

Comments on: "Credit Misallocation During the European
Financial Crisis"
(Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini)

and "International Financial Flows and Misallocation: Not so
Harmful After All"
(Cingano and Hassan)

Andrea Caggese
UPF, Barcelona GSE, and CREI

The papers

Cingano and Hassan=CH; Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini=SST

Both papers: effects of credit supply shocks on misallocation of resources.

- ▶ CH: Positive credit supply shock from international financial flows.
- ▶ SST: Excess credit supply from low capitalization banks to Zombie firms.

The papers

Cingano and Hassan=CH; Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini=SST

Both papers: effects of credit supply shocks on misallocation of resources.

- ▶ CH: Positive credit supply shock from international financial flows.
- ▶ SST: Excess credit supply from low capitalization banks to Zombie firms.

Three ingredients:

1. Fantastic datasets: data on individual loans, bank level variables, firm level balance sheets.

The papers

Cingano and Hassan=CH; Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini=SST

Both papers: effects of credit supply shocks on misallocation of resources.

- ▶ CH: Positive credit supply shock from international financial flows.
- ▶ SST: Excess credit supply from low capitalization banks to Zombie firms.

Three ingredients:

1. Fantastic datasets: data on individual loans, bank level variables, firm level balance sheets.
2. Identification:

The papers

Cingano and Hassan=CH; Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini=SST

Both papers: effects of credit supply shocks on misallocation of resources.

- ▶ CH: Positive credit supply shock from international financial flows.
- ▶ SST: Excess credit supply from low capitalization banks to Zombie firms.

Three ingredients:

1. Fantastic datasets: data on individual loans, bank level variables, firm level balance sheets.
2. Identification:
 - ▶ Multi-bank firms: can use firm-year fixed effects (isolate credit supply shocks).

The papers

Cingano and Hassan=CH; Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini=SST

Both papers: effects of credit supply shocks on misallocation of resources.

- ▶ CH: Positive credit supply shock from international financial flows.
- ▶ SST: Excess credit supply from low capitalization banks to Zombie firms.

Three ingredients:

1. Fantastic datasets: data on individual loans, bank level variables, firm level balance sheets.
2. Identification:
 - ▶ Multi-bank firms: can use firm-year fixed effects (isolate credit supply shocks).
 - ▶ Credible stories about cross sectional bank heterogeneity (pre 2000 bank exposure to international flows in CH, low capitalization in SST)

The papers

Cingano and Hassan=CH; Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini=SST

Both papers: effects of credit supply shocks on misallocation of resources.

- ▶ CH: Positive credit supply shock from international financial flows.
- ▶ SST: Excess credit supply from low capitalization banks to Zombie firms.

Three ingredients:

1. Fantastic datasets: data on individual loans, bank level variables, firm level balance sheets.
2. Identification:
 - ▶ Multi-bank firms: can use firm-year fixed effects (isolate credit supply shocks).
 - ▶ Credible stories about cross sectional bank heterogeneity (pre 2000 bank exposure to international flows in CH, low capitalization in SST)
3. Credit Shocks \Rightarrow Firm level real effects \Rightarrow misallocation/aggregate implications.

The papers

- ▶ Both papers very interesting, great addition to the literature! SST is more polished. CH has the potential to become as influential.

The papers

- ▶ Both papers very interesting, great addition to the literature! SST is more polished. CH has the potential to become as influential.
- ▶ Some considerations on point 3: Credit Shocks \Rightarrow Firm level real effects \Rightarrow misallocation/aggregate implications.

The papers

- ▶ Both papers very interesting, great addition to the literature! SST is more polished. CH has the potential to become as influential.
- ▶ Some considerations on point 3: Credit Shocks \Rightarrow Firm level real effects \Rightarrow misallocation/aggregate implications.
- ▶ Both papers part of a growing literature identifying these links.

The papers

- ▶ Both papers very interesting, great addition to the literature! SST is more polished. CH has the potential to become as influential.
- ▶ Some considerations on point 3: Credit Shocks \Rightarrow Firm level real effects \Rightarrow misallocation/aggregate implications.
- ▶ Both papers part of a growing literature identifying these links.
 - ▶ Measuring misallocation (especially without a structural model) is hard. No off the shelf reliable procedure.

The papers

- ▶ Both papers very interesting, great addition to the literature! SST is more polished. CH has the potential to become as influential.
- ▶ Some considerations on point 3: Credit Shocks \Rightarrow Firm level real effects \Rightarrow misallocation/aggregate implications.
- ▶ Both papers part of a growing literature identifying these links.
 - ▶ Measuring misallocation (especially without a structural model) is hard. No off the shelf reliable procedure.
 - ▶ TFPR, MPRK, profitability or productivity?

The papers

- ▶ Both papers very interesting, great addition to the literature! SST is more polished. CH has the potential to become as influential.
- ▶ Some considerations on point 3: Credit Shocks \Rightarrow Firm level real effects \Rightarrow misallocation/aggregate implications.
- ▶ Both papers part of a growing literature identifying these links.
 - ▶ Measuring misallocation (especially without a structural model) is hard. No off the shelf reliable procedure.
 - ▶ TFPR, MPRK, profitability or productivity?
 - ▶ Dispersion in TFPR: useful statistic, but strong assumptions for it to be a model-based measure of misallocation.

The papers

- ▶ Both papers very interesting, great addition to the literature! SST is more polished. CH has the potential to become as influential.
- ▶ Some considerations on point 3: Credit Shocks \Rightarrow Firm level real effects \Rightarrow misallocation/aggregate implications.
- ▶ Both papers part of a growing literature identifying these links.
 - ▶ Measuring misallocation (especially without a structural model) is hard. No off the shelf reliable procedure.
 - ▶ TFPR, MPRK, profitability or productivity?
 - ▶ Dispersion in TFPR: useful statistic, but strong assumptions for it to be a model-based measure of misallocation.
 - ▶ Useful to exploit more the richness of the micro data.

Cingano and Hassan

<i>Exposure_b * Post_t*</i>	(1) MRPK	(2) TFPR	(3) Collateral (fixed assets)
High	0.496*** (.061)	0.460*** (0.067)	0.448*** (0.065)
Low	0.343*** (0.062)	0.262*** (0.066)	0.253*** (0.067)

Cingano and Hassan

<i>Exposure_b * Post_t*</i>	(1) MRPK	(2) TFPR	(3) Collateral (fixed assets)
High	0.496*** (.061)	0.460*** (0.067)	0.448*** (0.065)
Low	0.343*** (0.062)	0.262*** (0.066)	0.253*** (0.067)

- ▶ Do not consider loans < 75k (not their fault) and single-bank small firms.

Cingano and Hassan

<i>Exposure_b * Post_t*</i>	(1) MRPK	(2) TFPR	(3) Collateral (fixed assets)
High	0.496*** (.061)	0.460*** (0.067)	0.448*** (0.065)
Low	0.343*** (0.062)	0.262*** (0.066)	0.253*** (0.067)

- ▶ Do not consider loans < 75k (not their fault) and single-bank small firms.
- ▶ TFPR might reflect monopoly power (rents).

Cingano and Hassan

<i>Exposure_b * Post_t*</i>	(1) MRPK	(2) TFPR	(3) Collateral (fixed assets)
High	0.496*** (.061)	0.460*** (0.067)	0.448*** (0.065)
Low	0.343*** (0.062)	0.262*** (0.066)	0.253*** (0.067)

- ▶ Do not consider loans < 75k (not their fault) and single-bank small firms.
- ▶ TFPR might reflect monopoly power (rents).
 - ▶ A growing firm with profitable opportunities and potential to create a lot of jobs likely has lower TFPR than a "stagnant" monopolist.

Cingano and Hassan

<i>Exposure_b * Post_t*</i>	(1) MRPK	(2) TFPR	(3) Collateral (fixed assets)
High	0.496*** (.061)	0.460*** (0.067)	0.448*** (0.065)
Low	0.343*** (0.062)	0.262*** (0.066)	0.253*** (0.067)

- ▶ Do not consider loans < 75k (not their fault) and single-bank small firms.
- ▶ TFPR might reflect monopoly power (rents).
 - ▶ A growing firm with profitable opportunities and potential to create a lot of jobs likely has lower TFPR than a "stagnant" monopolist.
 - ▶ Who are these MRPK firms? What do they do with the additional credit? Do they grow? Do they create jobs?

Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini

- ▶ Focus on one specific form of misallocation. Lending to Zombie firms.

Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini

- ▶ Focus on one specific form of misallocation. Lending to Zombie firms.
 - ▶ Zombie firms: not only loss making, but also stagnant and in an absorbing state.

Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini

- ▶ Focus on one specific form of misallocation. Lending to Zombie firms.
 - ▶ Zombie firms: not only loss making, but also stagnant and in an absorbing state.
- ▶ Results suggest that lending by "low capitalization" banks helps to (relatively) increase employment and sales of Zombie firms.

Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini

- ▶ Focus on one specific form of misallocation. Lending to Zombie firms.
 - ▶ Zombie firms: not only loss making, but also stagnant and in an absorbing state.
- ▶ Results suggest that lending by "low capitalization" banks helps to (relatively) increase employment and sales of Zombie firms.
- ▶ Zombie firms or temporary difficulties?

Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini

- ▶ Focus on one specific form of misallocation. Lending to Zombie firms.
 - ▶ Zombie firms: not only loss making, but also stagnant and in an absorbing state.
- ▶ Results suggest that lending by "low capitalization" banks helps to (relatively) increase employment and sales of Zombie firms.
- ▶ Zombie firms or temporary difficulties?
 - ▶ SST consider deep recessionary period (2008-2013).
 - ▶ 38% of firms classified as Zombies are still alive, and no longer Zombies, 2 years later.

Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini

- ▶ Focus on one specific form of misallocation. Lending to Zombie firms.
 - ▶ Zombie firms: not only loss making, but also stagnant and in an absorbing state.
- ▶ Results suggest that lending by "low capitalization" banks helps to (relatively) increase employment and sales of Zombie firms.
- ▶ Zombie firms or temporary difficulties?
 - ▶ SST consider deep recessionary period (2008-2013).
 - ▶ 38% of firms classified as Zombies are still alive, and no longer Zombies, 2 years later.
- ▶ What do Zombie firms do with the money? Can use micro-level flows to disentangle Zombies vs. firms with temporary difficulties?

Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini

The misallocation question:

- ▶ Lending to Zombie firms to keep them alive (or undead) is by construction misallocation.

Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini

The misallocation question:

- ▶ Lending to Zombie firms to keep them alive (or undead) is by construction misallocation.
- ▶ If use dispersion in TFPR: From Hsieh and Klenow (2009)

$$TFPR_{si} \propto (MPRK_{si})^{\alpha_s} (MPRL_{si})^{1-\alpha_s} \propto \frac{(1 + \tau_{K_{si}})^{\alpha_s}}{1 - \tau_{Y_{si}}}$$

- ▶ $TFPR_{si}$ only reflects frictions, not demand or productivity shocks.

Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini

The misallocation question:

- ▶ Lending to Zombie firms to keep them alive (or undead) is by construction misallocation.
- ▶ If use dispersion in TFPR: From Hsieh and Klenow (2009)

$$TFPR_{si} \propto (MPRK_{si})^{\alpha_s} (MPRL_{si})^{1-\alpha_s} \propto \frac{(1 + \tau_{K_{si}})^{\alpha_s}}{1 - \tau_{Y_{si}}}$$

- ▶ $TFPR_{si}$ only reflects frictions, not demand or productivity shocks.
- ▶ $\tau_{K_{si}}$ should be higher for zombie firms because they are riskier
⇒ dispersion as Risk-Adjusted Capital Allocation (David, Schmid and Zeke, 2019)

Schivardi, Sette and Tabellini

The misallocation question:

- ▶ Lending to Zombie firms to keep them alive (or undead) is by construction misallocation.
- ▶ If use dispersion in TFPR: From Hsieh and Klenow (2009)

$$TFPR_{si} \propto (MPRK_{si})^{\alpha_s} (MPRL_{si})^{1-\alpha_s} \propto \frac{(1 + \tau_{K_{si}})^{\alpha_s}}{1 - \tau_{Y_{si}}}$$

- ▶ $TFPR_{si}$ only reflects frictions, not demand or productivity shocks.
- ▶ $\tau_{K_{si}}$ should be higher for zombie firms because they are riskier
⇒ dispersion as Risk-Adjusted Capital Allocation (David, Schmid and Zeke, 2019)
- ▶ Excessive lending to zombies could lower $\tau_{K_{si}}$ ⇒ might reduce rather than increase dispersion.

Summing up

CT, SST are part of a growing literature:

1. Fantastic datasets: Individual Loan Level data, Bank level variables, Firm level balance sheets.
2. Identify credit supply shocks.
3. Credit Shocks \Rightarrow Firm level real effects \Rightarrow misallocation/aggregate implications.

Summing up

CT, SST are part of a growing literature:

1. Fantastic datasets: Individual Loan Level data, Bank level variables, Firm level balance sheets.
 2. Identify credit supply shocks.
 3. Credit Shocks \Rightarrow Firm level real effects \Rightarrow misallocation/aggregate implications.
- ▶ Very interesting papers.
 - ▶ Step 3 tricky, useful to have a structural model and/or exploit more the richness of micro data.