

CBM

R

7626

1986

217



* C I N O O 4 4 6 *

subfaculteit der econometrie

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM



TILBURG UNIVERSITY
DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

Postbus 90153 - 5000 LE Tilburg
Netherlands



$\frac{\text{FEW}}{217}$

Not for quotation

330.115
65P.14

THE FIRM'S INVESTMENT POLICY
UNDER A CONCAVE ADJUSTMENT
COST FUNCTION

Peter M. Kort
April 1986

THE FIRM'S INVESTMENT POLICY UNDER A CONCAVE ADJUSTMENT COST FUNCTION

Peter M. Kort
Tilburg University
P.O. Box 90153 - 5000 LE Tilburg
The Netherlands

The purpose of this article is to examine the effects of a concave adjustment cost function on the optimal dynamic investment policy of a firm. Such an assumption facilitates the explanation of stepwise investment expenditures in stead of continuous investments. Therefore, an optimal control model is formulated which allows discontinuities in the level of capital good stock. Using the conditions of the optimal solution we will design a search procedure which enables us to develop the optimal investment pattern.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the literature, adjustment costs within dynamic investment models nearly always are convex functions of investments. This implies rising marginal costs compared to the rate of investment. In that case adjustment costs are minimized through spreading out investment expenditures as much as possible over time. Investments are a smoothing problem. In this contribution we will introduce a concave adjustment cost function. Such costs imply decreasing marginal costs of investments and therefore it is optimal for the firm to invest either very much or nothing at all. Investments now become a scaling problem. We will formulate an optimal control model that allows discontinuities in the development of capital good stock at those moments when the large investment expenditures take place. To solve this model, we combine the necessary conditions based on Pontryagin's maximumprinciple (see e.g. Kamien & Schwartz (1983)) with some additional "jump" conditions, which have been designed by e.g. Seierstad & Sydsaeter (1986). From the optimal solution we infer a search procedure that helps us to fix the optimal points of time to invest as well as the optimal scales of the investment expenditures at the different points of time. The same

kind of search procedure was applied by Luhmer (1986) in order to solve an inventory problem.

Section 2 contains a short description of the theory of adjustment costs with the accent on the concave form and its implications. In section 3 our dynamic model with concave adjustment costs is presented, whereas section 4 contains a description and further analysis of the optimal solution, which is mathematically inferred in the appendix.

2. THE THEORY OF ADJUSTMENT COSTS.

In the literature a distinction is made between convex and concave adjustment cost functions.




figure 2.1. a convex and a concave adjustment cost function

Convex adjustment costs apply to a monopsonistic market of capital goods: if the firm wants to increase its rate of growth it will be confronted with increasing prices on the market because of its increased demand of capital goods. Because convex adjustment costs imply rising marginal costs, large investment expenditures are very expensive. Therefore, the firm will tend to adjust its capital good stock slowly instead of instantaneously: Investments are a smoothing problem.

In the literature most models have incorporated such a convex adjustment cost function. Some authors, however, like Nickell (1978) and Rothschild (1971), have argued that there are important economic reasons which plead for a concavely shaped adjustment cost function, such as indivisibilities, use of information, fixed costs of ordering and quantity discounts. In order to illustrate the first two arguments we give two quotations of Rothschild (1971):

"Training involves the use of information (once one has decided how to train one worker, one has in effect decided how to train any number of them), which is a classic cause of decreasing costs. Furthermore, the process is subject to some indivisibi-

lities. It requires at least one teacher to train one worker. Presumably no more teachers are required to train two or three workers."

"Similarly, reorganizing production lines involves both the use of information as a factor of production - once one has decided how to reorganize one production line, one has figured out how to reorganize two, three or n - and indivisibilities - one may not be able to reorganize only half or a tenth of a production line."

If the adjustment cost function is concave, marginal costs are decreasing with increasing investment expenditures. Therefore, the firm minimizes its adjustment costs if its investment policy consists of an alternation of very large investment expenditures and zero investment expenditures. In this way an impulse pattern arises which causes discontinuities in the development of capital good stock. Accordingly, we incorporate concave adjustment costs in an optimal control model that allows discontinuities in the state variable.

3. THE MODEL

We first assume that the firm behaves as if it maximizes its value for the shareholders. This value is expressed as the value of the profits over the planning period plus the value of the firm at the planning horizon. The profits are in this model the difference between the present value of the earnings stream and the sum of the present value of investment expenditures and adjustment costs, the final value of the firm equals the present value of the final capital good stock at the end of the planning period. Further, we assume that the firm operates under decreasing returns to scale and that the adjustment costs are a concave function of investments.

The above results in the next goal function:

$$\max_{I_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, n} \int_{T=0}^z S(K) \exp(-iT) dt - \sum_j (I_j + U(I_j)) \exp(-iT_j) + K(z) \exp(-iz) \quad (1)$$

in which

- I_j = j'th investment expenditure
- T = time
- z = planning horizon
- K = total amount of capital goods
- $S(K)$ = earnings, $S(K) > 0$, $\frac{dS}{dK} > 0$, $\frac{d^2S}{dK^2} < 0$
- $U(I_j)$ = adjustment costs of j'th investment, $U(I_j) > 0$, $\frac{dU}{dI_j} > 0$, $\frac{d^2U}{dI_j^2} < 0$, $U(0) = 0$
- T_j = point of time of j'th investment
- i = discount rate

We also assume that the amount of capital goods will increase by investments and decrease through depreciations, which are proportional to the value of the capital goods. So, we get the next state equation of capital good stock:

$$\dot{K} = \frac{dK}{dT} = -aK \quad \text{if } T \neq T_j, j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (2)$$

in which

a = depreciation rate

$$K^+(T) - K^-(T) = I_j \text{ if } T = T_j, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, n. \quad (3)$$

in which

$K^+(T)$ = amount of capital goods just after the investment impulse

$K^-(T)$ = amount of capital goods just before the investment impulse.

Investments are irreversible, so:

$$I_j > 0 \text{ for } j = 1, \dots, n \quad (4)$$

Finally, we assume a positive value of the capital good stock at $T = 0$:

$$K(0) = K_0 > 0 \quad (5)$$

Now (1) through (5) form our dynamic investment model with concave adjustment costs. As discontinuity of the state variable K is allowed, it is a non standard optimal control model. So, besides Pontryagin's maximum principle we have to apply additional optimality conditions which have to be fulfilled at jump locations. These kind of necessary optimality conditions are described by e.g. Seierstad & Sydsaeter (1986). The application to our problem can be found in the appendix.

4. OPTIMAL SOLUTION

At the location of an investment impulse, the following equation must hold:

$$I_j = K^+ - K^- \quad (6)$$

In the appendix, we obtain that also the following two expressions must hold at the moment of an investment impulse:

$$S(K^+) - S(K^-) - a\left(1 + \frac{dU}{dI_j}\right)I_j - i(U(I_j) + I_j) \begin{cases} > 0 \text{ for } T = 0 \\ = 0 \text{ for } T \in (0, z) \\ < 0 \text{ for } T = z \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

$$1 + \frac{dU}{dI_j} = \exp(-(1+a)(z-T)) + \int_{t=T}^z \frac{dS}{dK} \exp(-(1+a)(t-T)) dt \quad (8)$$

The left-hand side of expression (8) represents the costs of increasing the investment expenditure by one unit; at the right-hand side we find the marginal earnings of investments consisting of the present value of the remaining new equipment at the end of the planning period (the value of the new equipment decreases with depreciation rate "a" during the rest of the planning period) plus the present value of additional sales over the whole period due to this new equipment (the production capacity of this equipment decreases with a rate "a" during the remainder of the planning period). Expression (8) thus means that at all locations of investment impulses, marginal costs of investments must equal marginal earnings. This is easy to understand, because on the optimal production plan the cost of adjustment involved in installing one additional unit of capital good stock must always balance the net gain of the adjustment. For if it does not balance then either one unit increase or one unit reduction of the investment at that moment will lead to an increase in the present value of the firm.

Equations (6), (7) and (8) together may be exploited for a search procedure in order to obtain the optimal investment pattern. This can be done in a similar way Luhmer (1986) established the optimal ordering plan of the inventory problem under consideration. Contrary to Luhmer, our

search procedure starts at z and goes backwards in time, in stead of starting at the initial time point and continuing in course of time until the planning horizon is reached.

The search procedure, that is represented by figure 4.1., starts by choosing an arbitrary value of $K(z)$. Obviously, due to (8) no investment impulse can occur at the planning horizon itself, so we can go immediately to period $T = z-1$. We obtain the magnitude of $K(z-1)$ by substituting $z-1$ for T into the differential equation according to which K behaves during time intervals at which there is no investment impulse. Then we equalize $K(z-1)$ and K^+ and insert this value in (6) and (7) in order to get the corresponding values of I and K^- . Next, we check whether the obtained value of I fulfills the equality sign of expression (8). In case of an inequality no investment impulse takes place at this point of time; we now go to the previous period and continue the algorithm. If equation (8) holds, however, the investment impulse is optimal, $K(z-1)$ becomes equal to K^- and we continue in the same way as before. The algorithm stops as soon as the start of the planning period is reached. From the initial state constraint (5) we can check if an investment impulse is necessary at time point zero. If it is not, the obtained solution is feasible and if it is, the solution is only feasible when the magnitude of the investment impulse satisfies the inequality sign (!) of (7) and equation (8).

By applying this search procedure we can develop investment patterns for every $K(z)$. It depends on the corresponding value of the goal function which of these patterns is the optimal one.




figure 4.1 the search procedure which enables us to develop the optimal investment pattern.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT.

The author would like to thank Prof. dr. P.A. Verheyen and drs. G.J.C.Th. van Schijndel (both Tilburg University), Prof. dr. P.J.J.M. van Loon (Limburg University, Maastricht) and dr. J.L. de Jong (Eindhoven University of Technology) for many fruitful discussions and useful suggestions.

REFERENCES

- Kamien, M.I. & N. Schwartz, (1983), Dynamic optimization, the calculus of variation and optimal control in economics and management, 2nd reprint (North Holland, New York).
- Luhmer A., (1986), A continuous time, deterministic, nonstationary model of economic ordering, European Journal of Operational Research 24, pp. 123-135.
- Nickell S.J., (1978), The investment decisions of firms (James Nisbet, Welwyn).
- Rothschild M., (1971), On the cost of adjustment, Quarterly Journal of Economics 85, pp 605-622.
- Seierstad A. & K. Sydsaeter, (1986), Optimal control theory for economists, to be published.

Appendix. Derivation of the investment decision rule.

definitions:

ψ = co-state variable

H = hamiltonian

$g(K^-, I_j, T_j) = K^+ - K^-$

$-h(K^-, I_j, T_j)$ = total cost of the investment expenditure

The additional necessary conditions, developed by e.g. Seierstad & Sydsaeter, are the following:

at the jump points, it must hold that:

$$\psi^+ - \psi^- = -\frac{\partial h}{\partial K} - \psi^+ \frac{\partial g}{\partial K} \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{\partial h}{\partial I_j} + \psi^+ \frac{\partial g}{\partial I_j} = 0 \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} H^+ - H^- - \frac{\partial h}{\partial T} - \psi^+ \frac{\partial g}{\partial T} &> 0 && \text{for } T = 0 \\ &= 0 && \text{for } T \in (0, z) \\ &< 0 && \text{for } T = z \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

for all T at which there is no jump, it must hold that:

$$\frac{\partial h(K^-, 0, T)}{\partial I} + \psi \frac{\partial g(K^-, 0, T)}{\partial I} < 0 \quad (12)$$

From the model of section 3, we get that the following must hold:

$$h(K^-, I_j, T_j) = -(I_j + U(I_j)) \exp(-iT_j) \quad (13)$$

$$g(K^-, I_j, T_j) = I_j \quad (14)$$

Applying the maximumprinciple of Pontryagin to the model of section 3, we obtain the following necessary conditions:

$$H = S(K) \exp(-iT) - \psi aK \quad (15)$$

$$-\dot{\psi} = \frac{dS}{dK} \exp(-iT) - a\psi \quad (16)$$

$$\psi(z) = \exp(-iz) \quad (\text{transversality condition}) \quad (17)$$

After substituting (13) through (15) in (9) through (12) we get:
at the jump points, it must hold that:

$$\psi^+ - \psi^- = 0 \quad (18)$$

$$-(1 + \frac{dU}{dI_j}) \exp(-iT) + \psi^+ = 0 \quad (19)$$

$$H^+ - H^- - i(U(I_j) + I_j) \exp(-iT) \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{for } T = 0 \\ = 0 & \text{for } T \in (0, z) \\ < 0 & \text{for } T = z \end{cases} \quad (20)$$

for all T at which there is no jump, it must hold that:

$$-(1 + \frac{dU}{dI} (I=0)) \exp(-iT) + \psi < 0 \quad (21)$$

From (18) we can conclude that ψ is continuous at every jump point. Due to the insertion of (15) in (20) we obtain that at a jump point it must hold that:

$$(S(K^+) - S(K^-)) \exp(-iT) - a\psi(K^+ - K^-) - i(U(I_j) + I_j) \exp(-iT) \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{for } T = 0 \\ = 0 & \text{for } T \in (0, z) \\ < 0 & \text{for } T = z \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

After substituting (6) and (19) in (22) and deviding this equation by $\exp(-iT)$ we get:

$$S(K^+) - S(K^-) - a(1 + \frac{dU}{dI_j})I_j - i(U(I_j) + I_j) \begin{cases} > 0 & \text{for } T = 0 \\ = 0 & \text{for } T \in (0, z) \\ < 0 & \text{for } T = z \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

If we substitute in the solution of the differential equation (16) the transversality condition (17) we get:

$$\psi(T) = \exp(aT) \int_{t=T}^z \frac{dS}{dK} \exp(-(i+a)t) dt + \exp(aT) \exp(-(i+a)z) \quad (24)$$

From (19) and (24) we finally derive that at a jump point it must hold that:

$$1 + \frac{dU}{dI_j} = \int_{t=T}^z \frac{dS}{dK} \exp(-(i+a)(t-T)) dt + \exp(-(i+a)(z-T)) \quad (25)$$

IN 1985 REEDS VERSCHENEN

- 168 T.M. Doup, A.J.J. Talman
A continuous deformation algorithm on the product space of unit simplices
- 169 P.A. Bekker
A note on the identification of restricted factor loading matrices
- 170 J.H.M. Donders, A.M. van Nunen
Economische politiek in een twee-sectoren-model
- 171 L.H.M. Bosch, W.A.M. de Lange
Shift work in health care
- 172 B.B. van der Genugten
Asymptotic Normality of Least Squares Estimators in Autoregressive Linear Regression Models
- 173 R.J. de Groof
Geïsoleerde versus gecoördineerde economische politiek in een twee-regiomodel
- 174 G. van der Laan, A.J.J. Talman
Adjustment processes for finding economic equilibria
- 175 B.R. Meijboom
Horizontal mixed decomposition
- 176 F. van der Ploeg, A.J. de Zeeuw
Non-cooperative strategies for dynamic policy games and the problem of time inconsistency: a comment
- 177 B.R. Meijboom
A two-level planning procedure with respect to make-or-buy decisions, including cost allocations
- 178 N.J. de Beer
Voorspelprestaties van het Centraal Planbureau in de periode 1953 t/m 1980
- 178a N.J. de Beer
BIJLAGEN bij Voorspelprestaties van het Centraal Planbureau in de periode 1953 t/m 1980
- 179 R.J.M. Alessie, A. Kapteyn, W.H.J. de Freytas
De invloed van demografische factoren en inkomen op consumptieve uitgaven
- 180 P. Kooreman, A. Kapteyn
Estimation of a game theoretic model of household labor supply
- 181 A.J. de Zeeuw, A.C. Meijdam
On Expectations, Information and Dynamic Game Equilibria

- 182 Cristina Pennavaja
Periodization approaches of capitalist development.
A critical survey
- 183 J.P.C. Kleijnen, G.L.J. Kloppenburg and F.L. Meeuwsen
Testing the mean of an asymmetric population: Johnson's modified T
test revisited
- 184 M.O. Nijkamp, A.M. van Nunen
Freia versus Vintaf, een analyse
- 185 A.H.M. Gerards
Homomorphisms of graphs to odd cycles
- 186 P. Bekker, A. Kapteyn, T. Wansbeek
Consistent sets of estimates for regressions with correlated or
uncorrelated measurement errors in arbitrary subsets of all
variables
- 187 P. Bekker, J. de Leeuw
The rank of reduced dispersion matrices
- 188 A.J. de Zeeuw, F. van der Ploeg
Consistency of conjectures and reactions: a critique
- 189 E.N. Kertzman
Belastingstructuur en privatisering
- 190 J.P.C. Kleijnen
Simulation with too many factors: review of random and group-
screening designs
- 191 J.P.C. Kleijnen
A Scenario for Sequential Experimentation
- 192 A. Dortmans
De loonvergelijking
Afwenteling van collectieve lasten door loontrekkers?
- 193 R. Heuts, J. van Lieshout, K. Baken
The quality of some approximation formulas in a continuous review
inventory model
- 194 J.P.C. Kleijnen
Analyzing simulation experiments with common random numbers
- 195 P.M. Kort
Optimal dynamic investment policy under financial restrictions and
adjustment costs
- 196 A.H. van den Elzen, G. van der Laan, A.J.J. Talman
Adjustment processes for finding equilibria on the simplotope

- 197 J.P.C. Kleijnen
Variance heterogeneity in experimental design
- 198 J.P.C. Kleijnen
Selecting random number seeds in practice
- 199 J.P.C. Kleijnen
Regression analysis of simulation experiments: functional software specification
- 200 G. van der Laan and A.J.J. Talman
An algorithm for the linear complementarity problem with upper and lower bounds
- 201 P. Kooreman
Alternative specification tests for Tobit and related models

IN 1986 REEDS VERSCHENEN

- 202 J.H.F. Schilderinck
Interregional Structure of the European Community. Part III
- 203 Antoon van den Elzen and Dolf Talman
A new strategy-adjustment process for computing a Nash equilibrium
in a noncooperative more-person game
- 204 Jan Vingerhoets
Fabrication of copper and copper semis in developing countries.
A review of evidence and opportunities.
- 205 R. Heuts, J. v. Lieshout, K. Baken
An inventory model: what is the influence of the shape of the lead
time demand distribution?
- 206 A. v. Soest, P. Kooreman
A Microeconomic Analysis of Vacation Behavior
- 207 F. Boekema, A. Nagelkerke
Labour Relations, Networks, Job-creation and Regional Development
A view to the consequences of technological change
- 208 R. Alessie, A. Kapteyn
Habit Formation and Interdependent Preferences in the Almost Ideal
Demand System
- 209 T. Wansbeek, A. Kapteyn
Estimation of the error components model with incomplete panels
- 210 A.L. Hempenius
The relation between dividends and profits
- 211 J. Kriens, J.Th. van Lieshout
A generalisation and some properties of Markowitz' portfolio
selection method
- 212 Jack P.C. Kleijnen and Charles R. Standridge
Experimental design and regression analysis in simulation: an FMS
case study
- 213 T.M. Doup, A.H. van den Elzen and A.J.J. Talman
Simplicial algorithms for solving the non-linear complementarity
problem on the simplotope
- 214 A.J.W. van de Gevel
The theory of wage differentials: a correction
- 215 J.P.C. Kleijnen, W. van Groenendaal
Regression analysis of factorial designs with sequential replica-
tion

- 216 T.E. Nijman and F.C. Palm
Consistent estimation of rational expectations models

Bibliotheek K. U. Brabant



17 000 01059729 3