

Discussion of:
“Sovereign Default Risk and Firm
Heterogeneity”

Cristina Arellano, Yan Bai, Luigi Bocola

Christian Hellwig
Toulouse School of Economics

Overview

- ***Big picture question:***

Are sovereign debt crises a cause or a reflection of worsening private sector fundamentals?

- Build and quantify model with two-way feedback:

- Private sector credit conditions → Output → Sovereign Default Incentives

- Sovereign Default Spreads → Private sector credit conditions

- Paper makes two interesting points about such feedbacks, one about each side of the feedback loop.

- Main comments: Not sure the two points belong together

The model

- ***Small open economy: sovereign default as real options problem (Eaton and Gersovitz 1981, Arellano 2008)***
- Endogenize domestic output as function of credit conditions
- Aggregate conditions summarized by: $Y=Y(Q,A)$
 - Output as a function of aggregate productivity A , sovereign bond price Q
- Government budget constraint: $B + G \leq T(Y) + Q \cdot B'$
- Bond price: $Q = Q(B', Y, v)$
 - Market prices expected default risk (function of B' , Y , “default inclination” v)

The model

- Aggregate conditions: $Y=Y(Q,A)$
- Derived from micro-foundations:
 - Investment determined from individual firms' working capital constraints
 - Imperfect pass-through from sovereign spreads to private credit spreads
 - Pass-through parameter $\gamma > 0$
- Higher sovereign spread, lower Q:
 - Higher private credit rates
 - Working capital more expensive, firms invest, produce less
 - Effect more pronounced for firms with higher working capital requirements
 - Implications: $\frac{\partial y^i}{\partial Q} > 0, \frac{\partial y^i}{\partial lev^i} < 0, \frac{\partial^2 y^i}{\partial lev^i \partial Q} > 0$

The model

- ***Result I: Quantifying pass-through of sovereign spreads***
- Key idea: identify cross-partial via inter-action effect in panel data regression
- Italian firm data, regress sales growth on spreads, leverage, spreads*leverage
- Finding: A calibrated model matches Italian experience very well!
 - Match Italian sovereign default spreads 2007-2012 via shocks v
 - Set γ s.t. model-based regression coefficient matches actual panel regression
- Then model fully accounts output drop in Italy during this period (ca. 14%).
- Decomposition: at least 50% due to pass-through of sovereign risk!

The model

- ***Result II: Inspecting the feedback mechanism***
- Q decreasing in Y, and Y decreasing in Q → amplification and self-fulfilling crisis?? → NOT SO FAST!!

- Invert bond price function: $B' = B'(Q, Y, v)$

- Substitute into gov't BC:

$$B + G \leq T(Y(Q)) + Q \cdot B'(Q, Y(Q), v)$$

- Feedback from Q to Y tightens government budget constraint
- Reduces borrowing incentives, optimal to choose higher value of Q, slows down debt accumulation.
- Interpretation: “Austerity” as rational response to doom loops

Main Comment:

The two results are orthogonal to each other!

- Conditional on matching spreads, pass-through results do not require any stance on how sovereign debt dynamics, default incentives are modeled
- Shocks v serve as residual to close default side of model (Interpretation: political will to repay debt, market sentiments, contagion, sunspots,...)
- Delayed propagation result only relies on having some aggregate relation $Y(Q)$, not on its exact micro-foundations, i.e. interaction with leverage and private credit conditions

Focus further comments on the quantitative results about pass-through

Comments:

- ***Great to have a quantitative model that accounts for Italian experience...***
- Model explanation for Italy passes intuitive “smell test”:
 - External shocks to sovereign spreads
 - Pass through to domestic economy
 - Matches informal policy discussions, interpretations ca. 2012 extremely well (“Contagion”)
- Model calibrated to the right country:
 - “external shocks” story doesn’t really fit well with any other country (financial booms/busts in Spain/Ireland, fiscal sustainability crisis in Greece)

Comments (ctd):

What the model doesn't address:

- Explain why there is sovereign pass-through (reduced-form relation)
- Explain why spreads went up in the first place (matched via exog. shocks), government default incentives
- Observed debt levels... difficult to match in Arellano framework
- Model matches aggregate experience 2007-2012 by calibrating to micro data 2007-2012... is success a surprise?
- Recovery after 2012... paper would be much more striking, if mechanism could also account for recovery period (Draghi: “whatever it takes...”)
- Decompose the channels for output drops: cross-sectional factor misallocation (lower measured productivity) vs. aggregate labor/investment distortions

Comments (ctd):

Identification of pass-through:

- Model: Private and sovereign credit spreads price expected default losses... Data: *credit spread puzzle* (spreads >> default losses)... amplifies pass-through
- *Asset pricing*: accounting for corporate spreads requires “default” states with large aggregate default waves... implies large correlated default risk
 - Challenge: how to separate country default risk from firm-specific default risk
- Model abstracts from firm dynamics, banking, balance sheet effects, firm net worth, endogenous leverage etc.
- No endogenous propagation!
- Data: concern for endogeneity and selection on unobservables

Conclusion

Very interesting to have quantitative model to account for Italian experience, consistent with popular contagion story

Model probably not a good fit for other European countries

Methodological issues with identification of pass-through, but great to have a first attempt on which to build!