

COMMENTS ON “BANKS, CREDIT SUPPLY, AND THE LIFE CYCLE OF FIRMS: EVIDENCE FROM LATE NINETEENTH CENTURY JAPAN” BY JOHN P. TANG AND SERGI BASCO

Maria Alejandra Amado

Research Economist, International Economics and Euro Area Department
Bank of Spain

VIII BANCO DE ESPAÑA ECONOMIC HISTORY SEMINAR

Madrid

October 20th, 2022



OUTLINE

- **Summary**
- **Comments on weak entry effects**
- **Comments on pre-trends**
- **Comments on exit rates**
- **Financial openness and capital allocation**

- **Title: Banks, Credit Supply, and the Life Cycle of Firms: Evidence from Late Nineteenth Century Japan**
- **Objective:** Examine effects of credit supply shock on firm life cycles.
- **Shock: 1876 reform** → Government unilaterally converts annual hereditary stipends to former samurai into (interest bearing) public bonds. **Non-uniform and exogenous distribution of resident samurai across regions**
 - **Assumption:** samurai bonds increased the demand for deposits, which enabled banks to act as intermediaries to fund entrepreneurs.
 - **Mechanism:** Due to adverse selection, firms obtaining funds in the credit market are, on average, riskier.
- **Data:**
 - Firm-level outcomes (entry, exit, lifespan): 1870-1890
 - Bank capital data: 1880-1890
 - Bond issuance: 1876
- **Empirical Strategy: IV approach.**
 - **Variable of interest:** B_{it} bank capital per capita in prefecture i , year t
 - **Instrument:** Samurai bond per-capita, S_{it}
 - Dependent variable: (1) lifespan of a firm that is created in a given year and prefecture
 - (2) number of firm exits in a given prefecture, sector and period
 - (3) number of new firms established in a prefecture for each sector and period

- **Main findings:** (1) lifespan of new firms is inversely related to per capita bank capital
(2) firm exit increase in prefectures with a larger increase in per capita bank capital
(3) no significant relationship between firm entry and bank capital availability
(4) all these predictions hold for manufacturing sector → manufacturing firms facing higher financial constraints
- **Contribution:**
 - Authors exploit historical data to show that a credit supply shock affect life cycle of firms in the context of a developing economy
 - **Empirical implementation and analysis is convincing**, and **sizeable effects** at the extensive margin are found
 - *Takeaway: a consequence of this reform (credit supply shock) is that banks took more risk and lent to more fragile firms/ bad borrowers that had on average riskier projects and shorter lifespans.*
 - *Most of my comments are suggestions to rule out alternative explanations to these empirical findings.*

I. Comment on weak entry effects

- Authors find weak results on firm creation when instrumenting capital per-capita with bonds.
- They argue most of the observed correlation between bank capital and firm entry in the cross-section might be due to demand shocks mostly.

Potential explanation for low entry:

Equilibrium with excess supply? (Stiglitz, Weiss, greenwald, 1984)

- Banks with no constraints can remain in an equilibrium with excess availability of funding and no incentives to reduce IR since they'll capture riskier/less profitable firms
- Heterogeneity in how capital constrained are pre-existing banks or national banks that emerged after reform → low risk-taking behavior in banks that received larger bond values.

Is the number of banks per prefecture relevant for bank-risk taking?

- *Main specification uses Bank capital B_{it} per capita as your variable of interest*
 - B_{it} is the same in a prefecture with just one bank that captures all bonds from samurais than in a prefecture with N banks competing for the same total value of bonds.
 - I would guess that the **risk taking behavior of banks differ depending on how many banks compete** within a particular prefecture.

II. Comment on pre-trends

Are firms operating in highly exposed prefectures valid counterfactuals for those in unexposed prefectures?

- Authors control for industry or industry specific trends (sector specific regressions)
- Show that there is no correlation between connectivity (placement of railway stations), income levels per-capita and the value of bonds per-capita across prefectures.
- But still it should be ruled out that **observed variation in firm entry/exit** across prefectures was **not already present before the shock**.
 - *Placebo for pre-reform (period 1870-1875)*
 - *Robustness: Excluding major cities such as Tokyo or Osaka*

III. Comment on exit rates as an indicator of bank risk-taking behavior

- To verify the adverse selection mechanism, IDEALLY, one would need to check if lending terms were softer (e.g. *lower rates of collateralization, lengthening of loan maturities, lower interest rates*), and if this leads to a higher probability of default on debt.
- Authors use firm exit as an indicator of higher risk-taking behavior of banks. Where ***exit is defined as change in ownership, organizational form, liquidation, merger, or name.***
- **Exit \neq failure (different types of exit \rightarrow not necessarily all are related to inefficient firms or firms investing in projects with low probability of success in the sense of Stiglitz and Weiss)**
 - For example, the fact that small firms exit more frequently and grow faster conditional on survival has been widely documented in the literature (see Akcigit and Kerr 2010) \rightarrow not necessarily related to efficiency or lower quality projects.

Robustness: redefine your exit rate to just those firms that are liquidated excluding mergers or absorptions

III. Literature on Financial openness and capital allocation

- **Banks are allowed to obtain funding from abroad at a lower cost. (*Larrain and Stumpner, 2017, Varela 2015, Buera, Kaboski, and Shin 2011, etc*)**
 - This reduces capital misallocation, bank-dependent firms can borrow more and expand toward their efficient scale.
 - This effect is more pronounced in sectors with higher fixed cost or more dependent on external finance.
 - At the extensive margin, low productivity firms exit and high productivity firms enter.
 - **How do you reconcile this literature with your findings?**

BANCODE **ESPAÑA**
Eurosistema

THANK YOU

