

Dollarization of Liabilities in Non-tradable Goods Sector

By: Frédéric Chabellard

Working Paper No. 380
June 2001

Dollarization of Liabilities in Non-tradable Goods Sectors

Frédéric Chabellard [✉]

Université de Pau et des Pays de l'Adour, France

(Comments welcome)

Abstract

This paper questions the motivation of dollar indebtedness by firms of the non-tradable good sectors in a period of exchange rate pressure. Given the structure of banks' indebtedness and protection of banks' foreign lenders, a dollar denominated loan may allow firms to insure (partially) against the risk of an early liquidation of their projects if they turn out to be poor. Then it is shown that under dollarization of liabilities the government may be urged to soften monetary policy to induce a real appreciation that supports the domestic banking system. Therefore, it might be constrained in its ability to enforce an efficient regulatory policy.

JEL classification: G33; G28

Keywords: Foreign currency debt; Real and nominal exchange rates; Soft budget constraints; Too many to fail; Regulatory forbearance

[✉] Avenue du Doyen Poplawski, 64000 Pau, France. Tel.: +(33)5 59 80 75 80; fax: +(33)5 59 80 75 90; e-mail: frederic.chabellard@univ-pau.fr.

The author thanks participants at the 2001 AFSE conference on financial intermediaries, M. Laclau, D. Laborde and especially J. Le Cacheux for comments. All errors are my own.

Non-technical Summary

Dollarization of liabilities in the corporate sector characterizes many emerging or transition economies. It has proven to be potentially destabilizing, as for example in the recent Asian crisis. Addressing the issues raised by such a phenomenon requires ...rst to investigate ...rst the emergence of private foreign currency debt. The present paper questions intermediated dollar indebtedness by ...rms of the non-tradable goods sectors in a period of exchange rate pressure.

The setting is a simple game-theoretic model with three dates. In a small open economy we consider relationships between a bank and ...rms. The former's liabilities are made up of one unit of the tradable good, whose price at the intermediary date is random. The bank can choose to lend one unit of tradable or non-tradable good. Firms need one unit of good (whatever its nature) to start an investment project, which can be either good or poor. A poor project requires to be rolled over at the intermediary date to be completed. The liquidation policy of the bank depends, on the one hand, on the currency denomination of loans and, on the other hand, on the value of nominal and real exchange rates. A dollar loan allows banks to preserve the real value of their claims, but is riskier. However, because of the guarantee of its external debt, the bank may choose to grant dollar loans under conditions that are speci...ed. The bank's strategy depends especially on the average quality of projects in the economy: The lower the proportion of good projects in the economy, the proner the bank will be to lend tradable goods instead of non-tradable goods. As far as ...rms are concerned a dollar loan may allow them to bene...t from a higher probability of facing a soft budget constraint. Firms' preferences are determined by the average quality of projects that represents the probability of having a good project and the private bene...t the entrepreneurs extract from managing their project.

Then, the model is modi...ed to focus on banks-government relationships and analyses prudential regulation under dollarization of liabilities in non-tradable goods sectors. A cost-minimizing government is allowed to manipulate the real exchange rate, through the price of the non-tradable good. It can under particular circumstances lower the expected costs of banks rescue if rolled over poor projects fail. The negative counterpart is that it may be constrained in its ability to implement an e¢cient prudential policy because of a higher probability of facing a too many to fail situation as de...ned by Mitchell (1998).

1 Introduction

Private short-term foreign currency debts have played a central role in most recent emerging market crises. In East Asian countries, observers stressed the importance of short-term foreign currency outstanding debt both in corporate and banking sectors. The corporate sector borrowed in foreign currencies either directly from international investors or through domestic financial intermediaries as, for example, in Indonesia; banks usually intermediate foreign capital inflows because of a cost advantage over foreign lenders in observing the output realization of domestic firms. Moreover, firms of both tradable and non-tradable goods sectors contracted dollar denominated debt. The riskiness of such a choice is more striking in the latter case, for which real estate provides a good example, since firms' earnings and debts are not denominated in the same currency. Firms might be very vulnerable to exchange rate depreciation. Financial intermediaries also borrowed heavily in hard foreign currencies, typically the dollar or the yen, to grant domestic or foreign currency loans to finance domestic activities of firms. The BIS (1998) reported that in 1995 and 1996 banks of five Asian countries (Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Thailand and the Philippines) borrowed \$43 billions per year. Foreign currency debts accounted for up to thirty percent of banks liabilities. In a context of insufficient and inefficient prudential regulation, this led to high and certainly excessive investment in Asian economies. Corsetti et al., (1999, p1230-31) notice that "financial intermediation played a key role in channeling funds toward projects that were marginal if not outright unprofitable". Eventually, when the crisis occurred, resulting balance sheet mismatches both in corporate and banking sectors contributed to a deepening of the Asian crisis, and to a greater difficulty to manage this crisis (see e.g., BIS, 1998 or Jeanne, 2000).

Despite these destabilizing effects, little inquiry has concerned the emergence of intermediated dollar denominated debt in non-tradable goods sectors so far. The BIS (1998) noticed that fixed or quasi-fixed pegs maintained on a long period might have led economic agents to a false assessment of exchange rate risk.¹ On the other hand, few analyses are based on the idea that foreign currency indebtedness could be justified by private benefits for agents.

¹Moreover, this mistake could have been strengthened by an "inverse money illusion", the agents reasoning in terms on interest rates of US dollars or yen corrected by domestic inflation. This occurs when a fixed exchange rate regime is associated with high interest rate and high inflation. Residents are encouraged to borrow in foreign currency to finance domestic activity or domestic asset purchases, especially real estate in the Asian example (see BIS, 1998).

Burnside, Eichenbaum and Rebelo (2001) point out that fixing the exchange rate offers free insurance to firms which borrow in dollar. Caballero and Krishnamurty (2000) stress the role of foreign currency liabilities as an insurance against a shortage of external resources, assumed necessary for production. International financial constraints of developing countries justify the purchase of such an insurance. Moreover, they show that both domestic financial system underdevelopment and limited domestic collateral of firms explain that firms systematically undervalue insurance provided by local currency debt against countrywide shocks. In a model with foreign lenders but no banks, Schneider and Tornell (2000) show that firms of the non-tradable goods sectors may choose a dollar denominated debt to switch a part of their expected debt burden to foreign creditors, if the realization of the real exchange rate turns out to be unfavorable. A firm that does not meet its debt burden at the expected date is liquidated. Hence, they cannot capture wide “evergreening” practices, which seem have been a general feature of banking in the East Asian experience (see e.g., Caprio and Honohan, 1999).

Caballero and Krishnamurty assume that each loan is fully collateralized with assets denominated in the loan denomination currency; their model allows no default on debt. Schneider and Tornell suppose the immediate liquidation of a firm, when it cannot repay its financial obligations. On the contrary, the present paper proposes an explanation based on banks liquidation policy with respect to defaulting loans and is related to soft budget constraint theories. In this analytical framework, firms’ creditors cannot commit not to re-finance -or to roll over- a project not completed at the expected date. Kornai (1980) introduced the concept of soft budget constraint focusing on political motivations. Dewatripont and Maskin (1995) stressed the ex-post profitability of a re-financed project in the presence of irreversibilities. The soft budget constraint phenomenon can occur even if re-financing the poor project is ex-post inefficient. In Mitchell’s analysis (Mitchell, 1998), firms’ budget constraints are soften because banks gamble for resurrection or attempt to trigger a too many to fail.²

We retain the latter approach in this paper to analyze dollarization of liabilities before an exchange rate and/or a banking crisis occurs. We develop a simple model that extends this framework in order to consider two stylized facts of banking in emerging countries. Firstly, as already mentioned, a large part of commercial banks’ liabilities is denominated in hard foreign currencies. Therefore, expected or observed exchange rate variations affect banks’ balance sheets

²Dewatripont and Roland (2000) or Maskin and Xu (2001) provide recent surveys of soft budget constraint theories.

on the liabilities side and may change their incentives. Secondly, the government, often supported by international organizations, guarantees external debt of banks, especially in order to maintain access to international capital markets. Such an insurance is typically associated with the abandonment of an exchange rate peg. Empirical evidence supports this as shown for example by Hawkins and Turner (1999) or Corsetti et al. (1999). This means that banks benefit from a limited liability, which is here the origin of a moral hazard problem. They choose a risky asset (here they roll over a defaulting loan) with a high return if the gamble succeeds, but leave it to the government if the gamble fails.

Section 2 presents the model of bank-firms relationship and shows that liquidation policy of banks depends on the one hand, on the currency denomination of loans and on the other hand on the value of nominal and real exchange rates. A dollar loan allows banks to preserve the real value of their claims but is riskier. However, because of the guarantee of their external debt, banks may choose to grant dollar loans under conditions that are specified. Banks' strategy depends especially on the average quality of projects in the economy. As far as firms are concerned, a dollar loan may allow them to benefit from a higher probability of facing a soft budget constraint. Once again, firms preferences are determined by the average quality of projects that represents the probability of having a good project.

In section 3, the model is modified to focus on banks-government relationships and analyses prudential regulation under dollarization of liabilities in non-tradable goods sectors. The analysis relies on the concept of too many to fail. Such a situation occurs when closing down a large number of insolvent banks is more costly than rescuing them. We show that a cost-minimizing government might manipulate the real exchange rate to lower the costs of rescue. The negative counterpart is that it might be constrained in its ability to implement an efficient prudential policy. Section 4 presents final remarks and an appendix follows.

2 Foreign debt guarantee and soft budget constraints

2.1 General framework

Consider a simple model of a small open economy.³ There are three periods $t = 0; 1; 2$. The discount rate is zero. There are two perfectly divisible goods in the economy. The first one is a

³The model considers domestic currency denominated variables. Using the tradable good as a numeraire does not affect any result derived here.

non-tradable good whose related variables are denoted with subscript N; its domestic currency price is p_N . The second one is an internationally tradable good⁴ denoted with subscript T; its domestic currency price p_T is a random variable which at $t = 1$ takes on a range of values $p_{T;a}; p_{T;d}; p_{T;\bar{d}}$, with respective (positive) probabilities $1_a; 1_d; 1_{\bar{d}}$. We have

$$\sum_{i=a,d,\bar{d}} 1_i = 1$$

This distribution is common knowledge. There is no change in the price of the tradable good between $t = 1$ and $t = 2$. We also assume that at $t = 0$, $p_T = p_N$. It means that the real exchange rate, defined as the relative price of the tradable good in terms of the non-tradable good $\frac{p_T}{p_N}$, is equal to 1 at the beginning of the game. Then, $p_{T;a}; p_{T;d}$ and $p_{T;\bar{d}}$ correspond respectively to a decrease (a nominal appreciation), a small increase (a small nominal depreciation) and a high increase (a high nominal depreciation) of p_T . The same analysis holds with devaluation in the case of fixed or quasi-fixed exchange rate regime; in this case, 1_d and $1_{\bar{d}}$ express the probability of the abandonment of the peg. The values of $p_{T;a}$, $p_{T;d}$ and $p_{T;\bar{d}}$ will be clarified later.

2.1.1 The domestic productive sector

There are F identical (risk neutral) entrepreneurs, with F normalized to 1. Each entrepreneur is endowed with an investment project, that concerns the non-tradable good. There are two types of project (we identify the quality of a project with that of its entrepreneur). It is good i.e. completed in one period with probability θ . Then, it yields a gross return $p_N Y_N$ where Y_N denotes firm's output. The gross return of the project is not affected by the price of the tradable good. With probability $1 - \theta$, the project is poor. It yields no output after one period and leads the entrepreneur to default on its loan at $t = 1$. A poor project may be completed in the second period provided that the loan is rolled over. However, it yields a random production \tilde{Y}_N with $\tilde{Y}_N \in [0; Y_N]$. The distribution $(\theta; 1 - \theta)$ is common knowledge but an entrepreneur does not know her type at the outset of the game.

The project needs equivalently either one unit of non-tradable good or one unit of tradable good to be started. An entrepreneur has no endowment herself at period 0. So she has to

⁴The country is assumed to be price taker in the world market for importables and exportables. Therefore the terms of trade are exogenously given. Since we do not need to distinguish between exportables and importables, we can aggregate them into a composite commodity called tradable goods whose price (in dollar) is exogenously determined and supposed constant in this model.

obtain ...nancing, i.e. one unit of good, from the bank. She may ask for one unit of non-tradable good (a domestic currency loan) or for one unit of tradable good (a foreign currency loan, typically a dollar denominated loan). The ...rst one imposes, at $t = 1$, a repayment obligation $D \in [0; p_N Y_N]$. The second one imposes a repayment obligation, which depends on the value of the price of the tradable good. It may be $D(p_{T;a})$, $D(p_{T;d})$ or $D(p_{T;\bar{d}})$, henceforth denoted $D_{T;a}$, $D_{T;d}$ and $D_{T;\bar{d}}$ for simplicity. Following our assumptions on tradable good prices, we have $D_{T;a} < D_N < D_{T;d} < D_{T;\bar{d}}$. The entrepreneurs' objective function can be generally expressed as

$$a = \max \{ p_N Y_N - D; 0 \} + \theta \quad (1)$$

An entrepreneur receives the net return of the project $p_N Y_N - D_N$ or $p_N Y_N - D_{T;i}$ for $i \in \{a; d; \bar{d}\}$ if positive; in fact, we will assume that $p_N Y_N > D_{T;\bar{d}}$.⁵ It means that entrepreneurs benefit from a limited liability. In addition to that monetary profit, an entrepreneur has a private benefit θ if she retains her position. More specifically, she retains her private benefit if her project is good or if her project is poor and rolled over (then $\theta = b$; otherwise $\theta = 0$).

2.1.2 The bank

The characterization of the bank borrows from Mitchell (1998). It has no initial capital. Then, the bank's liabilities can be expressed as

$$d_N p_N + d_T p_T^{(0)} \quad (2)$$

where $d_N p_N$ is the non-tradable good debt, $d_T p_T^{(0)}$ the tradable goods debt vis-à-vis external investors and $p_T^{(0)}$ the price of the tradable good at the outset of the game. Debts have to be repaid at the end of the game. For the sake of analytical simplicity, we assume that d_N is zero and d_T is equal to 1. Then bank's liabilities are equal to $p_T^{(0)}$. Bank's liabilities are completely made up of an external debt that amounts to the value of one unit of tradable good. The important assumption is the guarantee of bank's external debt in tradable good. We assume that the government⁶ pays back foreign lenders if the bank's end of game net position is negative.

⁵More specifically, it means that if Y_N is realised, it allows an entrepreneur to pay its loan back. This assumption appears realistic since we investigate periods of exchange rate pressure and not the crisis itself. When the Asian crisis occurred, devaluation of Asian currency were generally very large (for example, 75% in Indonesia); in such a case, even an entrepreneur endowed with a good project is likely to be driven into insolvency.

⁶The government is a passive player in this section.

As far as bank's assets are concerned, the bank can choose to lend either one unit of non-tradable good or one unit of tradable good (we implicitly assume that the bank can exchange one unit of tradable good for one unit of non-tradable good without incurring costs at $t = 0$). It is also assumed that the bank charges each loan with the same real interest rate r : Interest rates issues are obviously important issues to understand borrowing and lending choice respectively of firms and banks. However, we focus here on another aspect of the problem. Let us consider each loan denomination in turn.

Firstly, the bank chooses to grant a non-tradable good loan. If the project turns out to be good, the loan is completely repaid. The return is D_N . When the bank faces default at intermediary period (i.e. the project is poor), it can choose either a tough liquidation policy or a soft liquidation policy. We will equivalently refer to a tough liquidation policy or imposing a hard budget constraint (HBC) and to a soft liquidation policy or imposing a soft budget constraint (SBC).

In the case of a tough policy, the bank receives a liquidation value L (with $L > 0$) which expresses the value of an entrepreneur's collateral. As IMF noticed concerning financial intermediation in East Asia, banks lending practices have relied on collateral rather than credit assessment and cash-flow analysis. Yet, on the one hand, collaterals were generally overvalued and on the other hand, difficulties in seizing and realizing a collateral reduce its value. A soft liquidation policy means "evergreening" the loan; it is rolled over without being reclassified (hence, the bank makes no provision) and without any consideration of project restructuring. Let suppose that there is no change in the nature, non-tradable or tradable, of the borrowed good. In that case, the project will succeed with probability q that can be written as $q_N = \Pr(p_N \geq p_N(1+r) - 0)$ or equivalently $q_N = \Pr(p_N \geq (1+r) - 0)$.⁷ The price of the non-tradable good does not affect the probability of repayment of a rolled over loan. The expected return of the loan is $q_N D_N$. Let us assume that $D_N > L > q_N D_N$. Furthermore, when a rolled over poor project fails that is the realized output does not allow the firm to repay its debt, whatever the nature of the borrowed good, it yields for the bank at $t = 2$, an end-of-game liquidation value I normalized to zero. Hence, the soft budget constraint phenomenon arises because a poor project whose liquidation value is greater than its continuation value is not terminated.

Secondly, the bank chooses to grant a tradable good loan. The expected repayment depends

⁷Ex-post, a poor project that succeeds may be seen as an illiquid one whereas a poor project that fails may be seen as an insolvent one.

on the price of the tradable good. For example, an increase (a nominal depreciation) may have two effects. The first one is an increase in the claim value. As stated before, the debt has in such a case, two possible outcomes $D_{T;d}$ and $D_{T;\bar{d}}$. Depreciation means symmetrically an increase of entrepreneurs' debt burden while the value of their assets remains unchanged. Therefore we assume that the probability of repayment of a rolled over loan is decreasing in the value of the tradable good price.⁸ It is worth noting that the probability of repayment can be expressed as $q_{T;i} = \text{Pr}\{p_N \geq p_{T;i}(1+r) \mid \omega_i\}$ or $q_{T;i} = \text{Pr}\{p_N \geq \frac{p_{T;i}}{p_N}(1+r) \mid \omega_i\}$. The ability of the firm to repay its loan depends more on the real exchange rate $\frac{p_T}{p_N}$ than on the price of the tradable good. The lower the real exchange rate, the higher the probability of repayment. In this version of the model, since p_N is given, both the nominal and the real exchange rates change in the same way. This second effect is captured by the following assumption: $q_N > q_{T;d} > q_{T;\bar{d}}$. As previously, we assume that $D_{T;i} > L > q_{T;i}D_{T;i}$ for each value of i , that is liquidation is the efficient ex-post policy.

2.1.3 The timing of the game

The timing of the game is as follows. At the outset of the game ($t = 0$), entrepreneurs choose to apply for a non-tradable good loan or for a tradable good loan. Then, the bank decides to grant non-tradable or tradable good loans. Only after contracting with the bank, entrepreneurs uncover their types. At the intermediary period ($t = 1$), return of the projects are observed. The bank also observes the value of the tradable good price. Then, it chooses action with respect to poor projects. At the end of the game ($t = 2$), the return of rolled over projects are observed and the bank is bailed out by the government if necessary. The game is of complete information and is solved by backward induction.

⁸Generally, a decrease in banks expected assets, following a strong domestic currency depreciation, results from the prospect of a bankruptcy wave in the productive sector especially due to slackening of economic growth, high interest rates and a cut in bank intermediation. Regarding the latter point, Berglöf and Roland (1997) showed that soft budget constraints can coexist with credit crunches.

2.2 Gambling banks and tradable goods loans

We start with the characterization of the bank's strategy. The bank is assumed to be risk neutral; it will choose the one which maximizes its expected profit.⁹ Since the bank's liabilities come due at the end of the game, its two-period earnings minus liabilities determine its solvency. We consider both possible strategies in turn assuming, on the one hand, that financing the F projects is ex-ante profitable for the bank and on the other hand, that $\bar{p}_T < p_{T,i} \leq \bar{p}_T + \bar{d}$. Returns on good projects are not high enough to permit the bank to repay its debt.

First, the bank may choose to grant non-tradable good loans. The expected return of a tough liquidation policy is $W_N^{liq} = \bar{p}_T + (1 - \bar{p}_T)L - p_{T,i}$. Funds $\bar{p}_T D_N + (1 - \bar{p}_T)L$ are received at $t = 1$ and invested in a safe asset whose return is normalized to zero. With respect to a soft liquidation policy, because foreign debt guarantee provides a limited liability, the bank's expected return is $W_N^{roll} = q_N(D_N - p_{T,i})$. The incentive to gamble for resurrection is defined by $\Phi W_N = W_N^{roll} - W_N^{liq}$. Hence,

$$\Phi W_N = (1 - \bar{p}_T)(D_N - L) - (1 - q_N)(D_N - p_{T,i}) \quad (3)$$

Clearly, this expression increases with the price of the tradable good.¹⁰ The higher the tradable good price, the higher entrepreneurs' probability of facing a soft budget constraint. The benefit of a soft liquidation policy results from the fact that bank's debt is only repaid with probability q . An increase in the price of the tradable good strengthens the bias towards a soft liquidation strategy resulting from the difference between the expected repayment of bank's debt and its face value when the bank gambles for resurrection. Conversely, a decrease in the price of the tradable good leads to a tougher liquidation policy. More precisely, the bank will choose a soft liquidation policy if

$$p_T \geq D_N - \frac{(1 - \bar{p}_T)(D_N - L)}{1 - q_N} \quad (4)$$

We assume that $p_{T,\bar{d}}$ is defined by this condition and that $p_{T,\bar{d}}$ is not high enough for bank to become insolvent if it chooses a tough liquidation policy. Thus, the expected return (denoted

⁹Institutional advantages may have biased banks' loans toward foreign currency loan. For example, the Philippines experienced a significant growth in foreign currency intermediation before the crisis occurs in part because of full tax-exemption (IMF, 1999).

¹⁰Unsurprisingly, the derivative of ΦW_N with respect to the liquidation value L is negative. A high liquidation value raises the opportunity cost of rolling over poor projects. The same remark holds when the bank grants a tradable good loan.

$E(W_N)$) of a bank, which chooses to grant non-tradable good loans, is

$$E(W_N) = (1_a + 1_d)(\textcircled{R}D_N + (1_i \textcircled{R})L) + 1_d q_N : D_N i 1_a p_{T;a} i 1_d p_{T;d} i 1_d q_N p_{T;d} \quad (5)$$

Then, the bank may choose to grant tradable good loans. As noted before, we have to consider the consequence of tradable good's price variations both on the value of the firm's debt and on the probability of repayment of a rolled over loan. Remember that the bank knows the final price of the tradable good. The return associated with each strategy may be written as a general rule as in the first case. However, repayment and probability of success depend on the tradable good price. So the incentive to soften the entrepreneurs' budget constraints ($\Phi W_T = W_T^{\text{roll}} ; W_T^{\text{liq}}$) can be written as

$$\Phi W_T = (1_i \textcircled{R})(D_{T;i} i L) i (1_i q_{T;i})(D_{T;i} i p_{T;i}) \quad (6)$$

where $W_T^{\text{roll}}; W_T^{\text{liq}}$ denote respectively the payoff of a strategy of soft or tough liquidation policy. We now have to establish the consequence of a tradable good price variation on the incentive to enforce a soft liquidation policy. It means to compute the derivative of the incentive to gamble with respect to the price of the tradable good. From equation (6), one obtains

$$\frac{\partial(\Phi W_T)}{\partial p_T} = \frac{\partial q_{T;i}}{\partial p_T} (D_T i p_T) + \frac{\partial D_T}{\partial p_T} (q_{T;i} i \textcircled{R}) + (1_i q_{T;i}) \quad (7)$$

An increase in the price of the tradable good will induce bank to implement a soft liquidation policy if this expression is positive. The first term is negative ($\frac{\partial q_{T;i}}{\partial p_T} < 0$ for p_N given and $D_T > p_T$). It represents the negative effect on bank's incentive to gamble due to the increase in the probability of failure (because of the depreciation) of a poor rolled over project. The sign of the second term depends on the sign of $(q_{T;i} i \textcircled{R})$. If $q_{T;i} > \textcircled{R}$, this term indicates the strengthening of the incentives to gamble related to the rise of the value of the potentially recoverable claim. On the other hand, if $q_{T;i} < \textcircled{R}$, the bank may choose a tough liquidation policy. The last term stands for the debt effect on the incentive to gamble. When it chooses a soft liquidation policy, the expected value of bank's debt is lower than its face value.

We assume that the overall expression is positive. Increase in the price of the tradable good urges the bank to adopt a soft liquidation policy. The bank's focus on the value of the claim, rather than the probability of repayment, can justify this assumption. Actually, observers stressed that in the case of Asian crisis, banks seem not to have taken into accounts the negative relationship between the probability of repayment and the exchange-rate value, when lending in

hard foreign currency (in our setting, it means that $\frac{q_{T,i}}{p_T}$ is equal or close to zero). They might have believed they just had to balance their own foreign currency debt with foreign currency loans to domestic firms or households to finance domestic activities (BIS, (1998); Caprio and Honohan, (1999)). Finally, devaluation of Asian currencies has made the exchange rate risk reappear as credit risk.

Let define $p_{T;a}$ (with $p_{T;a} < p_T$) as a tradable good price such that the bank implements a tough liquidation policy whatever the denomination currency of the loan. Then, define $p_{T;d}$ (with $p_T < p_{T;d}$) the tradable good price which corresponds to an increase in p_T so high as to lead the bank to choose a soft liquidation policy when granting a tradable good loan. We have to check whether $p_{T;d} < p_{T;\bar{d}}$. The following claim states this.

Claim 1 From the definitions of $p_{T;d}$ and $p_{T;\bar{d}}$, we have $p_{T;d} < p_{T;\bar{d}}$ if

$$q_{T;d} > 1 - i \frac{(1 - q_N)(1 - \theta)(D_{T;d} - L)}{(1 - q_N)(D_{T;d} - D_N) + (1 - \theta)(D_N - L)} \quad (8)$$

From now on, we assume that the probability of repayment $q_{T;d}$ satisfies this condition. It means that if $q_{T;d}$ is high enough, the necessary increase in the price of the tradable good to lead the bank to soften entrepreneurs' budget constraints is lower when the bank grants a tradable good loan.

Therefore we are now able to establish the strategy of the bank when it grants a dollar loan. It will implement a tough liquidation policy for $p_T = p_{T;a}$ and a soft liquidation policy otherwise. Its expected payoff is thus $\theta D_{T;a} + (1 - \theta)L - p_{T;a}$ if $p_T = p_{T;a}$, and $q_{T,i}(D_{T,i} - p_{T,i})$ for $i = d, \bar{d}$. We have

$$E(W_T) = 1_a(\theta D_{T;a} + (1 - \theta)L - p_{T;a}) + 1_d q_{T;d}(D_{T;d} - p_{T;d}) + 1_{\bar{d}} q_{T;\bar{d}}(D_{T;\bar{d}} - p_{T;\bar{d}}) \quad (9)$$

The bank is going to accept a tradable good loan if its expected payoff is higher than the expected payoff associated with a non-tradable good loan. That is if $E(W_T) > E(W_N)$. Rewriting this condition, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2 If equation (8) is satisfied, then the bank chooses to grant a tradable good loan if

$$\begin{aligned} & 1_d \frac{E}{h} q_{T;d}(D_{T;d} - p_{T;d}) - (\theta D_N + (1 - \theta)L - p_{T;d}) \\ & + 1_{\bar{d}} q_{T;\bar{d}}(D_{T;\bar{d}} - p_{T;\bar{d}}) - q_N(D_N - p_{T;\bar{d}}) \\ & > 1_a(\theta(D_N - D_{T;a})) \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The first term indicates the expected earnings of a soft liquidation policy in the case of a low depreciation ($p_T = p_{T;d}$). The second term represents potential earnings resulting from a soft liquidation policy in the case of a strong depreciation ($p_T = p_{T;\bar{d}}$). In fact, the sign of this term is difficult to assess because $D_{T;\bar{d}} > D_N$ and $p_{T;\bar{d}} > p_{T;d}$ and $q_{T;\bar{d}} < q_N$. The third term represents the loss of profit associated to good projects when there is an appreciation in the price of the tradable good. From basic comparative static, we derive the following corollary.

Corollary 3 The lower the proportion of good projects in the economy, the proner the bank will be to lend tradable goods instead of non-tradable goods.

Proof. The proof is straightforward. One computes the derivative of equation (10) with respect to θ : One obtains $\frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (D_N - L) = \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} (D_N - D_{T;a})$ which is negative ■

The guarantee of its external debt provides the bank with an implicit subsidy, which increases with credit risk. Then, if the former is high, it leads banks to take on more risk through tradable good loans. We now question firms' possibility to take advantage of this.

2.3 Why do entrepreneurs borrow the tradable good?

The model allows no bargaining power to the firm on the choice of the nature of the borrowed good. So this section aims at characterizing entrepreneurs preferences.¹¹ The important point here is that entrepreneurs do not know their type when they ask the bank for a non-tradable or a tradable good loan. An entrepreneur only knows the distribution $(\theta; 1 - \theta)$ of good and poor projects in the economy. Consider the two possibilities in turn. Borrowing a non-tradable good is the first possibility. If her project is good, an entrepreneur's expected payoff is $E^g = (p_N Y_N - D_N) + b \theta p_T - (1 - \theta) p_{T;d}$. Considering the structure of its liabilities, the bank will implement a soft liquidation policy only if $p_T = p_{T;\bar{d}}$, which may be the case with probability $\theta \bar{d}$. If her project is poor, her expected payoff is $E^p = \theta \bar{d} (q_N (p_N Y_N - D_N) + b)$. Thus, her total expected payoff is

$$E(E^g) = \theta ((p_N Y_N - D_N) + b) + (1 - \theta) \theta \bar{d} (q_N (p_N Y_N - D_N) + b) \quad (11)$$

The alternative is a tradable good loan. If her project is good, her expected payoff is $(p_N Y_N - D_{T;i}) + b$ with $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. If her project is poor, her expected payoff is zero if $p_T = p_{T;a}$ because

¹¹One should also have considered that firms benefit from bargaining power (considering for example large capital inflows and competitive pressure on banks in East Asia). In such a case, the formal characterization of the equilibrium will change but the analysis of firms' strategies is altered, what is our point.

she faces a hard budget constraint, and $q_{T;i}(p_N Y_N - D_{T;i}) + b$ if $p_T = p_{T;i}$ for $i = \underline{d}; \bar{d}$, because she has a soft budget constraint. Thus, an entrepreneur's total expected payoff is

$$E(a_T) = \theta(p_N Y_N - \frac{1}{a} D_{T;a} - \frac{1}{\underline{d}} D_{T;\underline{d}} - \frac{1}{\bar{d}} D_{T;\bar{d}} + b) + (1 - \theta)(\frac{1}{\underline{d}} q_{T;\underline{d}}(p_N Y_N - D_{T;\underline{d}}) + \frac{1}{\bar{d}} q_{T;\bar{d}}(p_N Y_N - D_{T;\bar{d}}) + (\frac{1}{\underline{d}} + \frac{1}{\bar{d}})b) \quad (12)$$

Entrepreneurs will choose a tradable good debt if $E(a_T) \geq E(a_N)$. Consequently, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 4 Entrepreneurs will ask for tradable good loans if

$$\theta[\frac{1}{a}(D_N - D_{T;a}) + (1 - \theta)[\frac{1}{\underline{d}}(q_{T;\underline{d}}(p_N Y_N - D_{T;\underline{d}}) + b)] \geq \theta[\frac{1}{\underline{d}}(D_{T;\underline{d}} - D_N) + \frac{1}{\bar{d}}(D_{T;\bar{d}} - D_N)] + (1 - \theta)\frac{1}{\bar{d}}[q_N(p_N Y_N - D_N) - q_{T;\bar{d}}(p_N Y_N - D_{T;\bar{d}})] \quad (13)$$

Recall that a decrease in the price of the tradable good leads the bank to harden the firm's budget constraint whatever good is the loan denominated. Then, the first term of left-hand side represents the profit related to tradable good denominated debt if the project is good and in the same time, the price of the tradable good decreases. It expresses the cut in firms' debt. The second term indicates the payoff due to the distortion of the bank's balance sheet which consequence is that a lower price of the tradable good allows the entrepreneur to have a soft budget constraint. The probability of facing a soft budget constraint is now $\frac{1}{\underline{d}} + \frac{1}{\bar{d}}$. It means that she retains at least her private benefit.

The right hand side of (13) only concerns monetary costs. The first term stands for the loss of profit resulting from an increase in the tradable good price if the project is good. Finally, the second term may express the monetary loss associated to a poor project if there is a high price of the tradable good ($p_T = p_{T;\bar{d}}$), but the firm's manager retains her non-monetary benefit b . Hence, the right hand side of (13) stands for the monetary cost of a better partial insurance against early liquidation of a poor project. Consequently, we can establish the following.

Corollary 5 If the private non-monetary benefit of entrepreneurs is high enough, i.e.

$$b \geq \frac{1}{\underline{d}} \frac{h}{\theta} [q_N(p_N Y_N - D_N) - q_{T;\bar{d}}(p_N Y_N - D_{T;\bar{d}})] + \frac{1}{\bar{d}} (D_{T;\bar{d}} - D_N) + \frac{1}{\underline{d}} (D_N - D_{T;a}) \quad (14)$$

Then the higher the proportion of poor projects in the economy, the proner entrepreneurs will be to borrow tradable goods.

Proof. The proof is straightforward. One computes the derivative of equation (13) with respect to θ . One obtains

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\partial}{\partial \theta} \left[\frac{1}{h} q_{T;d} (p_N Y_N - D_{T;d}) + b^a \right] \\ & \frac{1}{h} \frac{\partial q_{T;d}}{\partial \theta} (p_N Y_N - D_{T;d}) - \frac{1}{h} q_{T;d} \frac{\partial (p_N Y_N - D_{T;d})}{\partial \theta} \\ & + \frac{1}{a} (D_N - D_{T;a}) \frac{\partial (D_{T;d} - D_N)}{\partial \theta} - \frac{1}{d} (D_{T;d} - D_N) \frac{\partial (D_{T;d} - D_N)}{\partial \theta} \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Which is negative for the value presented in equation (14) ■

This result appears consistent with Schneider and Tornell's analysis (Schneider and Tornell, 2000, p21). They found, in a different setting, that as far as firms are concerned, "undertaking risky plans goes hand in hand with a preference for debt denominated in tradables".

Finally, it remains to precise the nature of the loan. It is possible to determine from proposition 1 and 2 cut-off levels of θ , the probability that a project be good. Denote θ^b , θ^f the cut-off levels respectively for the bank and entrepreneurs. If $\theta < \theta^b$ and $\theta < \theta^f$, then the bank grants the tradable good loan, entrepreneurs applied for. The realization of the tradable good price and eventually of a rolled over project determines payoffs. If $\theta > \theta^b$ and $\theta < \theta^f$, then entrepreneurs would like to ask for a tradable good loan but the bank would turn down. It just would be willing to grant a non-tradable good loan. Assumptions on entrepreneurs' private benefits ensure that the project is undertaken since $E(a_N)$ is positive while not undertaking the project yields a payoff equal to zero. If $\theta < \theta^b$ and $\theta > \theta^f$, the issue is quite unusual. Entrepreneurs would prefer to ask for a non-tradable good loan. However the bank would only accept to grant a tradable good loan.¹² At last, if $\theta > \theta^b$ and $\theta > \theta^f$, entrepreneurs apply for a non-tradable good loan and the bank accepts.

3 Prudential policy under dollarization of liabilities

Two main reasons explain excessive risk taking that occurred after the financial liberalization in East Asia (Mishkin, 1999). The first one was the lack of banks' managers of the expertise to

¹²Allowing the bargaining power to firms will obviously lead to opposite issues (in terms of the borrowed good) when the two parties have different preferences on the nature of the loan.

manage risk appropriately. The second one was the inadequacy of the regulatory/supervisory policy. Together with depositors and foreign lenders protection, it generated moral hazard as for example described in the preceding section. Then, this section will discuss the capacity of the government to implement efficient regulatory and supervisory policies when firms in the non-tradable good sector borrow tradable goods. The discussion of regulatory and supervisory policies under dollarization of liabilities relies on Mitchell's analysis (Mitchell, 1998) who introduced the concept of too many to fail to account for large levels of creditor passivity with respect to defaulting loans in transition countries.

Let consider a sketch of Mitchell's model¹³. Banks and the government interact in a two-stage game. The latter aims at cutting the costs resulting from the existence of non-performing loans under the constraint that foreign creditors be repaid at the end of the game. It is assumed to be cost-minimizing as in Mailath and Mester (1994). Payout to foreign lenders and costs of closing the banks constitute these costs.

Consider the preceding model with banks granting tradable good loans. Ex-ante i.e. at $t = 0$, the government is assumed to know the proportion of good projects in the economy, θ , and the number m of banks with poor projects in their portfolio (the share is $1 - \theta$). Furthermore, the government has fixed a high monitoring capacity, incurring a fixed cost K . At $t = 1$, after banks have chosen their policy, it is able to identify all banks which have implemented a soft liquidation policy with respect to defaulting loans. Then, it has to choose the ex-post policy it will implement. At $t = 2$, poor projects are realized and the government repay foreign lenders if necessary. Since there are more changes in prices than in the preceding sections, we introduce superscripts when necessary to denote the date of realization.

The first ex-post policy may be "closure". Banks having chosen a soft liquidation policy are closed down, poor projects are forced into bankruptcy (allowing the government to recover liquidation value of these projects) and banks' payoff is zero. The government entails both direct costs (administrative costs) and indirect costs due to disruptions in the domestic financial system. As in Mitchell's model, the total cost, denoted $c(m)$ is assumed to be convex in the number of closed banks. "Neutral forbearance" is the alternative policy. It means recapitalizing banks if poor rolled over projects fails and whatever the issue of the projects leaving banks

¹³We simply discuss here the possibility of occurrence of a too many to fail situation. The demonstration of consequences on monitoring capacity of the government requires a more formal model. Since it is very close to Mitchell, we leave it in the appendix.

open. The recapitalization is such that the nominal wealth of banks is zero. Therefore the expected cost is mR^{\min} where R^{\min} denotes the expected cost of recapitalization per banks, $R^{\min} = m^{-1} \int_i q^{(2)} \phi^h p_T^{(2)} \otimes D_T^{(2)} \mathbf{i}$ and the expected payoff of banks is positive.

A too many to fail occurs if closing down a large number of financially distressed banks is more costly than recapitalizing them, that is if

$$c(m) \leq m^{-1} \int_i q^{(2)} \phi^h p_T^{(2)} \otimes D_T^{(2)} \mathbf{i} \quad (16)$$

Mitchell shows that in such a case, an ex-ante tough prudential policy is not an issue because sub-game perfection would be violated. The prudential policy is softened through weaker monitoring capacity ex-ante or through ex-post recapitalization.

To account for the evolution of exchange rates in East Asian countries before the crises occurred, that is a trend of slight nominal depreciation (sometimes owing to a crawling peg arrangement) and real appreciation (see e.g. IMF, 1999, ...g 3, p 16), we now allow the government to manipulate the non-tradable good price after having observed both the price of the tradable good and the behavior of banks. Let assume that the price of the non-tradable good does not change between $t = 0$ and $t = 1$ and that the end-of-game non-tradable good price may be either $p_{\underline{N}}$ or $p_{\overline{N}}$ with $p_{\underline{N}} < p_{\overline{N}}$. Yet, manipulating the non-tradable good price may now alter the price of the tradable good through a rise of the nominal exchange rate. Hence, it is supposed that

$$p_T^{(2)} = p_T^{(1)} + \pm (p_{\underline{N}} \mathbf{i} p_{\overline{N}}) \quad (17)$$

where $0 < \pm \leq 1$.¹⁴ Moreover, we assume that $\pm \leq \frac{p_T^{(1)}}{p_{\underline{N}}}$. This assumption ensures that if the realization of the price of the tradable good consists in a nominal depreciation high enough to induce banks to roll over defaulting loans at the intermediate date ($p_T^{(1)} \leq p_{T;d}$), it can go with a real appreciation at the end of the game.

We first have to check whether an increase in $p_{\underline{N}}$ undermines banks' incentives to roll over poor projects. It can be written as

$$\phi W_T = (1 \mathbf{i} \otimes) (D_{T;i}^{(2)} \mathbf{i} L) \mathbf{i} (1 \mathbf{i} q_{T;i}^{(2)}) (D_{T;i}^{(2)} \mathbf{i} p_{T;i}^{(2)}) \quad (18)$$

¹⁴The parameter \pm is a synthetic one that incorporates the weight of non-tradable goods in the general prices index.

The derivative with respect to the price of the non-tradable good is

$$\frac{\partial(\Phi W_T)}{\partial p_N} = \frac{\partial q_T}{\partial p_N} (D_T^{(2)} \text{ ; } p_T^{(2)}) + \frac{\partial D_T}{\partial p_N} (q^{(2)} \text{ ; } \textcircled{R}) + (1 \text{ ; } q^{(2)}) \frac{\partial p_T}{\partial p_N} \quad (19)$$

An increase in p_N affects the probability $q^{(2)}$ of repayment of a poor rolled over project through a real appreciation; $q_T^{(2)}$ is increasing in p_N because it is assumed that $\pm < \bar{\pm}$. Following the preceding assumptions, the price of the tradable good $p_T^{(2)}$ is also increasing in p_N . It is the same for firms' debt in tradable good $D_T^{(2)}$.

A rise of p_N may urge banks with non performing tradable good loans in their portfolio to roll over them because the probability of repayment of a rolled over project increases following the real exchange rate appreciation ($\frac{\partial q_T}{\partial p_N} (D_T^{(2)} \text{ ; } p_T^{(2)}) > 0$) and the value of banks' external debt rises following the induced nominal depreciation ($(1 \text{ ; } q^{(2)}) \frac{\partial p_T}{\partial p_N} > 0$; recall that if a bank chooses to roll over defaulting loans, the expected value of its debt is lower than its face value). Furthermore, the domestic currency return of a rolled over project rises with nominal depreciation. It will urge banks to roll over poor projects if the probability of an end of game success is high enough with respect to the proportion of good projects \textcircled{R} . This condition is directly linked to the importance of real appreciation due to monetary softening, therefore related to \pm . The overall expression is non-negative, if one of these condition is satisfied: $q_T^{(2)} \text{ ; } \textcircled{R}$ or, otherwise, $\frac{\partial q}{\partial p_N} (D_T^{(2)} \text{ ; } p_T^{(2)}) + (1 \text{ ; } q_T^{(2)}) \frac{\partial p_T}{\partial p_N} \text{ ; } \frac{\partial D_T}{\partial p_N} (\textcircled{R} \text{ ; } q_T^{(2)})$. We assume that one of these condition is satisfied, that is monetary softening does not de-incite banks to roll over defaulting loans.

Following our assumptions, if the government chooses to close banks, it can recover the value of their external debt by forcing debtors into bankruptcy. Then, increasing the non-tradable good price is not an issue. So, we focus on the consequences on the costs associated to forbearance. If $\pm = \bar{\pm}$, any increase in the price of the non-tradable good induces a nominal depreciation so that there are no change in the real exchange rate defined as $\frac{p_T}{p_N}$. It means no alteration in the probability of success of rolled over poor projects, q_T , but there is a mechanical increase in the domestic currency value of banks' external debt. Therefore, increasing p_N is a dominated strategy. If $\pm = 0$, the rise of p_N does not alter the nominal exchange rate; on the other hand, there is a real appreciation that leads to an increase in q_T . Therefore, the expected costs of a strategy of forbearance decrease.

From the preceding discussion, it results that there exists a cut-off level of $\pm \geq 0$; $\bar{\pm}$, denoted \underline{b} , such that if $\pm > \underline{b}$, a rise of p_N raises the expected costs of recapitalization and can not be

an issue for the government. On the contrary, if $\pm \cdot b$, the government will increase p_N since the benefits of a higher probability of success of rolled over projects outweighs the extra-cost due to the increase of domestic currency external debt of banks. Then we define a strategy labelled “accommodating forbearance” as a strategy of forbearance together with an increase in the price of the non-tradable good. Then, the condition for existence of a too many to fail is altered. If $c(m) \leq mR^{\min}(p_N)$, a too many to fail is not possible. According to Mitchell’s analysis, there is no constraint on ex-ante monitoring activities. However, if (i) $\pm \cdot b$ and (ii) $mR^{\min}(p_N) \leq c(m) \leq mR^{\min}(p_N)$, then a too many to fail is made possible by the government’s capacity of lowering ex-post costs associated to a policy of forbearance through a real appreciation.

An ex-post policy of closure entails closure costs with certainty while leaving banks open results in costs of recapitalization only if the rolled over projects fails. The government’s ability to prompt a real appreciation allows it to lower this cost and makes forbearance more valuable. Following Mitchell’s analysis, this constraints the possibility to implement ex-ante monitoring capacity through a higher probability of facing a too many to fail.¹⁵ Note that this situation is more likely to occur when the number of financially distressed banks is high.¹⁶ The basic idea is that in Asian countries, despite of pressures on nominal exchange rates, the ongoing real appreciation has contributed to preclude governments from being able to implement an efficient prudential policy. It may have found expression in softening non-performing loans classification standards, loosening capital requirements or pursuing soft regulatory policies.

4 Concluding remarks

The example of Asian countries led us to investigate the firms’ motivation to borrow in dollar. Why did they choose to contract a (hard) foreign currency debt while depreciation (or devaluation) is probable? We supply here an insurance-based explanation. Contracting a dollar denominated loan may provide firms with a higher probability of facing a soft budget constraint, if their investment project is poor. A noticeable consequence of this analysis is that the higher the proportion of poor projects in the economy, the more firms will be prone to borrow in dollar. However, firms’ foreign currencies indebtedness goes hand in hand with a weakening of bank-

¹⁵See the appendix.

¹⁶Since for $m = 0$, costs associated to both policies are 0, and considering that $c(m)$ is convex in m while R^{\min} is linear in m , this statement requires the assumption that the slope of $c(m)$ in zero is lower than the one of R^{\min} .

ing system while the monetary institutions might be constrained in the regulatory/supervisory policies they are able to implement.

The situation described above may be less likely to occur if the government considered a larger objective function. First, it would take into account the weakening of the financial position of sound banks (that is without non-performing loans in their portfolio) since there is an increase in the domestic currency value of their external debt. Furthermore, it will take into account the consequences of the real appreciation on the domestic tradable good sector. These consequences depend on different and opposite effects if we consider a traditional model of trade (see Gandolfo, 1998; chap 6). First, a revenue effect can happen if the rise of p_N induces an increase in domestic demand of tradable goods (and if domestic producers benefit from this increase in the demand). Nevertheless, if we assume that producing one units of the tradable good requires a quantity x of the non-tradable good, profitability of tradable good sector decreases. We should also note that in a setting in which labor is a general factor moving freely from sector to sector, the increase in p_N the government prompts to cut its costs may impede a resource movement effect from the non-tradable to the tradable good sector (which may be ex-ante optimal if we solely consider the initial increase in p_T).

The approach developed in this paper could be extended to develop a dynamic analysis of intermediated foreign currency loan, for example along the lines of models developed by Dekle and Kletzer (2001) or Giannetti (2000).¹⁷ These authors propose models of the Asian crisis based on a dynamic analysis of banks' incentives to roll over defaulting loans. Yet they do not consider the non-tradable good sector. It would require to take into account both fiscal considerations (since it determines the government ability to repay domestic depositors and foreign lenders), the level of foreign exchange reserves and foreign lenders behavior. It would certainly allow us to draw some interesting conclusions on the ability of the government both to prompt a real appreciation and to implement a strict prudential policy.

5 Appendix

We present here a simplified version of Mitchell's analysis in order to show formally that the possible occurrence of a too many to fail situation constrains the monitoring capacity the gov-

¹⁷Giannetti's model does not rely on the assumption of deposit or foreign currency debt guarantee conversely to Dekle and Kletzer analysis or to the present paper.

ernment can implement ex-ante (for a complete analysis, see Mitchell, (1998)). There are m banks with non-performing loans in their portfolio. The timing is as the one described above. At $t = 0$, the government chooses a monitoring capacity, $\lambda \in [0; 1]$, and supports the cost $H(\lambda)$ assumed to be convex in λ . At $t = 1$, banks observe the price of the tradable good, assumed to be high enough to make a soft liquidation policy valuable. Then, they choose a liquidation policy with respect to defaulting loans. The government monitors banks and apply an ex-post policy to passive detected banks. At $t = 2$, poor rolled over projects are realized and the government pays back foreign lenders if projects fail.

Because of the monitoring capacity, the total ex-post cost of a closure policy is $C(\lambda; m) = H(\lambda) + c(\lambda; m) + (1 - \lambda)mR^{\min}$, where $R^{\min} = (1 - q)[p_T - \theta D_T]$. The last term differs from Mitchell; it is justified by the fact that at the end of the game, foreign lenders must be repaid if non-terminated poor projects fail. Let suppose that (i) the benefits of detecting a small number of banks exceeds the costs of closing these banks and (ii) at $\lambda = 0$, the marginal cost of monitoring does not outweigh the net marginal benefit of closing a small number of banks. Note that the expected payoff of a passive banks is now $(1 - \lambda)q_T(D_T - p_T)$; moreover, if the government apply a closure policy to passive detected banks, their payoff is zero. The total cost of a recapitalization policy is $R(\lambda; m) = mR^{\min}$ (if recapitalization is to be the optimal ex-post strategy, the government does not implement any monitoring capacity since monitoring is costly).

As Mitchell let state the following without proof. Denote by λ^* the value of $\lambda \in [0; \bar{\lambda}]$ such that the first-order condition for minimization of $C(\lambda; m)$ is satisfied. When the first order condition is satisfied

$$H'(\lambda^*) + \frac{\partial c(\lambda^*; m)}{\partial \lambda} - mR^{\min} = 0 \quad (\text{A.1})$$

The optimal value λ^* given a policy of intervention will either be λ^* or $\bar{\lambda}$, where $\bar{\lambda}$ represents a corner solution ($\bar{\lambda}$ is high enough to make a soft liquidation policy not valuable for banks). In the latter case,

$$H'(\bar{\lambda}) > mR^{\min} - \frac{\partial c(\bar{\lambda}; m)}{\partial \lambda} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

and

$$H(\bar{\lambda}) < C(\lambda^*; m) \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Consider first that the government expects that no collusion between banks. Because of assumptions (i) and (ii), $\lambda^* > 0$ implies that the total ex-post costs of a closure policy are lower than

total cost with $\hat{\tau} = 0$. Since $C(0; m)$ is equal to $R(0; m)$, the total cost of a closure policy must be lower than the total cost of a recapitalization policy. Then there exists an equilibrium with $\hat{\tau} > 0$ and closure of passive detected banks (we do not address the case in which accommodating forbearance is the preferred strategy ex-ante because of real appreciation).

Assume that the government wants to implement a high monitoring capacity (the corner solution). A too many to fail occurs if the ex-post costs of closure are higher than ex-post costs of recapitalization, that is if

$$c(\hat{\tau}m) + (1 - \hat{\tau})mR^{\min} > mR^{\min} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

or equivalently,

$$\frac{c(\hat{\tau}m)}{\hat{\tau}} > R^{\min} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Suppose that this condition is satisfied, because of induced -valuable- real appreciation and that the government expects that such an implicit collusion may occur. Then, there exists an equilibrium with $\hat{\tau}$ and closure of detected passive banks. To check this, note that since monitoring is costly

$$H(0) + mR^{\min} < H(\hat{\tau}) + mR^{\min} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where the last term stands for the costs of the government facing a too many to fail situation. From the preceding, we know that

$$H(\hat{\tau}) + c(\hat{\tau}m) + (1 - \hat{\tau})mR^{\min} < H(0) + mR^{\min} \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Hence

$$H(\hat{\tau}) + c(\hat{\tau}m) + (1 - \hat{\tau})mR^{\min} < H(\hat{\tau}) + mR^{\min} \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Then the equilibrium policy corresponds to a softening of prudential policy; the government must relax a monitoring capacity equal to $\hat{\tau}$ instead of $\hat{\tau}$.

References

- Berglöf, E., Roland, G., 1997. Soft Budget Constraint and Credit Crunches in Financial Transition, *European Economic Review* 41 (3-5), 807-17.
- BIS, 1999. 68th Annual Report. Bank for International Settlements, Basle.
- Burnside, C., Eichenbaum, M., Rebelo, S., 2001. Hedging and Financial Fragility in Fixed Exchange Rate Regimes, *European Economic Review* 45 (7), 1151-94.
- Caballero, R. J., Krishnamurty, A., 2000. Dollarization of Liabilities: Underinsurance and Domestic Financial Underdevelopment, Working Paper No 7792, NBER, Cambridge, MA.
- Caprio, G., Honohan, P., 1999. Restoring Banking Stability: Beyond Supervised Capital Requirements, *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 13 (4), 43-64.
- Corsetti, G., Pesenti, P., Roubini, N., 1999. Paper Tigers? A Model of the Asian Crisis, *European Economic Review* 43, 1211-36.
- Dekle, R., Kletzer, K., 2001. Domestic Bank Regulation and Financial Crises: Theory and Empirical Evidence from East Asia, NBER, Cambridge, MA.
- Dewatripont, M., Maskin, E., 1995. Credit and Efficiency in Centralized and Decentralized Economies, *Review of Economic Studies* 62 (4), 541-55.
- Dewatripont, M., Roland, G., 2000. Soft Budget Constraints, Transition, and Financial Systems, *Journal of Institutional and Theoretical Economics* 156, 245-260.
- Gandolfo, G., 1998. *International Trade Theory and Policy*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin.
- Giannetti, M., 2000. On the Causes of Overlending: Are Guarantees on Deposits the Culprit?, SITE, Stockholm School of Economics, mimeo.
- Hawkins, J., Turner, P., 1999. Bank Restructuring in Practice: An Overview. In: Bank for International Settlements. *Bank Restructuring in Practice*, BIS Policy Paper No 6, pp.6-105.
- IMF, 1998. *World Economic Outlook*. International Monetary Fund, Washington D.C.
- IMF, 1999. *Financial Sector Crisis and Restructuring: Lessons from Asia*. International Monetary Fund, Washington D.C.
- Jeanne, O., 2000. Foreign Currency debt and the Global Financial Architecture, *European Economic Review* 44 (4-6), 719-27.
- Kornai, J., 1980. *Economics of Shortage*. North-Holland, Amsterdam.
- Mailath, G. J., Mester, L. J., 1994. A Positive Analysis of Bank Closure, *Journal of Financial Intermediation* 3 (3), 272-99.

- Maskin, E., Xu, C., 2001. Soft budget Constraints Theories: From Centralization to the Market, *Economics of transition* 9 (1), 1-27.
- Mishkin, F. S., 1999. Lessons from the Asian Crisis, *Journal of International Money and Finance* 18, 709-23.
- Mitchell, J., 1998. Strategic Creditor Passivity, Regulation and Bank Bailouts, Discussion Paper No 1780, CEPR, London.
- Schneider, M., Tornell, A., (2000), Balance Sheet Effects, Bailout Guarantees and Financial Crises. Working Paper No 8060, NBER, Cambridge, MA.



THE WILLIAM DAVIDSON INSTITUTE
AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN BUSINESS SCHOOL

DAVIDSON INSTITUTE WORKING PAPER SERIES - Most Recent Papers

The entire Working Paper Series is available at: www.wdi.bus.umich.edu

CURRENT AS OF 7/06/01

Publication	Authors	Date
No. 380 Dollarization of Liabilities in Non-tradable Goods Sector	Frédéric Chabellard	June 2001
No. 379 Lessons from the Russian Meltdown: The Economics of Soft Legal Constraints	Enrico Perotti	Mar. 2001
No. 378 Effective Tax Rates in Transition	Vlad Ivanenko	May 2001
No. 377 Some Explanations for Changes in the Distribution of Household Income in Slovakia: 1988 and 1996	Thesia Garner and Katherine Terrell	May 2001
No. 376 Competition and Enterprise Performance in Transition Economies: Evidence from a Cross-country Survey	Wendy Carlin, Steven Fries, Mark Schaffer and Paul Seabright	May 2001
No. 375 Why More is Actually Less: New Interpretations of China's Labor-Intensive FDI	Yasheng Huang	May 2001
No. 374 Economic Fragmentation and FDI in China	Yasheng Huang	May 2001
No. 373 Earnings Disparities in the Czech Republic: Evidence of the Past Decade and Cross-National Comparison	Jiri Vecernik	May 2001
No. 372 Economic Reform, Democracy and Growth During Post-Communist Transition	Jan Fidrmuc	Mar. 2001
No. 371 Do Multinational Enterprises Substitute Parent Jobs for Foreign Ones? Evidence from Firm Level Panel Data	Jozef Konings and Alan Murphye	Apr. 2001
No. 370 From Needs to the Market: Changing Inequality of Household Income in the Czech Transition	Jiri Vecernik	Apr. 2001
No. 369 Competition and Corporate Governance: Substitutes or Complements? Evidence from the Warsaw Stock Exchange	Irena Grosfeld and Thierry Tresselt	Mar. 2001
No. 368 Multinational Corporations as Catalyst for Industrial Development: The Case of Poland	Carlo Altomonte and Laura Resmini	Feb. 2001
No. 367 A Multi-Task Theory of the State Enterprise Reform	Chong-En Bai, David D. Li, Zhigang Tao, and Yijiang Wang	Mar. 2001
No. 366a Confidence Building in Emerging Stock Markets	Enrico C. Perotti and Luc Laeven	June 2001
No. 366 Confidence Building in Emerging Stock Markets	Enrico C. Perotti, Luc Laeven, and Pieter van Oijen	Dec. 2000
No. 365 Incentive Contracting versus Ownership Reforms: Evidence from China's Township and Village Enterprises	Chun Chang, Brian McCall, and Yijiang Wang	Nov. 2000
No. 364 Individual Pay and Outside Options: Evidence from the Polish Labour Force Survey	Fiona Duffy and Patrick Paul Walsh	Mar. 2001
No. 363 Investment, Credit Rationing and the Soft Budget Constraint: Evidence from Czech Panel Data (revised Davidson Institute Working Paper No. 60a)	Lubomir Lizal and Jan Svejnar	Feb. 2001
No. 362 A Network Perspective on Inter-Organizational Transfer of R&D Capabilities: A Study of International Joint Ventures in Chinese Automobile Industry	Zheng Zhao, Jaideep Anand and Will Mitchell	Feb. 2001
No. 361 Network Restructuring and Firm Creation in East-Central Europe: A Public-Private Venture	Gerald A. McDermott	Dec. 2000
No. 360 Responses of Private and Public Schools to Voucher Funding: The Czech and Hungarian Experience	Randall K. Filer and Daniel München	Oct. 2000
No. 359 Labor Market Uncertainty and Private Sector Labor Supply in Russia	Steven Stillman	Sept. 2000
No. 358 Russian Roulette-Expenditure Inequality and Instability in Russia, 1994-1998	Branko Jovanovic	Sept. 2000

The entire Working Paper Series is available at: www.wdi.bus.umich.edu

No. 357 Dealing with the Bad Loans of the Chinese Banks	John P. Bonin and Yiping Huang	Jan. 2001
No. 356 Retail Banking in Hungary: A Foreign Affair?	John P. Bonin and István Ábel	Dec. 2000
No. 355 Optimal Speed of Transition: Micro Evidence from the Czech Republic	Stepan Jurajda and Katherine Terrell	Dec. 2000
No. 354 Political Instability and Growth in Dictatorships	Jody Overland, Kenneth L. Simons and Michael Spagat	Nov. 2000
No. 353 Disintegration and Trade	Jarko Fidrmuc and Jan Fidrmuc	Nov. 2000
No. 352 Social Capital and Entrepreneurial Performance in Russia: A Panel Study	Bat Batjargal	Dec. 2000
No. 351 Entrepreneurial Versatility, Resources and Firm Performance in Russia: A Panel Study	Bat Batjargal	Dec. 2000
No. 350 The Dynamics of Entrepreneurial Networks in a Transitional Economy: The Case of Russia	Bat Batjargal	Dec. 2000
No. 349a R&D and Technology Spillovers via FDI: Innovation and Absorptive Capacity	Yuko Kinoshita	Apr. 2001
No. 349 R&D and Technology Spillovers via FDI: Innovation and Absorptive Capacity	Yuko Kinoshita	Nov. 2000
No. 348 Microeconomic aspects of Economic Growth in Eastern Europe and the Former Soviet Union, 1950-2000	Sergei Guriev and Barry W. Ickes	Nov. 2000
No. 347 Effective versus Statutory Taxation: Measuring Effective Tax Administration in Transition Economies	Mark E. Schaffer and Gerard Turley	Nov. 2000
No. 346 Objectives and Constraints of Entrepreneurs: Evidence from Small and Medium Size Enterprises in Russia and Bulgaria	Francesca Pissarides, Miroslav Singer and Jan Svejnar	Oct. 2000
No. 345 Corruption and Anticorruption in the Czech Republic	Lubomír Lízal and Evžen Kočenda	Oct. 2000
No. 344 The Effects of Direct Foreign Investment on Domestic Firms	Jozef Konings	Oct. 2000
No. 343 On the Identification of Relative Wage Rigidity Dynamics	Patrick A. Puhani	Oct. 2000
No. 342 The Determinants of Foreign Direct Investment in Transition Economies	Alan A. Bevan and Saul Estrin	Oct. 2000
No. 341 The Global Spread of Stock Exchanges, 1980-1998	Klaus Weber and Gerald F. Davis	Nov. 2000
No. 340 The Costs and Benefits of Euro-isation in Central-Eastern Europe Before or Instead of EMU Membership	D. Mario Nuti	Oct. 2000
No. 339 Debt Overhang and Barter in Russia	Sergei Guriev, Igor Makarov and Mathilde Maurel	Sept. 2000
No. 338 Firm Performance and the Political Economy of Corporate Governance: Survey Evidence for Bulgaria, Hungary, Slovakia and Slovenia	Patrick Paul Walsh and Ciara Whela	July 2000
No. 337 Investment and Instability	Nauro F. Campos and Jeffrey B. Nugent	May 2000
No. 336 The Evolution of the Insurance Sector in Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union	Robert B.K. Pye	Aug. 2000
No. 335 Institutional Technology and the Chains of Trust: Capital Markets and Privatization in Russia and the Czech Republic	Bruce Kogut and Andrew Spicer	Aug. 2000
No. 334 The Evolution of Market Integration in Russia	Daniel Berkowitz and David N. DeJong	Aug. 2000
No. 333 Efficiency and Market Share in Hungarian Corporate Sector	László Halpern and Gábor Körösi	July 2000
No. 332 Search-Money-and-Barter Models of Financial Stabilization	S.I. Boyarchenko and S.Z. Levendorskii	July 2000
No. 331 Worker Training in a Restructuring Economy: Evidence from the Russian Transition	Mark C. Berger, John S. Earle and Klara Z. Sabirianova	Aug. 2000
No. 330 Economic Development in Palanpur 1957-1993: A Sort of Growth	Peter Lanjouw	Aug. 2000
No. 329 Trust, Organizational Controls, Knowledge Acquisition from the Foreign Parents, and Performance in Vietnamese International Joint Ventures	Marjorie A. Lyles, Le Dang Doanh, and Jeffrey Q. Barden	June 2000

The entire Working Paper Series is available at: www.wdi.bus.umich.edu

No. 328 Comparative Advertising in the Global Marketplace: The Effects of Cultural Orientation on Communication	Zeynep Gürhan-Canli and Durairaj Maheswaran	Aug. 2000
No. 327 Post Privatization Enterprise Restructuring	Morris Bornstein	July 2000
No. 326 Who is Afraid of Political Instability?	Nauro F. Campos and Jeffrey B. Nugent	July 2000
No. 325 Business Groups, the Financial Market and Modernization	Raja Kali	June 2000
No. 324 Restructuring with What Success? A Case Study of Russian Firms	Susan Linz	July 2000
No. 323 Priorities and Sequencing in Privatization: Theory and Evidence from the Czech Republic	Nandini Gupta, John C. Ham and Jan Svejnar	May 2000
No. 322 Liquidity, Volatility, and Equity Trading Costs Across Countries and Over Time	Ian Domowitz, Jack Glen and Ananth Madhavan	Mar. 2000
No. 321 Equilibrium Wage Arrears: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Institutional Lock-In	John S. Earle and Klara Z. Sabirianova	Oct. 2000
No. 320 Rethinking Marketing Programs for Emerging Markets	Niraj Dawar and Amitava Chattopadhyay	June 2000
No. 319 Public Finance and Low Equilibria in Transition Economies: the Role of Institutions	Daniel Daianu and Radu Vranceanu	June 2000
No. 318 Some Econometric Evidence on the Effectiveness of Active Labour Market Programmes in East Germany	Martin Eichler and Michael Lechner	June 2000
No. 317 A Model of Russia's "Virtual Economy"	R.E Ericson and B.W Ickes	May 2000
No. 316 Financial Institutions, Financial Contagion, and Financial Crises	Haizhou Huang and Chenggang Xu	Mar. 2000
No. 315 Privatization versus Regulation in Developing Economies: The Case of West African Banks	Jean Paul Azam, Bruno Biais, and Magueye Dia	Feb. 2000
No. 314 Is Life More Risky in the Open? Household Risk-Coping and the Opening of China's Labor Markets	John Giles	Apr. 2000
No. 313 Networks, Migration and Investment: Insiders and Outsiders in Tirupur's Production Cluster	Abhijit Banerjee and Kaivan Munshi	Mar. 2000
No. 312 Computational Analysis of the Impact on India of the Uruguay Round and the Forthcoming WTO Trade Negotiations	Rajesh Chadha, Drusilla K. Brown, Alan V. Deardorff and Robert M. Stern	Mar. 2000
No. 311 Subsidized Jobs for Unemployed Workers in Slovakia	Jan. C. van Ours	May 2000
No. 310 Determinants of Managerial Pay in the Czech Republic	Tor Eriksson, Jaromir Gottvald and Pavel Mrazek	May 2000
No. 309 The Great Human Capital Reallocation: An Empirical Analysis of Occupational Mobility in Transitional Russia	Klara Z. Sabirianova	Oct. 2000
No. 308 Economic Development, Legality, and the Transplant Effect	Daniel Berkowitz, Katharina Pistor, and Jean-Francois Richard	Feb. 2000
No. 307 Community Participation, Teacher Effort, and Educational Outcome: The Case of El Salvador's EDUCO Program	Yasuyuki Sawada	Nov. 1999
No. 306 Gender Wage Gap and Segregation in Late Transition	Stepan Jurajda	May 2000
No. 305 The Gender Pay Gap in the Transition from Communism: Some Empirical Evidence	Andrew Newell and Barry Reilly	May 2000
No. 304 Post-Unification Wage Growth in East Germany	Jennifer Hunt	Nov. 1998
No. 303 How Does Privatization Affect Workers? The Case of the Russian Mass Privatization Program	Elizabeth Brainerd	May 2000
No. 302 Liability for Past Environmental Contamination and Privatization	Dietrich Earnhart	Mar. 2000
No. 301 Varieties, Jobs and EU Enlargement	Tito Boeri and Joaquim Oliveira Martins	May 2000
No. 300 Employer Size Effects in Russia	Todd Idson	Apr. 2000
No. 299 Information Complements, Substitutes, and Strategic Product Design	Geoffrey G. Parker and Marshall W. Van Alstyne	Mar. 2000
No. 298 Markets, Human Capital, and Inequality: Evidence from Rural China	Dwayne Benjamin, Loren Brandt, Paul Glewwe, and Li Guo	May 2000

The entire Working Paper Series is available at: www.wdi.bus.umich.edu

No. 297 Corporate Governance in the Asian Financial Crisis	Simon Johnson, Peter Boone, Alasdair Breach, and Eric Friedman	Nov. 1999
No. 296 Competition and Firm Performance: Lessons from Russia	J. David Brown and John S. Earle	Mar. 2000
No. 295 Wage Determination in Russia: An Econometric Investigation	Peter J. Luke and Mark E. Schaffer	Mar. 2000
No. 294 Can Banks Promote Enterprise Restructuring?: Evidence From a Polish Bank's Experience	John P. Bonin and Bozena Leven	Mar. 2000
No. 293 Why do Governments Sell Privatised Companies Abroad?	Bernardo Bortolotti, Marcella Fantini and Carlo Scarpa	Mar. 2000
No. 292 Going Public in Poland: Case-by-Case Privatizations, Mass Privatization and Private Sector Initial Public Offerings	Wolfgang Aussenegg	Dec. 1999
No. 291a Institutional Technology and the Chains of Trust: Capital Markets and Privatization in Russia and the Czech Republic	Bruce Kogut and Andrew Spicer	Feb. 2001
No. 291 Institutional Technology and the Chains of Trust: Capital Markets and Privatization in Russia and the Czech Republic	Bruce Kogut and Andrew Spicer	Mar. 1999
No. 290 Banking Crises and Bank Rescues: The Effect of Reputation	Jenny Corbett and Janet Mitchell	Jan. 2000
No. 289 Do Active Labor Market Policies Help Unemployed Workers to Find and Keep Regular Jobs?	Jan C. van Ours	Feb. 2000
No. 288 Consumption Patterns of the New Elite in Zimbabwe	Russell Belk	Feb. 2000
No. 287 Barter in Transition Economies: Competing Explanations Confront Ukrainian Data	Dalia Marin, Daniel Kaufmann and Bogdan Gorochovskij	Jan. 2000
No. 286 The Quest for Pension Reform: Poland's Security through Diversity	Marek Góra and Michael Rutkowski	Jan. 2000
No. 285 Disorganization and Financial Collapse	Dalia Marin and Monika Schnitzer	Oct. 1999
No. 284 Coordinating Changes in M-form and U-form Organizations	Yingyi Qian, Gérard Roland and Chenggang Xu	May 1999
No. 283 Why Russian Workers Do Not Move: Attachment of Workers Through In-Kind Payments	Guido Friebel and Sergei Guriev	Oct. 1999
No. 282 Lessons From Fiascos in Russian Corporate Governance	Merritt B. Fox and Michael A. Heller	Oct. 1999
No. 281 Income Distribution and Price Controls: Targeting a Social Safety Net During Economic Transition	Michael Alexeev and James Leitzel	Mar. 1999
No. 280: Starting Positions, Reform Speed, and Economic Outcomes in Transitioning Economies	William Hallagan and Zhang Jun	Jan. 2000
No. 279 : The Value of Prominent Directors	Yoshiro Miwa & J. Mark Ramseyer	Oct. 1999
No. 278: The System Paradigm	János Kornai	Apr. 1998
No. 277: The Developmental Consequences of Foreign Direct Investment in the Transition from Socialism to Capitalism: The Performance of Foreign Owned Firms in Hungary	Lawrence Peter King	Sept. 1999
No. 276: Stability and Disorder: An Evolutionary Analysis of Russia's Virtual Economy	Clifford Gaddy and Barry W. Ickes	Nov. 1999
No. 275: Limiting Government Predation Through Anonymous Banking: A Theory with Evidence from China.	Chong-En Bai, David D. Li, Yingyi Qian and Yijiang Wang	July 1999
No. 274: Transition with Labour Supply	Tito Boeri	Dec. 1999
No. 273: Sectoral Restructuring and Labor Mobility: A Comparative Look at the Czech Republic	Vit Sorm and Katherine Terrell	Nov. 1999
No. 272: Published in: <i>Journal of Comparative Economics</i> "Returns to Human Capital Under the Communist Wage Grid and During the Transition to a Market Economy" Vol. 27, pp. 33-60 1999.	Daniel Munich, Jan Svejnar and Katherine Terrell	Oct. 1999
No. 271: Barter in Russia: Liquidity Shortage Versus Lack of Restructuring	Sophie Brana and Mathilde Maurel	June 1999
No. 270: Tests for Efficient Financial Intermediation with Application to China	Albert Park and Kaja Sehrt	Mar. 1999