance is costly: $\beta > \gamma$, where β is the required return on bank loans.
- ▶ Now: $R^* = R_f + R_u + R_m$, where R_m is the bank's payoff.
- ▶ As banks monitor loans, shirking is lower: $b^* < B^*$. Hence:

$$R_f \geq b^* / \Delta p$$

- ▶ Assume monitoring costs c^* per firm (project). Then:

$$p_H R_m - c^* \geq p_L R_m \quad \text{or} \quad R_m \geq c^* / \Delta p$$

Indirect finance, continued

- ▶ Competition drives banks' payoff to: $R_m = c^* / \Delta p$
- ▶ If I_m is the bank's investment, $\beta I_m = p_H R_m$. Hence:

$$I_m(\beta) = \frac{p_H c^*}{\beta \Delta p}$$

- ▶ Only firms with capital, $A \geq \underline{A}(\gamma, \beta)$ will be able to obtain a loan.
- ▶ Indirect finance is possible only if c^* is low enough that:

$$c^* \Delta p < p_H [B^* - b^*] \implies \underline{A}(\gamma, \beta) < \bar{A}(\gamma)$$

Indirect finance, continued

- ▶ Competition drives banks' payoff to: $R_m = c^* / \Delta p$
- ▶ If I_m is the bank's investment, $\beta I_m = p_H R_m$. Hence:

$$I_m(\beta) = \frac{p_H c^*}{\beta \Delta p}$$

- ▶ Only firms with capital, $A \geq \underline{A}(\gamma, \beta)$ will be able to obtain a loan.
- ▶ Indirect finance is possible only if c^* is low enough that:

$$c^* \Delta p < p_H [B^* - b^*] \implies \underline{A}(\gamma, \beta) < \bar{A}(\gamma)$$

Indirect finance, continued

- ▶ Competition drives banks' payoff to: $R_m = c^* / \Delta p$
- ▶ If I_m is the bank's investment, $\beta I_m = p_H R_m$. Hence:

$$I_m(\beta) = \frac{p_H c^*}{\beta \Delta p}$$

- ▶ Only firms with capital, $A \geq \underline{A}(\gamma, \beta)$ will be able to obtain a loan.
- ▶ Indirect finance is possible only if c^* is low enough that:

$$c^* \Delta p < p_H [B^* - b^*] \implies \underline{A}(\gamma, \beta) < \bar{A}(\gamma)$$

Indirect finance, continued

- ▶ Competition drives banks' payoff to: $R_m = c^* / \Delta p$
- ▶ If I_m is the bank's investment, $\beta I_m = p_H R_m$. Hence:

$$I_m(\beta) = \frac{p_H c^*}{\beta \Delta p}$$

- ▶ Only firms with capital, $A \geq \underline{A}(\gamma, \beta)$ will be able to obtain a loan.
- ▶ Indirect finance is possible only if c^* is low enough that:

$$c^* \Delta p < p_H [B^* - b^*] \implies \underline{A}(\gamma, \beta) < \bar{A}(\gamma)$$

Interpretation

- ▶ HT model shows how initial capital allows access to credit markets.
- ▶ Firms with enough capital can borrow without monitoring (but will still not shirk)
- ▶ Firms with too little capital will not be able to borrow at all.
- ▶ Firms with $\underline{A}(\gamma, \beta) \leq A < \bar{A}(\gamma)$ can obtain bank loans (and will be monitored)

Interpretation

- ▶ HT model shows how initial capital allows access to credit markets.
- ▶ Firms with enough capital can borrow without monitoring (but will still not shirk)
- ▶ Firms with too little capital will not be able to borrow at all.
- ▶ Firms with $\underline{A}(\gamma, \beta) \leq A < \bar{A}(\gamma)$ can obtain bank loans (and will be monitored)

Interpretation

- ▶ HT model shows how initial capital allows access to credit markets.
- ▶ Firms with enough capital can borrow without monitoring (but will still not shirk)
- ▶ Firms with too little capital will not be able to borrow at all.
- ▶ Firms with $\underline{A}(\gamma, \beta) \leq A < \bar{A}(\gamma)$ can obtain bank loans (and will be monitored)

Interpretation

- ▶ HT model shows how initial capital allows access to credit markets.
- ▶ Firms with enough capital can borrow without monitoring (but will still not shirk)
- ▶ Firms with too little capital will not be able to borrow at all.
- ▶ Firms with $\underline{A}(\gamma, \beta) \leq A < \bar{A}(\gamma)$ can obtain bank loans (and will be monitored)

Credit Market Equilibrium

- ▶ HT assume that the aggregate supply of capital is given by:
 - ▶ Investors' capital: $K_u = S(\gamma)$, where $S'(\gamma) > 0$
 - ▶ Banks' capital: K_m is exogenously fixed
 - ▶ Firms' initial capital: K_f is exogenously fixed
- ▶ Beware: some ambiguities remain (see notes).
- ▶ Firms' aggregate demand for funds:

Firms' demand for uninformed capital: $D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f)$

- - +

Firms' demand for monitored loans: $D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f)$

- - +

Credit Market Equilibrium

- ▶ HT assume that the aggregate supply of capital is given by:
 - ▶ Investors' capital: $K_u = S(\gamma)$, where $S'(\gamma) > 0$
 - ▶ Banks' capital: K_m is exogenously fixed
 - ▶ Firms' initial capital: K_f is exogenously fixed
- ▶ Beware: some ambiguities remain (see notes).
- ▶ Firms' aggregate demand for funds:

Firms' demand for uninformed capital: $D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f)$

- - +

Firms' demand for monitored loans: $D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f)$

- - +

Credit Market Equilibrium

- ▶ HT assume that the aggregate supply of capital is given by:
 - ▶ Investors' capital: $K_u = S(\gamma)$, where $S'(\gamma) > 0$
 - ▶ Banks' capital: K_m is exogenously fixed
 - ▶ Firms' initial capital: K_f is exogenously fixed
- ▶ Beware: some ambiguities remain (see notes).
- ▶ Firms' aggregate demand for funds:

Firms' demand for uninformed capital: $D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f)$

$\begin{matrix} - & - & + \end{matrix}$

Firms' demand for monitored loans: $D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f)$

$\begin{matrix} - & - & + \end{matrix}$

Credit Market Equilibrium, continued

▶ Market equilibrium conditions:

Bond market (direct finance): $D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = S(\gamma)$

Intermediary loans (indirect finance): $D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = K_m$

▶ Various 'shocks':

■ Credit crunch: K_m falls

■ Collateral squeeze: K_f falls

■ Savings squeeze: $S(\gamma)$ shifts left, lowering S for each γ .

▶ Results:

■ Credit crunch $\implies \beta \uparrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

■ Collateral squeeze $\implies \beta \downarrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

■ Savings squeeze $\implies \gamma \uparrow; \beta \downarrow$.

Credit Market Equilibrium, continued

▶ Market equilibrium conditions:

Bond market (direct finance): $D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = S(\gamma)$

Intermediary loans (indirect finance): $D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = K_m$

▶ Various 'shocks':

1 Credit crunch: K_m falls

2 Collateral squeeze: K_f falls

3 Savings squeeze: $S(\gamma)$ shifts left, lowering S for each γ .

▶ Results:

1 Credit crunch $\implies \beta \uparrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

2 Collateral squeeze $\implies \beta \downarrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

3 Savings squeeze $\implies \gamma \uparrow; \beta \downarrow$.

Credit Market Equilibrium, continued

- ▶ Market equilibrium conditions:

Bond market (direct finance): $D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = S(\gamma)$

Intermediary loans (indirect finance): $D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = K_m$

- ▶ Various 'shocks':

1 **Credit crunch**: K_m falls

2 Collateral squeeze: K_f falls

3 Savings squeeze: $S(\gamma)$ shifts left, lowering S for each γ .

- ▶ Results:

1 Credit crunch $\implies \beta \uparrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

2 Collateral squeeze $\implies \beta \downarrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

3 Savings squeeze $\implies \gamma \uparrow; \beta \downarrow$.

Credit Market Equilibrium, continued

- ▶ Market equilibrium conditions:

Bond market (direct finance): $D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = S(\gamma)$

Intermediary loans (indirect finance): $D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = K_m$

- ▶ Various 'shocks':

1 Credit crunch: K_m falls

2 Collateral squeeze: K_f falls

3 Savings squeeze: $S(\gamma)$ shifts left, lowering S for each γ .

- ▶ Results:

1 Credit crunch $\implies \beta \uparrow; \gamma \downarrow$

2 Collateral squeeze $\implies \beta \downarrow; \gamma \downarrow$

3 Savings squeeze $\implies \gamma \uparrow; \beta \downarrow$

Credit Market Equilibrium, continued

- ▶ Market equilibrium conditions:

Bond market (direct finance): $D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = S(\gamma)$

Intermediary loans (indirect finance): $D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = K_m$

- ▶ Various 'shocks':

1 Credit crunch: K_m falls

2 Collateral squeeze: K_f falls

3 Savings squeeze: $S(\gamma)$ shifts left, lowering S for each γ .

- ▶ Results:

☐ Credit crunch $\implies \beta \uparrow; \gamma \downarrow$

☐ Collateral squeeze $\implies \beta \downarrow; \gamma \downarrow$

☐ Savings squeeze $\implies \gamma \uparrow; \beta \downarrow$

Credit Market Equilibrium, continued

- ▶ Market equilibrium conditions:

Bond market (direct finance): $D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = S(\gamma)$

Intermediary loans (indirect finance): $D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = K_m$

- ▶ Various 'shocks':

1 Credit crunch: K_m falls

2 Collateral squeeze: K_f falls

3 Savings squeeze: $S(\gamma)$ shifts left, lowering S for each γ .

- ▶ Results:

1 Credit crunch $\implies \beta \uparrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

2 Collateral squeeze $\implies \beta \downarrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

3 Savings squeeze $\implies \gamma \uparrow; \beta \downarrow$.

Credit Market Equilibrium, continued

- ▶ Market equilibrium conditions:

Bond market (direct finance): $D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = S(\gamma)$

Intermediary loans (indirect finance): $D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = K_m$

- ▶ Various 'shocks':

1 Credit crunch: K_m falls

2 Collateral squeeze: K_f falls

3 Savings squeeze: $S(\gamma)$ shifts left, lowering S for each γ .

- ▶ Results:

1 **Credit crunch** $\implies \beta \uparrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

2 Collateral squeeze $\implies \beta \downarrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

3 Savings squeeze $\implies \gamma \uparrow; \beta \downarrow$.

Credit Market Equilibrium, continued

- ▶ Market equilibrium conditions:

$$\text{Bond market (direct finance): } D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = S(\gamma)$$

$$\text{Intermediary loans (indirect finance): } D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = K_m$$

- ▶ Various 'shocks':

1 Credit crunch: K_m falls

2 Collateral squeeze: K_f falls

3 Savings squeeze: $S(\gamma)$ shifts left, lowering S for each γ .

- ▶ Results:

1 Credit crunch $\implies \beta \uparrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

2 Collateral squeeze $\implies \beta \downarrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

3 Savings squeeze $\implies \gamma \uparrow; \beta \downarrow$.

Credit Market Equilibrium, continued

- ▶ Market equilibrium conditions:

$$\text{Bond market (direct finance): } D_u(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = S(\gamma)$$

$$\text{Intermediary loans (indirect finance): } D_m(\gamma, \beta; K_f) = K_m$$

- ▶ Various 'shocks':

1 Credit crunch: K_m falls

2 Collateral squeeze: K_f falls

3 Savings squeeze: $S(\gamma)$ shifts left, lowering S for each γ .

- ▶ Results:

1 Credit crunch $\implies \beta \uparrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

2 Collateral squeeze $\implies \beta \downarrow; \gamma \downarrow$.

3 Savings squeeze $\implies \gamma \uparrow; \beta \downarrow$.

Variable Investment

- ▶ **Allows firms to choose the size, I , of their investment projects**
- ▶ Now all firms invest in a project proportional to initial capital.
- ▶ Hence, the model is no use in analysing access to different credit markets.
- ▶ Main use of the model: clarify aggregate credit market equilibrium theory
- ▶ Details are optional for EC372.

Variable Investment

- ▶ Allows firms to choose the size, I , of their investment projects
- ▶ Now all firms invest in a project proportional to initial capital.
- ▶ Hence, the model is no use in analysing access to different credit markets.
- ▶ Main use of the model: clarify aggregate credit market equilibrium theory
- ▶ Details are optional for EC372.

Variable Investment

- ▶ Allows firms to choose the size, I , of their investment projects
- ▶ Now all firms invest in a project proportional to initial capital.
- ▶ Hence, the model is no use in analysing access to different credit markets.
- ▶ Main use of the model: clarify aggregate credit market equilibrium theory
- ▶ Details are optional for EC372.

Variable Investment

- ▶ Allows firms to choose the size, I , of their investment projects
- ▶ Now all firms invest in a project proportional to initial capital.
- ▶ Hence, the model is no use in analysing access to different credit markets.
- ▶ Main use of the model: clarify aggregate credit market equilibrium theory
- ▶ Details are optional for EC372.

Variable Investment

- ▶ Allows firms to choose the size, I , of their investment projects
- ▶ Now all firms invest in a project proportional to initial capital.
- ▶ Hence, the model is no use in analysing access to different credit markets.
- ▶ Main use of the model: clarify aggregate credit market equilibrium theory
- ▶ Details are optional for EC372.