CBM
CBM
R
7626
1991
483

TILBURG UNIVERSITY
KATHOLIEKE UNIVERSITEIT BRABANT
POSTBOX 90153
5000 LE TILBURG
THE NETHERLANDS

* C I N 0 1 2 0 9 *

[redacted]

DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS

RESEARCH MEMORANDUM

K.U.B.
BIBLIOTHEEK
TILBURG

A DYNAMIC MODEL OF THE FIRM WITH UNCERTAIN EARNINGS AND ADJUSTMENT COSTS

Peter M. Kort

R48

FEW 483

338.55

A DYNAMIC MODEL OF THE FIRM WITH UNCERTAIN EARNINGS AND ADJUSTMENT COSTS

Peter M. Kort[1)]

Econometrics Department, Tilburg University, P.O. Box 90153, 5000 LE Tilburg, The Netherlands

Abstract

In this paper a stochastic dynamic model of the firm developed by Bensoussan and Lesourne (1980) is extended to allow for adjustment costs. The optimal solution is derived for different scenarios dependent on the shapes of the expected earnings function and the adjustment cost function, and on the different parameters of the model. It turns out that, besides pure investment, dividend and saving policies, also mixed policies can be optimal for the firm. The latter do not occur in the solution of the Bensoussan and Lesourne model, and, therefore, the solutions derived in this paper come closer to reality.

1. INTRODUCTION AND MODEL FORMULATION

This paper deals with the influence of uncertain earnings and adjustment costs on the optimal investment, dividend and saving policies of a firm. The basis of the research carried out in this paper lies in two different areas. On one hand we have the deterministic adjustment cost literature where the influence of adjustment costs on dynamic investment behavior is studied (see e.g. Gould (1968), Kort (1988a, 1990a)). On the other hand we think of the application of stochastic dynamic optimization methods to economic problems (see e.g. Lehoczky, Sethi and Shreve (1983), Pindyck (1988) and Tapiero, Reisman and Ritchken (1987)). In the paper by Bensoussan and Lesourne (1980) the investment/dividend/saving decision is studied within a stochastic dynamic model of a self-financing firm (see also Kort (1988b) and Kort (1989)). In Bensoussan and Lesourne (1981) this model was extended to allow for borrowing, but, unfortunately, they had to rely on numerical results in stead of analytical derivations to characterize the

---

1) The author thanks Raymond Gradus (Tilburg University) for his remarks.

solution. An other related model can be found in Kort (1990b) where dividend is an argument of a concave utility function.

In this paper we extend the model of Bensoussan and Lesourne (1980) by incorporating adjustment costs with the aim to derive some analytical results. The stochastic dynamic optimization model is as follows:

$$\max_{I(t),D(t)} E_0\left(\int_0^T D(t)\exp(-it)dt\right) \tag{1}$$

$$dK(t) = I(t)dt,\ K(0) = K_0 \tag{2}$$

$$dM(t) = (S(K(t))-I(t)-A(I(t))-D(t))dt + \sigma S(K(t))dB(t),\ M(0) = M_0 \tag{3}$$

$$D(t) \geq 0 \tag{4}$$

$$I(t) \geq 0 \tag{5}$$

$$S(K(t)) - I(t) - A(I(t)) - D(t) \geq 0 \tag{6}$$

in which:

- t : time
- $B = B(t)$: a standard Wiener process with independent increments $dB(t)$, which are normally distributed with mean zero and variance dt
- $D = D(t)$: dividend rate at time t
- $I = I(t)$: investment rate at time t
- $K = K(t)$: stock of capital goods at time t
- $M = M(t)$: cash balance at time t
- $A(I(t))$: rate of adjustment costs, $A(0) = 0$, $A'(I) > 0$, $A''(I) > 0$
- $S(K(t))$: usual deterministic earnings function, $S(0) = 0$, $S'(K) > 0$, $S''(K) < 0$, $S'(0) > i\ (1+A'(0))$
- i : shareholders' time preference rate ($i > 0$ and constant)
- T : horizon date, $T = \inf\{t|M(t) \leq 0)$
- σ : a constant

The expressions (1), (2), (4) and (5) are the same as in the original model of Bensoussan and Lesourne (1980). The firm behaves as if it maximizes the shareholders' value of the firm which can be expressed as the mathematical expectation of the discounted dividend stream over the planning period. As soon as the cash balance becomes negative the firm is bankrupt. When this happens the horizon date is reached, which is in this way endogenously determined (1). Capital stock can be increased by investment and depreciation is left out for reasons of mathematical tractability (2). Investment is irreversible (5).

The amount of earnings during a time period dt can be expressed as:

$$R(K(t))dt = S(K(t))dt + \sigma S(K(t))dB(t) \tag{7}$$

Hence the earnings consist of a deterministic $(S(K)dt)$ and a stochastic part $(\sigma S(K)dB)$. These earnings can be used for investment, which also generates adjustment costs, for dividend payments and for increasing the cash balance. The value per unit of capital goods is fixed at one unit of money. Taking all this into account we arrive at equation (3).

As in the model of Bensoussan and Lesourne (1980) it is also assumed here that the firm cannot spend more money on investment and dividend than the expected earnings. This is achieved by (6) and the difference with the comparable constraint in Bensoussan and Lesourne (1980) is the occurrence of adjustment costs.

2. THE OPTIMAL POLICIES

To solve the model we use dynamic programming. To do so we need a value function which is defined by:

$$V(M(t),K(t)) = \max_{\substack{I,D\geq 0 \\ I+A(I)+D\leq S(K)}} E_t\left(\int_t^T D\exp(-is)ds\right) \tag{8}$$

V is the expected discounted dividend stream during a time interval that begins at an arbitrary instant $t \in [0,T]$ and ends at the horizon date T. V can be interpreted as the value of the firm at time t. Because the horizon date T depends completely on the value of M, we can conclude that V depends only on M and K, and not explicitly on t.

Throughout the rest of the paper we assume that the partial derivatives V_M, V_K, V_{MM}, V_{KK} and V_{MK} exist. Now, the Hamilton-Jacobi-Bellman equation equals (see also Bensoussan and Lesourne (1980), pp. 244-245):

$$iV = \max_{\substack{I,D\geq 0 \\ I+A(I)+D\leq S(K)}} \{D + V_M(S(K)-I-A(I)-D) + V_K I\} + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 S^2(K)V_{MM} \tag{9}$$

Because the horizon date is determined by M becoming equal to zero, the boundary condition can be expressed as:

$$V(0,K) = 0 \tag{10}$$

What we have to do now is to determine the control variables I and D in such a way that the value of the firm V is maximized, thus that within expression (9) the part between brackets is maximized. To do so, we solve for every fixed pair (K,M) the following static optimization problem:

$$\max_{I,D}\{D + V_M(S(K)-I-A(I)-D) + V_K I\} \tag{11}$$

$$\text{s.t. } I \geq 0,\ D \geq 0,\ I + A(I) + D \leq S(K) \tag{12}$$

Figure 1 illustrates the set of feasible pairs (I,D). The optimal solution can only lie on the corners, on the edges or in the interior, i.e. there are seven possible cases to investigate. In Appendix 1 the Kuhn-Tucker conditions are used to transform these cases into the optimal policies of the firm. It turns out that the cases 6 and 7 do not lead to well defined policies, but the conditions under which these cases occur imply that it is also optimal to carry out two of the other policies. This derivation of the optimal policies has strong similarities with step 1 of the so-called two-step procedure, which can be used to solve a certain class of deterministic optimal control models (see e.g. Hartl (1988)).

Figure 1. The set of feasible pairs (I,D).

In Appendix 1 we show that five candidate policies have to be considered for optimality. It turns out that one of them is optimal depending on the relationship between:

V_M : increase of the value of the firm due to one extra dollar kept in cash

$V_K/(I+A'(I))$: increase of the value of the firm due to an additional investment of one dollar corrected for the fact that this generates additional adjustment costs

1 : the profitability of an additional dollar used to increase dividend

Before presenting the optimal policies, we first define the following function:

$$C(I) = I + A(I) \tag{13}$$

in which:

$C(I)$: total cost function

From (4), (6) and (13) it can be concluded that the firm invests maximally if it holds that:

$$I = C^{-1}(S(K)) \tag{14}$$

The five optimal policies are the following:

<u>Investment policy</u>: $dK = C^{-1}(S(K))dt$, $dM = \sigma S(K)dB$, $D = 0$
optimal if:

$$V_K/\{1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K)))\} \geq \max(1, V_M) \tag{15}$$

(15) implies that for this policy it is marginally better:
- to invest maximally than to pay out dividend;
- to invest maximally than to increase cash.

<u>Cash policy</u>: $dK = 0$, $dM = S(K)dt + \sigma S(K)dB$, $D = 0$
optimal if:

$$V_M \geq \max(1, V_K/\{1 + A'(0)\}) \tag{16}$$

Thus for this policy it is marginally better:
- to increase cash than to pay out dividend;
- to increase cash than to invest.

<u>Dividend policy</u>: $dK = 0$, $dM = \sigma S(K)dB$, $D = S(K)$
optimal if:

$$1 \geq \max(V_M, V_K/\{1 + A'(0)\}) \tag{17}$$

Due to (17) we can conclude that for this policy it is marginally better:
- to pay out dividend than to increase cash;
- to pay out dividend than to invest.

<u>Investment/dividend policy</u>: $dK = Idt$, $dM = \sigma S(K)dB$, $D = S(K) - I - A(I)$
optimal if:

$$V_K/\{1 + A'(I)\} = 1 \geq V_M \tag{18}$$

Due to (18) and the strict convexity of A(I) it is marginally better:
- to use a part of the expected earnings to invest and the rest for paying out dividend, than to increase cash;
- to use a part of the expected earnings to invest and the rest for paying out dividend, than to use all expected earnings for investment;
- to use a part of the expected earnings to invest and the rest for paying out dividend, than to use all expected earnings for paying out dividend.

Investment/cash policy: $dK = Idt$, $dM = (S(K)-I-A(I))dt + \sigma S(K)dB$, $D = 0$ optimal if:

$$V_K/(1+A'(I)) = V_M \geq 1 \tag{19}$$

From (19) and the strict convexity of A(I) we derive that it is marginally better:
- to use a part of the expected earnings to invest and the rest to increase cash, than to pay out dividend;
- to use a part of the expected earnings to invest and the rest to increase cash, than to use all expected earnings for investment;
- to use a part of the expected earnings to invest and the rest to increase cash, than to use all expected earnings for increasing cash.

3. THE OPTIMAL SOLUTIONS FOR DIFFERENT SCENARIOS

In the previous section we have established the five policies that can be optimal. As already stated in Section 2, the value of the firm V only depends on M and K and not on t. Then the same holds, of course for the partial derivatives V_M and V_K. Now, we can conclude from the conditions (15) through (19) that it completely depends on the values of M and K which of the five policies is optimal for the firm to carry out. Hence, we can divide the M-K plane in five regions, each of them belonging to one of the five candidates for an optimal policy, which are collections of those values of M and K for which the corresponding policy is optimal. In this way we get the following regions: investment-region, cash-region, dividend-region, investment/dividend-region, investment/cash-region. In what follows these regions will be denoted by I-region, M-region, D-region, I/D-region and I/M-region, respectively.

Due to the conditions (15) through (19) and the assumption that the partial derivatives V_{MK}, V_{MM} and V_{KK} exist, we can establish the following general features for the positions of the regions in the M-K plane:

(F1): The boundary between the M-region and the I-region does not exist for K positive. This is because in the M-region it holds that $V_M \geq V_K/\{1 + A'(0)\}$ and in the I-region we have $V_M \leq V_K/\{1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K)))\}$. Due to the strict convexity of A(I) we can conclude that for K positive we get $A'(C^{-1}(S(K))) > A'(0)$. Hence, in the M-K plane the M-region and the I-region can only hit eachother for K equal to zero. Therefore for K positive there will always an I/M-region be situated between the M-region and the I-region.

(F2): For K positive the same reasoning as in (F1) can be applied to argue that the I/D-region must always be situated between the I-region and the D-region.

(F3): For K positive the boundaries between the M-region and the I/M-region ($V_M = V_K/\{1 + A'(0)\}$ which holds on this boundary because both (16) and (19) must be satisfied) and between the I-region and the I/D-region ($V_K/\{1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K)))\} = 1$) do not intersect because it can never be optimal to pay out dividend in a region that hits this intersection point (this because the two equalities imply that $V_M > 1$).

(F4): Following the same reasoning as in (F3) for K positive, we can argue that the boundaries between the I/M-region and the I-region ($V_M = V_K/\{1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K)))\}$) and between the D-region and the I/D-region ($V_K/\{1 + A'(0)\} = 1$) do not intersect.

Notice that (F1) implies that for K positive the boundary between the M-region and the I/M-region and the boundary between the I/M-region and the I-region do not intersect, and that the implication of (F2) is that the boundaries between the I-region and the I/D-region and between the I/D-region and the D-region do not intersect.

Except that the contents and the proof of the Propositions 3 and 4 are slightly adjusted for the presence of adjustment costs, the following propositions and their proofs also hold for the original Bensoussan-Lesourne model without adjustment costs. Therefore, here we only present the propositions and for their proofs we refer to Kort (1989).

Proposition 1

If $1/i - \sigma/\sqrt{2i} > 0$, only the M-region includes the K-axis.

Proposition 2

The boundary between the M-region and the D-region is given by $M = \rho S(K)$, in which:

ρ : a constant, which satisfies:

$$\exp((r_1 - r_2)\rho) = [1 - r_2(1/i - \sigma/\sqrt{2i})]/[1 - r_1(1/i - \sigma/\sqrt{2i})] \tag{20}$$

where

$$r_1 = [-1 + \sqrt{1+2\sigma^2 i}]/\sigma^2 \tag{21}$$

$$r_2 = [-1 - \sqrt{1+2\sigma^2 i}]/\sigma^2 \tag{22}$$

Proposition 3

The boundary between the I/D-region and the D-region increases in the M-K plane and lies below a horizontal asymptote which is situated on the level K^*, determined by $S'(K^*) = i(1+A'(0))$. The D-region lies at the left-hand side of this boundary.

At the intersection point $(\bar{M},\bar{K})$ of the boundary between the I/D-region and the D-region and the boundary between the M-region and the D-region ($M = \rho S(K)$, see Proposition 2) it must hold that $S'(\bar{K})\ (1/i - \sigma/\sqrt{2i} - \rho) = 1 + A'(0)$.

Proposition 4

The boundary between the M-region and the M/I-region starts at the origin and ends at the intersection point $(\bar{M},\bar{K})$ of the boundaries between the M-region and the D-region and between the I/D-region and the D-region.

In addition we developed the following propositions, from which the proofs are presented in Appendix 2:

Proposition 5

The D-region and the I/M-region hit eachother at one and only one point, namely at $(\bar{M},\bar{K})$, which is the intersection point of the boundary between the I/D- and D-region and the boundary between the M- and D-region (see Proposition 3).

The same holds for the M-region and the I/D-region.

Proposition 6

If the I-region exists for $M \to \infty$ then the boundary between this region and the I/D-region is situated at a level $K = \hat{K}$ for $M \to \infty$, where $\hat{K}$ is given by:

$$\frac{S'(\hat{K})}{i\{1+A'(S(\hat{K}))\}}\left[1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(\hat{K}))) + C^{-1}(S(\hat{K}))A''(C^{-1}(S(\hat{K})))\right] =$$

$$1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(\hat{K}))) \tag{23}$$

From (23) we derive the following sufficient condition for $\hat{K}$ being positive:

$$S'(0) \geq i\ \{1 + A'(S(\hat{K}))\} \tag{24}$$

Notice that (24) is not a sufficient condition for an investment policy being optimal when M is sufficiently large and K is below $\hat{K}$. However due to economic reasons it is clear that this is the preferable policy, because the expected marginal earnings are high while there is no immediate risk for bankruptcy. Therefore, in the sequel we take the view that the firm invests maximally when K is small and M sufficiently high.

From the propositions 3, 4 and 5 it is clear that the intersection point $(\bar{M},\bar{K})$ of the boundary between the M-region and the D-region and the boundary between the I/D-region and the D-region plays a crucial role in the optimal solution. We first pay attention to the solution for the scenarios where this intersection point exists. From Proposition 3 we obtain that existence is assured if the following inequality holds:

$$S'(0)(1/i-\sigma/\sqrt{2i}-\rho) > 1 + A'(0) \tag{25}$$

The solution for this scenario is depicted in Figure 2. Notice that (25) implies that $1/i - \sigma/\sqrt{2i} > 0$, so according to Proposition 1 the M-region includes the K-axis. The reader can check for him/herself that the features (F1)-(F4) and the remaining propositions are also satisfied. Concerning this solution it has to be remarked that we cannot prove anything about the shape of the boundary between the I/M-region and the I/D-region, except that it ends at $(\bar{M},\bar{K})$ (cf. Proposition 5). In Figure 2 we assume that it lies on the curve $M = \rho S(K)$ which seems reasonable because, like on the boundary between the M-region and the D-region, on this boundary it must also hold that $V_M = 1$ (cf. (18) and (19)).

Figure 2. The optimal solution for the scenario where it holds that $S'(0)(1/i-\sigma/\sqrt{2i}-\rho) > 1 + A'(0)$.

The solution depicted in Figure 2 has some similarities with the corresponding solution of the original Bensoussan-Lesourne model without adjustment costs (see Kort (1988b), Figure 4.1. Panel D), namely that the firm saves money if the amount of equipment is high enough while the cash-situation is poor, that the firm invests if the amount of equipment is low while there is plenty of cash to limit the risk of bankruptcy and that the firm pays out dividends if M and K are such that the expected marginal earnings are too small to justify additional growth and the amount of cash available high enough to guarantee a sufficiently safe situation. The difference is that the present solution contains two more regions in which it is optimal to carry out a mixed investment/saving-policy (I/M-region) and a mixed investment/dividend-policy (I/D-region), respectively. Concerning the I/M-region, on its boundary with the M-region it holds that $I = 0$, and on the boundary with the I-region the firm invests at its maximum implying that $I + A(I) = S(K)$. In between investment is such that $V_M = V_K/(1+A'(I))$, so the increase of the value of the firm due to one extra dollar in cash is equal to the increase of the value of the firm due to one extra dollar of capital goods, corrected for the fact that additional adjustment costs must be paid in order to increase the stock of capital goods.

Concerning the I/D-region, on its boundary with the I-region it holds that $I + A(I) = S(K)$ and $D = 0$ and on the boundary with the D-region $I = 0$ and $D = S(K)$. In the rest of the region I and D are such that the marginal profitability of an additional dollar used to increase dividend (= 1) is equal to $V_K/(1+A'(I))$.

In the evolution of the firm over time M and K are continuous (cf. (2)-(6)). Therefore, the existence of the two intermediate regions where mixed policies are optimal, imply that the investment level develops gradually over time. Such an investment behavior is also concluded from the deterministic adjustment cost literature (cf. Kort (1990a)), in which it is shown that the investment rate is a continuous function of time.

In Figure 2 it can also be seen that the firm never invests when K is greater than K^*. The reason is that, due to the concavity of $S(K)$, the expected marginal earnings ($S'(K)$) then fall below the minimal return the shareholders demand ($= i(1+A'(0))$). This feature also plays an important role in deterministic adjustment cost models.

Next, we study the solution under the following scenario:

$$S'(0)(1/i-\sigma/\sqrt{2i}-\rho) < 1 + A'(0) \text{ and } 1/i - \sigma/\sqrt{2i} > 0 \tag{26}$$

From Proposition 1 we obtain that the M-region is still the only region that includes the K-axis, but due to Proposition 3 we can conclude that now the intersection point $(\bar{K},\bar{M})$ does not exist. Hence, the general features (F1)-(F4) and the Propositions (1)-(6) now lead to the solution, which is depicted in Figure 3.

Figure 3. The optimal solution for the scenario where it holds that $S'(0)(1/i-\sigma/\sqrt{2i}-\rho) < 1 + A'(0)$ and $1/i - \sigma/\sqrt{2i} > 0$.

The difference between this solution and the solution of Figure 2 is that here it is optimal to pay out dividend for some low levels of capital stock and cash balance. The reason could be that in this solution the firm has to deal with larger values of time preference rate i and risk parameter σ (cf. (25, (26) and the fact that tedious calculations show that both the signs of the derivatives from ρ to i and σ are not clearly positive or negative (see also Kort (1988b), Appendix 2)). A high time preference rate implies that the shareholders of the firm can obtain a high return through investing there money outside the firm and therefore they like to receive lots

of dividends. A high σ means that the outcome of the firm's earnings is very uncertain (cf. (7)). Hence, for low levels of M the chance of going bankrupt is very high. Therefore, the shareholders want to obtain dividends as soon as possible, thus before the bankruptcy occurs.
In Figure 4 the solution is depicted, which is optimal under the following parameter configuration:

$$1/i - \sigma/\sqrt{2i} < 0 \tag{27}$$

Hence, for this solution the values of i and σ are even higher than for the solution presented in Figure 3. Here, the outcome of the firm's earnings is so uncertain that the shareholders believe that even increasing cash at a maximal rate cannot prevent bankruptcy when M is small. Instead, the shareholders want to receive dividends that they can use for investment outside the firm in order to generate a return which equals the high time preference rate i. The fact that only the D-region includes the K-axis follows from the proof of Proposition 1 (see Kort (1989), p. 161).

Figure 4. The optimal solution for the scenario where it holds that $1/i - \sigma/\sqrt{2i} < 0$.

4. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper the stochastic model of the firm by Bensoussan and Lesourne (1980) is extended by incorporating adjustment costs. The influence of both adjustment costs and uncertainty on the behavior of the firm was already modelled by Pindyck (1982), but our approach differs in that we also take the possibility of bankruptcy into consideration. This enabled us to analyze the firm's cash decision.

Besides pure investment, dividend and saving policies, the results obtained in this paper show that, contrary to Bensoussan and Lesourne (1980), a mixed investment/dividend policy and a mixed investment/saving policy can also be optimal for the firm. Therefore, the solutions in this paper have a richer structure and come closer to reality, compared to those resulting from the Bensoussan and Lesourne model.

As it is now, the financial side of the model is somewhat underdeveloped. Therefore, an interesting topic for future research could be to incorporate external financing possibilities like borrowing and issuing new shares.

APPENDIX 1. THE OPTIMAL POLICIES

In order to solve problem (11)-(12) we set up the Lagrangian:

$$L = D(1-V_M) + I(V_K-V_M) - A(I)V_M + S(K)V_M + \lambda_1 I + \lambda_2 D + \lambda_3(S(K)-I-A(I)-D) \tag{A1}$$

The Kuhn-Tucker optimality conditions are:

$$L_D = 1 - V_M + \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 = 0 \tag{A2}$$

$$L_I = V_K - V_M(1+A'(I)) + \lambda_1 - \lambda_3(1+A'(I)) = 0 \tag{A3}$$

$$\lambda_1 I = 0 \; , \quad \lambda_1 \geq 0 \tag{A4}$$

$$\lambda_2 D = 0 \; , \quad \lambda_2 \geq 0 \tag{A5}$$

$$\lambda_3(S(K)-I-A(I)-D) = 0 \; , \quad \lambda_3 \geq 0 \tag{A6}$$

We now derive the conditions for which cases 1-7 of Figure 1 can occur.

Case 1: $I > 0$, $D = 0$, $I + A(I) = S(K) \Rightarrow$ investment policy.

In this case we have $\lambda_1 = 0$ from (A4) and $I = C^{-1}(S(K))$ from (13). Now, we obtain from (A3):

$$V_K/\{1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K)))\} \geq V_M \tag{A7}$$

From (A2) and (A3) we can derive:

$$\lambda_2 = -1 + V_K/\{1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K)))\} \geq 0 \tag{A8}$$

(A7)-(A8) lead to (15).

Case 2: $I = D = 0$, $S(K) - I - A(I) - D > 0 \Rightarrow$ cash policy.

Here $\lambda_3 = 0$ because of (A6). Hence, (A2)-(A3) lead to (16).

Case 3: $I = 0$, $D > 0$ $D = S(K) \Rightarrow$ dividend policy.

Here $\lambda_2 = 0$ (cf. A5). Hence, (A2) leads to:

$$V_M \leq 1 \tag{A9}$$

From (A2)-(A3) we can conclude:

$$\lambda_1 = 1 + A'(0) - V_K \geq 0 \tag{A10}$$

(A9)-(A10) lead to (17).

Case 4: $I > 0$, $D > 0$, $I + A(I) + D = S(K) \Rightarrow$ investment/dividend-policy.

Here $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0$ because of (A4)-(A5). Hence (A2)-(A3) lead to (18).

Case 5: $I > 0$, $D = 0$, $I + A(I) < S(K) \Rightarrow$ investment/cash-policy.

Here $\lambda_1 = \lambda_3 = 0$ because of (A4) and (A6). Now (A2)-(A3) lead to (19).

Case 6: $I = 0$ $D > 0$, $S(K) - D > 0$.

Here $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$ due to (A5)-(A6). Now (A2)-(A3) lead to:

$$1 = V_M \geq V_K/\{1 + A'(0)\} \tag{A11}$$

Here it is not clear for the firm what to do, because the marginal value of dividend pay out equals the marginal value of saving money. Therefore the firm can adopt either a pure cash policy or a pure dividend policy. This is optimal because (A11) does not contradict (16) or (17).

Case 7: $I > 0$, $D > 0$, $S(K) - I - A(I) - D > 0$.

Here $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = 0$ due to (A4)-(A7). Now (A2)-(A3) result in:

$$1 = V_M = V_K/\{1 + A'(I)\} \tag{A12}$$

Due to the same reasoning as in Case 6 it can be concluded that under (A12) both an investment/dividend-policy as well as an investment/cash-policy are optimal.

APPENDIX 2. THE PROOFS OF THE PROPOSITIONS 5 AND 6

Proof of Proposition 5

In the D-region it holds that $D = S(K)$ and $I = 0$. If we substitute these values into (9) we obtain:

$$iV = S(K) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 S^2(K) V_{MM} \tag{A13}$$

Solving this differential equation implies:

$$V = S(K)/i + c_1(K)\exp[M\sqrt{2i}/\sigma S(K)] + c_2(K)\exp[-M\sqrt{2i}/\sigma S(K)] \tag{A14}$$

From the previous propositions we know that the D-region exists for finite K and infinite M. Due to (8) we derive that V must always have a finite value, so from (A14) we can conclude that $c_1(K) = 0$. From (A14) we also obtain:

$$V_M = -c_2(K)\sqrt{2i}\ \exp[-M\sqrt{2i}/\sigma S(K)]/\sigma S(K) \tag{A15}$$

Due to Proposition 2 we know that the boundary between the M-region and the D-region ($V_M = 1$ (cf. (16), (17))) is given by $M = \rho S(K)$. After substitution of $M = \rho S(K)$ into (A15) and equating V_M to 1 we obtain the following expression for $c_2(K)$:

$$c_2(K) = -\sigma S(K)\exp[\rho\sqrt{2i}/\sigma]/\sqrt{2i} \tag{A16}$$

Knowing $c_1(K)$ and $c_2(K)$ we now get from (A14):

$$V_K = S'(K)\{1/i - (\sigma/\sqrt{2i}+M/S(K))\exp[(\rho-M/S(K))\sqrt{2i}/\sigma]\} \tag{A17}$$

$$V_M = \exp[(\rho-M/S(K))\sqrt{2i}/\sigma] \tag{A18}$$

On the boundary between the D-region and the I/M-region it must hold that:

$$1 = V_M = V_K/\{1 + A'(0)\} \tag{A19}$$

Equating V_M to 1 gives that for this boundary it must hold that:

$$M = \rho S(K) \tag{A20}$$

After substitution of (A20) into (A17) and equating V_K to $1 + A'(0)$ we get:

$$S'(K)\{1/i - \sigma/\sqrt{2i} - \rho\} = 1 + A'(0) \tag{A21}$$

Comparing these results with Proposition 3 we conclude that (A20) and (A21) are exactly the conditions that fix $(\bar{M},\bar{K})$.

It is left to the reader to check that manipulating the information for the M-region in the same way as done above for the D-region leads to the conclusion that $(\bar{M},\bar{K})$ is the only point in common for the M-region and the I/D-region too.
q.e.d.

Proof of Proposition 6

On the boundary between the I-region and the I/D-region it holds that $I = C^{-1}(S(K))$, $D = 0$ and $V_K = 1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K)))$. Combining this with (9) leads to:

$$iV = \{1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K)))\}C^{-1}(S(K)) + \frac{1}{2}\sigma^2 S^2(K)V_{MM} \tag{A22}$$

This differential equation can be solved:

$$V = \{1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K)))\}C^{-1}(S(K))/i + c_3(K)\exp[M\sqrt{2i}/\sigma S(K)] +$$
$$+ c_4(K)\exp[-M\sqrt{2i}/\sigma S(K)] \tag{A23}$$

From (F2) in Section 3 we obtain that if it exists this boundary is situated below the D-I/D boundary, so it then exists for infinite M and finite K. Therefore c_3 must be equal to zero, because V must have a finite value. After differentiating (A23) to K and equate this to $1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K)))$ we obtain the following expression for the I-I/D boundary:

$$\frac{S'(K)}{iC'(S(K))}\{1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K))) + C^{-1}(S(K))A''(C^{-1}(S(K)))\} +$$
$$+ \left[c_4'(K) + \frac{M\sqrt{2i}\ S'(K)c_4(K)}{\sigma S^2(K)}\right]\exp[-M\sqrt{2i}/\sigma S(K)] = 1 + A'(C^{-1}(S(K))) \tag{A24}$$

Because c_4 and c_4' are finite (this follows from the assumption that V_k exists) taking M to infinity in (A24) leads to expression (23).
q.e.d.

REFERENCES

Bensoussan, A., Lesourne, J., 1980, Optimal growth of a self-financing firm in an uncertain environment, in: A. Bensoussan, P. Kleindorfer and C.S. Tapiero (eds.): Applied Stochastic Control in Economics and Management Science, North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 235-269.

Bensoussan, A., Lesourne, J., 1981 Optimal growth of a firm facing a risk of bankruptcy, Infor 19, pp. 292-310.

Gould, J.P., 1968, Adjustment costs in the theory of investment of the firm, Review of Economic Studies 35, pp. 47-56.

Hartl, R.F., 1988, A dynamic activity analysis for a monopolistic firm, Optimal Control Applications & Methods 9, pp. 253-272.

Kort, P.M., 1988a, Optimal dynamic investment policy under financial restrictions and adjustment costs, European Economic Review 32, pp. 1769-1776.

Kort, P.M. 1988b, The influence of a stochastic environment on the firm's optimal dynamic investment policy, in: G. Feichtinger (ed.): Optimal Control Theory and Economic Analysis 3, North-Holland, Amsterdam, pp. 245-263.

Kort, P.M., 1989, Optimal Dynamic Investment Policies of a Value Maximizing Firm, Lecture Notes in Economics and Mathematical Systems 330, Springer, Berlin.

Kort, P.M., 1990a, A dynamic net present value rule in a financial adjustment cost model, Optimal Control Applications & Methods 11, pp. 277-282.

Kort, P.M., 1990b, Dynamic firm behavior within an uncertain environment, European Journal of Operational Research 47, pp. 371-385.

Lehoczky, J., Sethi S., Shreve, S., 1983, Optimal consumption and investment policies allowing consumption constraints and bankruptcy, Mathematics of Operations Research 8, pp. 613-636.

Pindyck, R.S., 1982, Adjustment costs, uncertainty and the behaviour of the firm, American Economic Review 72, pp. 415-427.

Pindyck, R.S., 1988, Irreversible investment, capacity choice, and the value of the firm, American Economic Review 78, pp. 969-985.

Tapiero, C.S., Reisman, A., Ritchken, P., 1987, Product failures, manufacturing reliability and quality control: a dynamic framework, Infor 25, pp. 152-164.

IN 1990 REEDS VERSCHENEN

419 Bertrand Melenberg, Rob Alessie
A method to construct moments in the multi-good life cycle consumption model

420 J. Kriens
On the differentiability of the set of efficient (μ,σ^2) combinations in the Markowitz portfolio selection method

421 Steffen Jørgensen, Peter M. Kort
Optimal dynamic investment policies under concave-convex adjustment costs

422 J.P.C. Blanc
Cyclic polling systems: limited service versus Bernoulli schedules

423 M.H.C. Paardekooper
Parallel normreducing transformations for the algebraic eigenvalue problem

424 Hans Gremmen
On the political (ir)relevance of classical customs union theory

425 Ed Nijssen
Marketingstrategie in Machtsperspectief

426 Jack P.C. Kleijnen
Regression Metamodels for Simulation with Common Random Numbers: Comparison of Techniques

427 Harry H. Tigelaar
The correlation structure of stationary bilinear processes

428 Drs. C.H. Veld en Drs. A.H.F. Verboven
De waardering van aandelenwarrants en langlopende call-opties

429 Theo van de Klundert en Anton B. van Schaik
Liquidity Constraints and the Keynesian Corridor

430 Gert Nieuwenhuis
Central limit theorems for sequences with m(n)-dependent main part

431 Hans J. Gremmen
Macro-Economic Implications of Profit Optimizing Investment Behaviour

432 J.M. Schumacher
System-Theoretic Trends in Econometrics

433 Peter M. Kort, Paul M.J.J. van Loon, Mikulás Luptacik
Optimal Dynamic Environmental Policies of a Profit Maximizing Firm

434 Raymond Gradus
Optimal Dynamic Profit Taxation: The Derivation of Feedback Stackelberg Equilibria

435 Jack P.C. Kleijnen
Statistics and Deterministic Simulation Models: Why Not?

436 M.J.G. van Eijs, R.J.M. Heuts, J.P.C. Kleijnen
Analysis and comparison of two strategies for multi-item inventory systems with joint replenishment costs

437 Jan A. Weststrate
Waiting times in a two-queue model with exhaustive and Bernoulli service

438 Alfons Daems
Typologie van non-profit organisaties

439 Drs. C.H. Veld en Drs. J. Grazell
Motieven voor de uitgifte van converteerbare obligatieleningen en warrantobligatieleningen

440 Jack P.C. Kleijnen
Sensitivity analysis of simulation experiments: regression analysis and statistical design

441 C.H. Veld en A.H.F. Verboven
De waardering van conversierechten van Nederlandse converteerbare obligaties

442 Drs. C.H. Veld en Drs. P.J.W. Duffhues
Verslaggevingsaspecten van aandelenwarrants

443 Jack P.C. Kleijnen and Ben Annink
Vector computers, Monte Carlo simulation, and regression analysis: an introduction

444 Alfons Daems
"Non-market failures": Imperfecties in de budgetsector

445 J.P.C. Blanc
The power-series algorithm applied to cyclic polling systems

446 L.W.G. Strijbosch and R.M.J. Heuts
Modelling (s,Q) inventory systems: parametric versus non-parametric approximations for the lead time demand distribution

447 Jack P.C. Kleijnen
Supercomputers for Monte Carlo simulation: cross-validation versus Rao's test in multivariate regression

448 Jack P.C. Kleijnen, Greet van Ham and Jan Rotmans
Techniques for sensitivity analysis of simulation models: a case study of the CO_2 greenhouse effect

449 Harrie A.A. Verbon and Marijn J.M. Verhoeven
Decision-making on pension schemes: expectation-formation under demographic change

IN 1991 REEDS VERSCHENEN

466 Prof.Dr. Th.C.M.J. van de Klundert - Prof.Dr. A.B.T.M. van Schaik
Economische groei in Nederland in een internationaal perspectief

467 Dr. Sylvester C.W. Eijffinger
The convergence of monetary policy - Germany and France as an example

468 E. Nijssen
Strategisch gedrag, planning en prestatie. Een inductieve studie binnen de computerbranche

469 Anne van den Nouweland, Peter Borm, Guillermo Owen and Stef Tijs
Cost allocation and communication

470 Drs. J. Grazell en Drs. C.H. Veld
Motieven voor de uitgifte van converteerbare obligatieleningen en warrant-obligatieleningen: een agency-theoretische benadering

471 P.C. van Batenburg, J. Kriens, W.M. Lammerts van Bueren and R.H. Veenstra
Audit Assurance Model and Bayesian Discovery Sampling

472 Marcel Kerkhofs
Identification and Estimation of Household Production Models

473 Robert P. Gilles, Guillermo Owen, René van den Brink
Games with Permission Structures: The Conjunctive Approach

474 Jack P.C. Kleijnen
Sensitivity Analysis of Simulation Experiments: Tutorial on Regression Analysis and Statistical Design

475 An $O(n\log n)$ algorithm for the two-machine flow shop problem with controllable machine speeds
C.P.M. van Hoesel

476 Stephan G. Vanneste
A Markov Model for Opportunity Maintenance

477 F.A. van der Duyn Schouten, M.J.G. van Eijs, R.M.J. Heuts
Coordinated replenishment systems with discount opportunities

478 A. van den Nouweland, J. Potters, S. Tijs and J. Zarzuelo
Cores and related solution concepts for multi-choice games

479 Drs. C.H. Veld
Warrant pricing: a review of theoretical and empirical research

480 E. Nijssen
De Miles and Snow-typologie: Een exploratieve studie in de meubelbranche

481 Harry G. Barkema
Are managers indeed motivated by their bonuses?

Bibliotheek K. U. Brabant
17 000 01066371 5