



13TH JACQUES POLAK ANNUAL RESEARCH CONFERENCE  
NOVEMBER 8-9, 2012

---

# How Firms Respond to Business Cycles: The Role of Firm Age and Size

Roberto N. Fattal Jaef  
International Monetary Fund

Paper presented at the 13th Jacques Polak Annual Research Conference  
Hosted by the International Monetary Fund  
Washington, DC—November 8–9, 2012

**The views expressed in this paper are those of the author(s) only, and the presence of them, or of links to them, on the IMF website does not imply that the IMF, its Executive Board, or its management endorses or shares the views expressed in the paper.**

# How Firms Respond to Business Cycles: The Role of Firm Age and Size

Discussant: Roberto N. Fattal Jaef

IMF

November 7, 2012

# Question, Findings and Significance

- Empirical exploration of cyclical behavior of firms by age and size
- Young/small firms respond more strongly to the business cycle
  - ▶ specially more so during the great recession
  - ▶ collapse in local housing prices
- Significance of paper's findings and approach:
  - ▶ combined with theory, can use micro-data to infer nature of shock
    - ★ TFP shock, credit shock
  - ▶ nature of shock matters for policy response

# A theory to study Firm Responses to TFP and Credit Shocks

- Large number of entrepreneurs distinguished by:
  - ▶ Idiosyncratic productivity:  $e$ , stochastic
  - ▶ Wealth:  $a$ , endogenously chose to max. lifetime utility
- Production and factor choice

$$\pi = \max_{l,k} f(k, l, Z_s e_s) - w_s l - (\delta + r_s)k$$

*s.t.*

$$k \leq \lambda_s a_s$$

## Predictions from TFP shock

- Credit conditions are good (high  $\lambda$ ) , and TFP falls (low  $Z$ )

$$l, k \propto f(Ze; w, r)$$

- ▶ no further reallocation beyond idiosyncratic shocks

# Predictions for Firm Credit Shocks

- **credit crunch** (i.e.  $\lambda_s$  falls)

$$l, k \propto f(Ze, a; w, r)$$

## Predictions for Firm Credit Shocks

- **credit crunch** (i.e.  $\lambda_s$  falls)

$$l, k \propto f(Ze, a; w, r)$$

- L and K reallocated from constrained to unconstrained entrepreneurs

# Predictions for Firm Credit Shocks

- credit crunch (i.e.  $\lambda_s$  falls)

$$l, k \propto f(Ze, a; w, r)$$

- L and K reallocated from constrained to unconstrained entrepreneurs
- Who is (un)constrained depends on joint distribution over  $\{e, a\}$ 
  - 1 low wealth low productivity: young, small, likely unconstrained
  - 2 low wealth high productivity: young, small, likely constrained
  - 3 high wealth: old and unconstrained; large or small based on productivity



# Predictions for Firm Credit Shocks

- credit crunch (i.e.  $\lambda_s$  falls)

$$l, k \propto f(Ze, a; w, r)$$

- L and K reallocated from constrained to unconstrained entrepreneurs
- Who is (un)constrained depends on joint distribution over  $\{e, a\}$ 
  - 1 low wealth low productivity: young, small, likely unconstrained
  - 2 low wealth high productivity: young, small, likely constrained
  - 3 high wealth: old and unconstrained; large or small based on productivity
- Hope is Age, Size or joint Age-Size distribution inform about  $\{e, a\}$

# Can a Single Dimension Signal a Credit-Crunch?

- Mixed results in the literature about the role of size:
  - ▶ Moscarini and Postely-Vinay (2012): the large are more cyclical
  - ▶ Gertler and Gilchrest (1994): small are more responsive to monetary contractions

# Can a Single Dimension Signal a Credit-Crunch?

- Mixed results in the literature about the role of size:
  - ▶ Moscarini and Postely-Vinay (2012): the large are more cyclical
  - ▶ Gertler and Gilchrest (1994): small are more responsive to monetary contractions
- **This paper:** State and time-series variation and time/state fixed effects
  - ▶ Net Growth of Small firms falls significantly relative to Large [▶ tablesize](#)
  - ▶ Consistent with Gertler and Gilchrest
- Although effect of age/size decomposition is stronger, age not essential to detect shock
  - ▶ Classification by size is enough according to theory [▶ graph](#)

## Other Theory-Based Implications to be Tested

- Net growth differential between young/small and large/mature falls
  - ▶ But large/mature are net job destroyers. why?
  - ▶ Unconstrained firms should be expanding: lower factor prices [▶ graph](#)
- State-level variation in wage adjustment:
  - ▶ Are large/mature firms growing faster in states where wages fell the most?
- TFP as cyclical indicator
  - ▶ Theory predicts no differential response by firm size age
  - ▶ VAR impulse responses to TFP shock consistent with this?

## BACK-UP SLIDES



# State and Time Series Variation, Time and State Fixed Effects: Net Growth Differentials by Size Only

▶ main

Size Only

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	diff_net_rate_small_st	diff_net_rate_small_st	diff_net_rate_small_st
Chg. Unemp Rate	-0.828 <sup>***</sup> (0.131)		
Real GDP GR		0.114 <sup>***</sup> (0.025)	
HP-Filtered Unemp. Rt.			-1.129 <sup>***</sup> (0.211)
<i>N</i>	1530	1530	1530

Standard errors in parentheses

\*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$