# REMARKS ON VARIABLE CAPITAL UTILIZATION

*Beatriz Rumbos*
*Instituto Tecnológico Autónomo de México*
*México D.F. 01000*
*México*

*Leonardo Auernheimer*
*Texas A&M University*
*College Station, Texas 77843-4228*
*USA*

## ABSTRACT

The utilization rate of the capital input is made endogenous within a neoclassical growth model. The optimal utilization rate is found to be determined by the opportunity cost of holding capital, or the *net real interest rate*. This rate may vary in the short run so total services of capital become a control, rather than a state variable. We find a slower rate of convergence towards the steady state when a variable utilization rate of capital is introduced. Some simulations are carried out to illustrate this point and the role of the various parameters. The slower convergence would imply a higher degree of persistence in reaction to temporary changes in the parameters. This is consistent with various results obtained within the business cycle literature.

## INTRODUCTION

In the standard theory of capital and factor demand the rate of physical depreciation is usually taken to be constant; nonetheless, it has long been recognized that depreciation may be subject to choice by the users of capital.[1] The idea that capital depreciates faster when used more intensively has been around at least since Marshall (1922) and was tackled by Keynes (1935) through the concept of "pure user cost." Capital may be used with varying degrees of intensity and the cost of such use is borne through increased depreciation of the good, commonly known as "wear and tear". Examples of this line of research are Calvo (1975), Auernheimer (1986), Diewert (1986), Bischoff and Kokkelenberg (1987), Johnson (1994) and references therein.

The importance of assuming a variable utilization rate of capital to explain variations in output was first modeled formally by Greenwood, Hercowitz and Huffman (1988). Theirs is a fairly standard real business cycle model (RBC) where the cycles are generated by way of shocks to investment. More recently DeJong, Ingram and Whiteman (1995, 1996), Burnside, Eichenbaum and Rebelo (1995) and Licandro and Puch (1996) among others, have studied the effect of a variable utilization rate in various RBC models.

In this paper we provide a qualitative analysis of the variable utilization rate of capital assumption. In order to do this, we work in a continuous time environment using one of the many variations of the typical one sector general equilibrium Ramsey growth model. To concentrate in the production or "supply side" of the economy, the utilization rate and investment decisions, we consider the case in which agents can hold an alternative asset yielding a fixed rate of return. The typical *small open economy* with a foreign asset and a given world interest rate is, perhaps, the best example of such a case. To have a dynamic setup where adjustment is not instantaneous, we follow the usual procedure of introducing adjustment costs on investment. The introduction of a variable utilization rate of capital, not only turns the capital input into a control variable (total services of capital), but it also affects the slope of the saddle path and the convergence rate. We illustrate this with some simulations where the model is compared to one with a fixed utilization rate of capital. Finally, we consider the effect of a temporary fall (rise) in the world interest rate to highlight the differences between the two models during the adjustment process.

## 1. THE MODEL

We Consider the usual Ramsey-type one sector neoclassical growth model, except that (i) there are costs associated with the level of (gross) investment, and (ii) agents can hold either physical capital or an alternative asset yielding a constant rate of return.[2] This particular version of the standard growth model is well known.[3] We introduce variable utilization rate of capital, as specified below, within this specialized version.

We may think of the model as that of a small open economy populated by infinitely lived representative agents. For simplicity, assume a constant population, equal to the labor force, normalized at unity. There is one good that may take the form of capital ($k$), or consumption ($c$). Production depends on two inputs: the fixed level of labor and services of the capital stock, and is subject to constant returns to

scale. Let $s$ denote services per unit of capital, so that $S = sk$ stands for the total flow of services rendered by the capital stock.[4] We will refer to $s$ as the "rate of capital utilization". Total services ($S$) may be transformed into output by means of a production technology ($f$), yielding $Q = f(S)$. This function satisfies, $f(0) = 0$, $f' > 0$ and $f'' < 0$, where a prime (') following a one variable function denotes its derivative. Within this context, capital may be thought of as machines that may be operated or used at a variable rate $s$, this utilization rate may be interpreted as the "speed of operation" or "intensity of use" .[5]

Assume that capital depreciates at a rate $d = d(s)$, that is a twice differentiable function of $s$ satisfying the properties $d(0) = d_0 \geq 0$, $d' > 0$ and $d'' > 0$. This function captures the "user cost" concept of capital utilization, in the sense that capital wears out faster when used more intensively. The condition $d(0) = d_0$ implies that even when not in use, capital still depreciates at the rate $d_0$. The representative agent in this economy is a rational individual endowed with perfect foresight, who derives utility from consumption ($c$) by way of a utility function $u(c)$. The function $u$ is, as usual, twice differentiable, increasing and concave; furthermore, it also satisfies $\lim_{c \to 0} u(c) = -\infty$. Our agent may hold physical capital and also a foreign asset ($a$) with a constant rate of return ($r$) equal to the world real interest rate. This asset may be negative; hence, debt is allowed. We introduce adjustment costs on investment so that it is impossible for individuals to adjust their portfolios discretely at any given time; thus, both capital and foreign assets become state variables determined by past history. If $I$ stands for the rate of gross investment, let $h(I)$ denote a *per unit investment cost function* satisfying the following properties:

$$h(0) = 0$$
$$h' > 0 \quad\quad\quad (1)$$
$$Ih'' + 2h' > 0 \text{ (i.e., total cost } Ih \text{ is convex).}[6]\ [7]\ [8]$$

The typical individual maximizes his lifetime utility of consumption subject to the usual flow budget constraint and given the capital evolution equation, i.e.,

$$\max \int_0^\infty u(c)e^{-rt}dt \quad\quad\quad \text{subject to}$$

$$\dot{a} = f(sk) + ar - c - I[(1 + h(I)] \quad\quad\quad (2)$$
$$\dot{k} = I - d(s)k \quad\quad\quad (3)$$

given some initial stock holdings $k_0$ and $a_0$.

In the above expression, $r$ stands for the individual's time preference rate, a dot over a variable denotes its time derivative, and for future reference, a hat " ^ " will denote its proportional rate of change. We assume $r = r$.[9]

The current value Hamiltonian for the above problem can be expressed by $H = u(c) + l_1\dot{a} + l_2\dot{k}$, where $l_1$ and $l_2$ are the costate variables.

Letting $p \equiv \dfrac{l_2}{l_1}$, so that $p$ is the real shadow price of capital, the first order necessary conditions are given by

$$l_1 = u' \quad\quad\quad (4)$$
$$\dot{l}_1 = 0 \ ^{10} \qu\quad\quad\quad (5)$$
$$f'(sk) = pd'(s) \qu\quad\quad\quad (6)$$
$$p = 1 + h(I) + Ih'(I) \quad\quad\quad (7)$$
$$\dot{p} = -sf'(sk) + p(r + d(s)) \quad\quad\quad (8)$$

and the usual transversality requirements.

Equations (4) and (5) imply a constant level of consumption. Expression (6) implicitly determines a function $s = s(k,p)$, with $s_k < 0$ and $s_p < 0$. This embodies the notion that, *ceteris paribus*, a higher capital stock or a higher price of capital entails a lower level of services per unit of capital. Equation (7) implicitly determines investment as a function of $p$, $I = f(p)$, satisfying $f' > 0$, which may be interpreted as an "investment supply" schedule. Notice that expression (7) says that at all times the price of capital is equal to the marginal cost of transforming the consumption good into the capital good, through the investment process.[11]

Substituting the above expressions for $s$ and $I$ into (3) and (8), we obtain the system of two differential equations in $k$ and $p$,

$$\dot{k} = f(p) - d(s(k, p))$$
$$\dot{p} = -sf'(s(k, p)) + p[r + d(s(k, p))] . \quad\quad\quad (9)$$

Linearizing around the long run equilibrium point $(k^*, p^*)$ where $\dot{k} = \dot{p} = 0$, the above system can be expressed in matrix form as

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{k} \\ \dot{p} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -(d + kd's_k) & f' - kd's_p \\ -psd''s_k & -psd''s_p \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} k - k^* \\ p - p^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad\quad\quad (9')$$

where all the functions are evaluated at their long run steady state values.

The determinant of the system matrix is negative, so saddle path stability will always exist around the equilibrium point. The slope of the locus $\dot{p} = 0$ is always negative but flexibility in the choice of $s$ has the effect of rotating the locus $\dot{k} = 0$ clockwise around the equilibrium point, so that its slope may turn out to be negative.

Assume that we have a system with a fixed rate of utilization and depreciation and another system with flexibility in the choice of $s$, both sharing a common steady state. We would like to know how flexibility affects the saddle path in order to detect the differences, between the transitional dynamics of the two systems. In order to find out, we must describe the effect that the rotation of the locus $\dot{k} = 0$ has on the saddle path. It is not hard to see that when flexibility is introduced, a "flatter" saddle path and a lower speed of adjustment towards the steady state arise. A proof of this statement is included in the appendix.

The constant level of consumption ($c^*$) is determined from the lifetime budget constraint and the transversality condition as

$$c^* = a_0 r + r \int_0^\infty [f(sk) - I(1 + h(I))]e^{-rt} dt \qquad (10)$$

where $s$, $k$ and $I$ are evaluated along their optimal path. The flow $\dot{a} + ar$ (i.e., foreign asset accumulation) is then determined at all times by the difference between net output, $f(sk) - I(1+h(I))$, and consumption.

Finally, notice that equations (6) and (8) yield the relationship

$$s\boldsymbol{d}'(s) - \boldsymbol{d}(s) = r - \hat{p} . \qquad (11)$$

The interpretation of (11) is straightforward: if $s$ and $k$ are thought of as the two factors needed to produce a total amount of services $S$, then the representative agent's problem is to minimize the total cost of producing a given level $\overline{S}$ of total services. This problem can be stated as

$$\min\{ (r - \hat{p})k + \boldsymbol{d}(s)k \} \qquad (12)$$
$$\text{subject to} \quad sk = \overline{S} .$$

The first term in the cost function represents the opportunity cost of capital, and the second term the "depreciation" cost. The optimal $s$ solving the above minimization problem must satisfy the condition $s\boldsymbol{d}'(s) - \boldsymbol{d}(s) = r - \hat{p}$, which is identical to (11).[12]

Equation (13) implies that the optimal level of services per unit of capital, $s$, is determined only by the net real interest rate $(r - \hat{p})$ and the functional form $\boldsymbol{d}(s)$. Since $r$ is an exogenous constant, it is the *rate of change* ($\hat{p}$) that is accountable for any change in $s$. On the other hand expression (7) implies that investment is determined at all times by the *level* of $p$.

## 2. CAPITAL UTILIZATION ALONG THE SADDLE PATH

We now study the adjustment of the system for a given initial level of the capital stock. If the initial capital stock ($k_0$) is less than that of the long run steady state, then the economy is growing, and figure (1) implies that equilibrium is approached from the northwest along the saddle path. Initial investment is higher than its equilibrium value and falls towards it while capital converges to its long run steady state. During the adjustment process, the net real interest rate is greater than $r$ and falling; thus, capital is used more intensively in this period.[13] In other words, in order to produce a given amount of total services, a substitution away from capital and into utilization takes place. A higher initial capital stock with a contracting economy yields completely symmetric results.

It is now straightforward to analyze the effects of sudden changes in the capital stock, such as a destruction of a portion $\boldsymbol{D}k$ [14], given that the system is initially resting at its long run steady state ($k^*, p^*$). At the time of the "shock", consumption falls and remains at that level from this time onwards. This is caused by a permanent reduction in the present value of net domestic output caused by the destruction of capital.[15]

Note that a variable utilization rate will cause the initial rise in $p$, and hence in $I$, to be smaller in magnitude when compared to the fixed $s$ and $\boldsymbol{d}$ case due to the flatter saddle path. If the cost of investing is expected to fall in the future, a variable utilization rate of capital allows agents to postpone investment. Individuals may initially invest less than they would be able to without a variable utilization rate, offsetting their present lower capital stock with a higher utilization rate. Furthermore, the convergence towards the steady state takes place at a slower rate when flexibility in the choice of $s$ exists, in other words, there is more persistence in the "shock". This observation is important since convergence in this type of model is generally associated with long term trend rather than transition in the short run.

To determine the effect that the sudden loss of capital has on total services, note that the time derivative of total services is $\dot{S} = s\dot{k} + \dot{s}k$, and by (6) we have $\dot{s} = s_k\dot{k} + s_p\dot{p}$, combining these two expressions we derive

$$\dot{S} = (s + ks_k)\dot{k} + ks_p\dot{p} \,. \tag{13}$$

It is not difficult to check that for t > 0 expression (13) is positive so that at t =0, total services $S$ must fall and then increase back to their original level. As in the case of investment, flexibility has the effect of dampening the initial shock - a fall in this case - on total services and thus on output, by increasing unit services (*s*). Figures 2 through 5 depict the above considerations.

## 3.  SOME SIMULATIONS

In order to further examine what a variable utilization rate of capital contributes to the model, we proceed to do a numerical simulation for various values of the parameters. In each case  two systems are considered: one with a variable and the other one with a fixed utilization rate; furthermore, both systems converge to the same steady state. The following specific functional forms and values of the parameters are used throughout:

$$f(sk) = (sk)^{a} \tag{14}$$

$$\boldsymbol{d}(s) = \boldsymbol{d}_0 + s^{\boldsymbol{b}} \tag{15}$$

$$h(I) = bI \tag{16}$$

$r = 0.06$;  $\boldsymbol{d}_0 = 0.01$; the other parameters will vary as specified in tables 1 through 6. As usual, the speed of convergence towards the steady state is given by the magnitude of the negative eigenvalue of  the matrix in (9´).

Each of the tables corresponds to a given value of the exponent $\boldsymbol{b}$ in (15), the greater the values of  $\boldsymbol{b}$, the more the system resembles the usual fixed utilization rate case. Two values of  the exponent $\boldsymbol{a}$  are considered: 0.3 and 0.75; these represent the share of total services of capital in gross output. The two possible values are justified in Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1995) depending on the concept of capital that one is using. the 0.3 value corresponds to a narrow concept of capital as plant and equipment and the higher 0.75 corresponds to a wider concept that includes human as well as physical capital.[16] The coefficient $b$ in equation (16) is varied from 1 to 5 in order to account for different levels of adjustment costs. In each table, the values indicated by $\boldsymbol{d}$*, $p$* and $k$* represent the steady state values and  the last two columns give respectively the convergence values, $\boldsymbol{l}_v$ and  $\boldsymbol{l}_f$ for  variable and fixed utilization rate $s$.

Blanchard, Changyong and Lawrence (1993)  estimate the value of  $p$ to be in the neighborhood of 1.5. Barro and Sala -i- Martin (1995) mention that higher values of $p$ may be plausible when we adopt the wider definition of capital; the reason being that human capital may have a very high adjustment cost. In our simulations the parameter $b$  takes values from 1 to 5 in order to obtain different rates of convergence. The value of $p$* is dependent on $b$, and in most cases it stays within *reasonable* ranges. The difference between rates of convergence goes from a striking 10%-18% in table 1 to a negligible 0.1%-0.5% in table 3. This is to be expected since as the parameter $a$ takes higher values, the models differ less from each other.

Lower convergence rates assign more importance to the transitional dynamics; furthermore, in a discretized version of the model where uncertainty is explicitly introduced, a lower rate of convergence would be related to  higher *persistence* of the various shocks. Licandro and Puch (1996) recognize the importance of a variable utilization rate of capital as a persistence factor of aggregate shocks.

## 4.  THE RESPONSE TO A TRANSITORY CHANGE IN THE INTEREST RATE

In order to illustrate the difference in response to parameter changes that a variable utilization rate may bring about, we look at changes in the exogenously given real interest rate. Starting from an initial long run equilibrium, assume that at time $t = 0$  there is an unanticipated fall in the constant real interest rate, expected to end at a future known time $t = \boldsymbol{t}$ .[17]

The depiction in a phase diagram would be straightforward. The locus  $\dot{k} = 0$  is not affected and the locus  $\dot{p} = 0$ temporarily moves upwards. We carry out a simulation where the initial (and final) real interest rate is assumed to be 0.06, with a transitory fall to 0.04 lasting ten periods.

Figures 6 through 9  show the comparative behavior of the various magnitudes for the case of variable intensity of use, and for the case of a fixed intensity of use equal to the initial equilibrium value.

Figures 6  and 9 show the behavior of the price and the stock of capital respectively. The first obvious observation is that flexibility brings about both a wider fluctuation and longer persistence in both of these quantities. The effects on the price of capital are traced by the changes in gross investment. These are reflected also in the behavior of net investment, except that they are importantly magnified due to what happens to the rate of depreciation during the transition. This becomes clear in  figure 7.  Finally, the net

real interest rate, $r - \hat{p}$, which is at all times the determinant of the utilization rate follows a path similar to it. A graph for the rate of depreciation, not shown here, would also trace the path of the rate of utilization.

The two most important conclusions, though, are reflected in the graph of figure 8. Flexibility in the choice of utilization causes output to drop due to the initial fall in intensity of use; thus, a fall in the interest rate turns out to be initially contractionary. The conventional wisdom of an expansionary effect of a fall in the rate of interest is reflected for the case in which intensity of use and depreciation are fixed: during the interim period for which the interest rate is lower, output is always higher. When flexibility in the choice of utilization is assumed, this is hardly the case; rather, the effect is initially in the opposite direction, and of comparatively much larger magnitude. Of course, the expansionary effect on investment is not only preserved, but also augmented.

We should note that this result is not the consequence of the fall in the interest rate being transitory. Simulations for the case of a permanent change show the same qualitative results for the initial effects.[18]

## 5. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In the previous sections, we showed the importance of taking into consideration the pure user cost of capital at the general equilibrium level. We extended two previous models (Auernheimer (1986) and Calvo (1975)), in order to obtain an optimality condition for the utilization rate of the capital stock, or equivalently, for an optimal depreciation rate. The optimal level of services per unit of capital, turned out to be determined, at each point in time, exclusively by the net real interest rate. Another conclusion of our model is that flexibility in the utilization of capital, reduces the speed of convergence towards the steady state and the slope of the saddle path. This induces more persistence in reaction to changes in the parameters and an ambiguous effect on the magnitude or amplitude of the change .

When we analyze the effect of a temporary fall in the exogenous interest rate, a tentative initial conclusion is that flexibility in the intensity of use of the capital stock increases both the amplitude and persistence of the response to the change. A more definite, and somehow striking conclusion, is the initial "contractionary" effect on output of a fall in the interest rate. Once the incentive to economize on the use of "services per unit of capital" (*vis-à-vis* the use of "units of capital") in the production of total capital services is taken into consideration, the conclusion seems less striking.

In this work we did not attempt to model the labor market explicitly; nonetheless, it would be interesting to do so, in order to analyze how the variable utilization rate affects the response of labor hours to various shocks. The high volatility of total hours worked and the absence of a high correlation between hours worked and average labor productivity, have constituted a puzzle within the real business cycle models. Ambler and Paquet (1994), attempted to solve this problem by assuming a stochastic rate of depreciation. We believe our model could also be suited to gain some insights concerning this puzzle.

The importance of a variable rate of services for capital as a propagation mechanism in business cycles, was pointed out previously in Greenwood, Hercowitz and Huffman (1988). Our model may be interpreted as a continuous time, open economy and deterministic version of their work.[19]
DeJong, Ingram and Whiteman (1995) and DeJong, Ingram, Wen and Whiteman (1996) argue that a variable utilization rate of capital serves to characterize the properties of the US business cycle. What we saw here is that a variable utilization rate is not only just a propagation mechanism for certain *shocks*, but it also affects their persistence and magnitude.

## 6. TABLES AND FIGURES

Saddle Path



**Figure 1**

## Capital Stock



Flexible   Rigid

**Figure 2**

## Utilization Rate



**Figure 3**

## Output



Flexible   Rigid

**Figure 4**

## Price of Capital



Flexible   Rigid

**Figure 5**

## Price of Capital



Flexible   Fixed

**Figure 6**

## Utilization Rate



**Figure 7**

**Figure 8**



**Figure 9**

Table 1
(β = 1.25)

| b | α | δ* | p* | k* | λ_v | λ_f |
|---|------|------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| 1 | 0.75 | 0.21 | 1.273 | 0.649 | -0.219 | -0.318 |
| 2 | 0.75 | 0.21 | 1.387 | 0.460 | -0.204 | -0.296 |
| 3 | 0.75 | 0.21 | 1.465 | 0.369 | -0.197 | -0.287 |
| 4 | 0.75 | 0.21 | 1.527 | 0.313 | -0.194 | -0.282 |
| 5 | 0.75 | 0.21 | 1.577 | 0.275 | -0.191 | -0.278 |
| 1 | 0.3  | 0.21 | 1.233 | 0.554 | -0.236 | -0.477 |
| 2 | 0.3  | 0.21 | 1.391 | 0.466 | -0.200 | -0.408 |
| 3 | 0.3  | 0.21 | 1.518 | 0.411 | -0.186 | -0.380 |
| 4 | 0.3  | 0.21 | 1.627 | 0.373 | -0.178 | -0.365 |
| 5 | 0.3  | 0.21 | 1.722 | 0.344 | -0.173 | -0.355 |

Table 2
(β = 2)

| b | α | δ* | p* | k* | λ_v | λ_f |
|---|------|------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| 1 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 1.619 | 5.155 | -0.071 | -0.082 |
| 2 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 1.803 | 3.346 | -0.069 | -0.079 |
| 3 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 1.926 | 2.572 | -0.068 | -0.078 |
| 4 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 2.020 | 2.125 | -0.067 | -0.077 |
| 5 | 0.75 | 0.06 | 2.097 | 1.829 | -0.067 | -0.076 |
| 1 | 0.3  | 0.06 | 1.227 | 1.888 | -0.112 | -0.151 |
| 2 | 0.3  | 0.06 | 1.382 | 1.592 | -0.093 | -0.127 |
| 3 | 0.3  | 0.06 | 1.507 | 1.408 | -0.086 | -0.117 |
| 4 | 0.3  | 0.06 | 1.613 | 1.277 | -0.082 | -0.112 |
| 5 | 0.3  | 0.06 | 1.707 | 1.178 | -0.079 | -0.109 |

Table 3
(β = 5)

| b | α | δ* | p* | k* | λ_v | λ_f |
|---|------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1 | 0.75 | 0.023 | 2.562 | 34.713 | -0.028 | -0.029 |
| 2 | 0.75 | 0.023 | 2.900 | 21.121 | -0.028 | -0.029 |
| 3 | 0.75 | 0.023 | 3.123 | 15.726 | -0.027 | -0.028 |
| 4 | 0.75 | 0.023 | 3.292 | 12.734 | -0.027 | -0.028 |
| 5 | 0.75 | 0.023 | 3.430 | 10.802 | -0.027 | -0.028 |
| 1 | 0.3  | 0.023 | 1.219 | 4.867  | -0.059 | -0.065 |
| 2 | 0.3  | 0.023 | 1.370 | 4.117  | -0.049 | -0.054 |
| 3 | 0.3  | 0.023 | 1.492 | 3.646  | -0.044 | -0.049 |
| 4 | 0.3  | 0.023 | 1.596 | 3.311  | -0.042 | -0.047 |
| 5 | 0.3  | 0.023 | 1.688 | 3.057  | -0.040 | -0.045 |

**ENDNOTES**

[1] There is a second strand of the literature related to the choice of an optimal depreciation rate, developed independently despite addressing the same problem. This is related to the case in which depreciation is "embodied" in the capital good at the time at which it is produced. The depreciation rate is then interpreted as a measure of durability or "quality" . In this case, both the cost of production and the market price of the good are decreasing functions of the depreciation rate and it is up to the producer to choose the optimal depreciation rate. The question has been studied in the literature on "consumer durable" goods, in particular after an important paper by Swan (1970) showing that optimal durability is independent of demand considerations and ultimately determined by the real interest rate. Auernheimer and Saving (1977) extend Swan's result to a more general setup, in which the firm is subject to adjustment costs.

[2] As mentioned before, this can be an alternative form of capital, producing output with a linear technology, or a foreign asset yielding a constant rate of interest. We will from here on refer to the second possibility, with the proviso

that such an asset can be negative *i.e., debt(. This means, of course, that consumption goods may be exported or imported.

[3] See, for example, Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1994).

[4] Johnson (1994), assumes a more general form for total services, specifically: $S=g(s)k$, where the function $g$ satisfies $g(0)=0$, $g'>0$ and $g''\leq0$. This generalization will not add any new insight though, so in order to economize on notation we assume $g(s)=s$ as is commonly done in the literature.

[5] We may equivalently assume that $s$ is an index of capacity utilization so that $0 \leq s \leq 1$.

[6] We could have defined alternatively a *total investment cost* function $C(I)=I[1+h(I)]$.

[7] Notice that since adjustment costs depend on gross investment then, even in the long run steady state, the price of capital will be different from unity.

[8] If $k$ is thought as a composite of physical and human capital, one could argue that the adjustment cost for investment are particularly important for human capital due to the process of education. For more details on this argument see Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1995).

[9] The assumption $r = r$ may be justified by assuming that the rest of the world is in equilibrium so that the real interest rate is equal to the rest of the world's consumers time preference rate. Individuals in our country are presumed to be no different than their foreign peers yielding $r = r$. There are certain problems associated with the other two possibilities. If $r > r$, individuals in this country are more impatient than those in the rest of the world; therefore, they mortgage all their capital and labor income in order to increase their present consumption driving their future consumption towards zero. In order to avoid this outcome, an international credit constraint on the country may be imposed. If $r < r$, the country is more patient than the rest of the world and will asymptotically accumulate all of the world's assets, once this happens, the "small country" assumption is untenable and the world real interest rate $r$ cannot be assumed to be an exogenous constant. This issue is one of the problems of applying the Ramsey model to the open economy and it is throughly discussed in Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1995).

[10] This condition would have to be replaced by $\dot{I}_1 = I_1(r-r)$ when $r \neq r$.

[11] In this sense, an alternative but equivalent interpretation of the model is the existence of a competitive industry, earning zero profits, dedicated to the "production" of capital goods using the consumption good as an input, with a cost of production given by $h(I)$.

[12] Condition (11) is equivalent to that obtained in Auernheimer (1986) for the optimal depreciation rate in the industry. It is also equivalent to the condition derived in Swan (1970) for the case of an optimal embedded

depreciation rate for durable consumer goods. Johnson (1994), gives the following interpretation of the expression $sd'- d$: Given a fixed quantity of total services ($\overline{S}$), we have that $\left.\dfrac{d(dk)}{dk}\right|_{sk=\overline{S}} = d - sd'$. The first part of this expression represents the increase in total depreciation ($dk$) due to the marginal unit of capital, the second is the reduction in depreciation of the total capital stock due to a lower utilization rate. Thus, $sd'-d$ represents the return of the marginal unit of capital measured in depreciation savings.

[13] If $k$ is thought of as an inventory of final goods, increased depreciation during the adjustment amounts to faster liquidation of the inventory caused by the falling price of $k$.

[14] This is the typical "earthquake effect".

[15] The fall in consumption is a direct consequence of the open economy assumption. In the absence of the term $ar$ in budget constraint (2), consumption is at all times equal to net output and must eventually return to its original level.

[16] When capital is used in the wide sense to include human capital, one has to be careful with the interpretation of services ($s$). In ancient times there was a close analogy between physical and human capital, the intensity of use approach applied to both kinds of capital and the cost was borne by physical depreciation of either machines or human beings. Nowadays the analogy is not so clear since most jobs do not require individuals to exert themselves in a physical way. In our model, labor is supplied inelastically and leisure does not enter the utility function; thus, using labor more intensively does not correspond to more hours worked. One may think, though, of assigning the worker with a *harder* job, one involving more responsibilities. The depreciation comes about because the individual will likely be more stressed bringing about the usual health problems.

[17] Notice that we have assumed at the outset that $r = r$, i.e., that the interest rate is equal to the rate of time preference. If for some time $r < r$, then during that interval consumption will fall. Although the analysis of the behavior on the production side (the capital stock, its price, investment and intensity of use) is not affected, we assume in this experiment that the initial level of foreign assets is sufficiently large so that no solvency condition is violated.

[18] The analysis of a permanent fall in the interest rate, starting from an initial benchmark case of the rates of interest and time preference being equal, presents the problem of consumption permanently falling. As mentioned before one could introduce bounds on international borrowing to avoid this. We could also have started from a situation for which $r > r$, with a level of consumption and assets rising forever but then the assumption of a "small country" runs into trouble.

[19] In order to obtain similar results, we would have to assume a temporary shock on the adjustment cost function *h(I)*. This has the effect of , say, reducing the marginal cost of investment and hence increasing the marginal efficiency of investment. Greenwood , Hercowitz and Huffman (1988) achieve this by way of a shock to the marginal productivity of investment.

## APPENDIX

Here, we include a proof of the effect of flexibility upon the saddle path.

Let *D* be the determinant of the system matrix in (9') when there is no flexibility, the negative eigenvalue (*m*) is then given by

$$m = \frac{-r - \sqrt{r^2 - 4D}}{2} \qquad (A1)$$

and the slope (*m*) of the saddle path is

$$m = \frac{-s^2 f''}{m - (r + d)} . \qquad (A2)$$

On the other hand when flexibility in the choice of *s* is introduced, the negative eigenvalue and the slope of the saddle path are given respectively by

$$\overline{m} = \frac{-r - \sqrt{r^2 - 4AD}}{2} \qquad (A1')$$

and

$$\overline{m} = \frac{-s^2 f''}{\overline{m}/A - (r + d)} , \qquad (A2')$$

where $A \equiv \frac{p d''}{p d'' - k f''} < 1$, and *D* is the same determinant as above. It is not hard to check that $\frac{|\overline{m}|}{A} > |m| > |\overline{m}|$, and hence $|m| > |\overline{m}|$; this entails a lower speed of adjustment towards the steady state and a "flatter" saddle path when flexibility is introduced.

## REFERENCES

Abel, A. 1982 Dynamic Effects of permanent and temporary tax policies in a q Model of Investment. Journal of Monetary Economic*s*, 9, 1982: 353-73.

Ambler, S., and A. Paquet. 1994. Stochastic Depreciation and the Business Cycle. International Economic Review, 35, 1, 1994: 101-16.

Arrow, K.J. 1968. Optimal Capital Policy with Irreversible Investment. In Value Capital and Growth, Papers in Honour of Sir John Hicks, ed. J. N. Wolfe, Edinburgh: Edinburgh U. Press.

Auernheimer, L. 1986. Variable Depreciation and Some of its Implications. Canadian Journal of Economics, 9, February 1986: 99-113.

_____and Saving, T. 1977. Market Organization and the Durability of Durable Goods. Econometrica, 45,1, 1977: 219-28.

Barro, R. J. 1991. Economic Growth in a Cross-Section of Countries. Quarterly Journal of Economics,106, May 1991: 407-445.

_____ and Sala-i-Martin, X. 1992. Convergence. Journal of Political Economy, 100, 1992: 223-251.

_____ and Sala-i-Martin, X. 1994. Economic Growth. McGraw Hill.

Bischoff, C.W. and Kokkelenberg, E.C. 1987. Capacity Utilization and Depreciation in Use. Applied Economics, 19, August 1987: 995-1007.

Blanchard, O.R., Changyong and Summers, L. 1993. The stock Market, Profit and Investment. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 108, 1, 1993: 115-136.

Burnside, C., Eichenbaum, M., and Rebelo, S. 1995. Capital Utilization and Returns to Scale. Macroeconomics Annual, NBER 1995*:* 67-110.

Calvo, G.A. 1975. Efficient and Optimal Utilization of Capital Services. American Economic Review, 65, March 1975: 181-186.

DeJong, D., Ingram, B. and Whiteman, C. 1995. Keynes vs. Prescott and Solow: Identifying Sources of Business Cycles Fluctuations. *Working Paper*, March, 1995.

Diewert, E. 1978. Walras' Theory of Capital Formation and the Existence of a Temporary Equilibrium. In <u>Equilibrium and Disequilibrium in Economic Theory.</u> ed. G. Schwodiaver. Dordrecht: D. Reidel.

Eisner, R. E. and Strotz, R. 1963. Determinants of Business Investment. In <u>Impacts of Monetary Policy</u>, New Jersey: Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall.

Gould, J. P. 1968. Adjustment Costs in the Theory of Investment of the Firm. <u>Review of Economic Studie</u>s, 1968: 47-55.

Greenwood, J., Hercowitz, Z. and Huffman, G. 1988. Investment, Capacity Utilization and the Real Business Cycle. <u>American Economic Review</u>, 78, June 1988: 402-417

Johnson, P.A., 1994. Capital Utilization and Investment, When Capital Depreciates in Use: Some Implications and Tests. <u>Journal of Macroeconomics</u>, 16, 2, Spring 1994: 243-259.

Keynes, J.M. 1936<u>. The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money</u>. London: Macmillan.

Licandro, O. and Puch, L. 1996. Capital Utilization, Maintenance Costs and the Business Cycle. *Working Paper,* Universidad Carlos III de Madrid and Fedea, April 1996.

Lucas, R. 1967. Optimal Investment Policy and the Flexible Accelerator. <u>International Economic Review,</u> 8, February 1967: 78-85.

Marshall, A. 1922. <u>Principles of Economics.</u> London: Macmillan.

Swan, P.L. 1970. Durability of Consumption Goods. <u>American Economic Review</u>, 50, Dec 1970: 884-894.

Taubman, P. and Wilkinson, M. 1970. User Cost, Capital Utilization and Investment Theory. <u>International Economic Review</u>, 11, June 1970: 109-115.

### ENDNOTES

[1] There is a second strand of the literature related to the choice of an optimal depreciation rate, developed independently despite addressing the same problem. This is related to the case in which depreciation is "embodied" in the capital good at the time at which it is produced. The depreciation rate is then interpreted as a measure of durability or "quality" . In this case, both the cost of production and the market price of the good are decreasing functions of the depreciation rate and it is up to the producer to choose the optimal depreciation rate. The question has been studied in the literature on "consumer durable" goods, in particular after an important paper by Swan (1970) showing that optimal durability is independent of demand considerations and ultimately determined by the real interest rate. Auernheimer and Saving (1977) extend Swan's result to a more general setup, in which the firm is subject to adjustment costs.

[2] As mentioned before, this can be an alternative form of capital, producing output with a linear technology, or a foreign asset yielding a constant rate of interest. We will from here on refer to the second possibility, with the proviso that such an asset can be negative *i.e., debt(. This means, of course, that consumption goods may be exported or imported.

[3] See, for example, Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1994).

[4] Johnson (1994), assumes a more general form for total services, specifically: $S=g(s)k$, where the function $g$ satisfies $g(0)=0$, $g'>0$ and $g''\leq 0$. This generalization will not add any new insight though, so in order to economize on notation we assume $g(s)=s$ as is commonly done in the literature.

[5] We may equivalently assume that $s$ is an index of capacity utilization so that $0 \leq s \leq 1$.

[6] We could have defined alternatively a *total investment cost* function $C(I)=I[1+h(I)]$.

[7] Notice that since adjustment costs depend on gross investment then, even in the long run steady state, the price of capital will be different from unity.

[8] If $k$ is thought as a composite of physical and human capital, one could argue that the adjustment cost for investment are particularly important for human capital due to the process of education. For more details on this argument see Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1995).

[9] The assumption $r = r$ may be justified by assuming that the rest of the world is in equilibrium so that the real interest rate is equal to the rest of the world's consumers time preference rate. Individuals in our country are presumed to be no different than their foreign peers yielding $r = r$. There are certain problems associated with the other two possibilities. If $r > r$, individuals in this country are more impatient than those in the rest of the world; therefore, they mortgage all their capital and labor income in order to increase their present consumption driving their future consumption towards zero. In order to avoid this outcome, an international credit constraint on the country may be imposed. If $r < r$, the country is more patient than the rest of the world and will asymptotically accumulate all of the world's assets, once this happens, the "small country" assumption is untenable and the world real interest rate $r$ cannot be assumed to be an exogenous constant. This issue is one of the problems of applying the Ramsey model to the open economy and it is throughly discussed in Barro and Sala-i-Martin (1995).

[10] This condition would have to be replaced by
$$l_1 = l_1(r - r) \text{ when } r \neq r.$$

[11] In this sense, an alternative but equivalent interpretation of the model is the existence of a competitive industry, earning zero profits, dedicated to the "production" of capital goods using the consumption good as an input, with a cost of production given by $h(I)$.

[12] Condition (12) is equivalent to that obtained in Auernheimer (1986) for the optimal depreciation rate in the industry. It is also equivalent to the condition derived in Swan (1970) for the case of an optimal embedded depreciation rate for durable consumer goods. Johnson (1994), gives the following interpretation of the expression $sd' - d$: Given a fixed quantity of total services ($\bar{S}$), we have that $\left.\dfrac{d(dk)}{dk}\right|_{sk=\bar{S}} = d - sd'$. The first part of this expression represents the increase in total depreciation ($dk$) due to the marginal unit of capital, the second is the

reduction in depreciation of the total capital stock due to a lower utilization rate. Thus, $sd'$-$d$ represents the return of the marginal unit of capital measured in depreciation savings.

[13] If $k$ is thought of as an inventory of final goods, increased depreciation during the adjustment amounts to faster liquidation of the inventory caused by the falling price of $k$.

[14] This is the typical "earthquake effect".

[15] The fall in consumption is a direct consequence of the open economy assumption. In the absence of the term $ar$ in budget constraint (2), consumption is at all times equal to net output and must eventually return to its original level.

[16] When capital is used in the wide sense to include human capital, one has to be careful with the interpretation of services ($s$). In ancient times there was a close analogy between physical and human capital, the intensity of use approach applied to both kinds of capital and the cost was borne by physical depreciation of either machines or human beings. Nowadays the analogy is not so clear since most jobs do not require individuals to exert themselves in a physical way. In our model, labor is supplied inelastically and leisure does not enter the utility function; thus, using labor more intensively does not correspond to more hours worked. One may think, though, of assigning the worker with a *harder* job, one involving more responsibilities. The depreciation comes about because the individual will likely be more stressed bringing about the usual health problems.

[17] Notice that we have assumed at the outset that $r = r$, i.e., that the interest rate is equal to the rate of time preference. If for some time $r < r$, then during that interval consumption will fall. Although the analysis of the behavior on the production side (the capital stock, its price, investment and intensity of use) is not affected, we assume in this experiment that the initial level of foreign assets is sufficiently large so that no solvency condition is violated.

[18] The analysis of a permanent fall in the interest rate, starting from an initial benchmark case of the rates of interest and time preference being equal, presents the problem of consumption permanently falling. As mentioned before one could introduce bounds on international borrowing to avoid this. We could also have started from a situation for which $r > r$, with a level of consumption and assets rising forever but then the assumption of a "small country" runs into trouble.

[19] In order to obtain similar results, we would have to assume a temporary shock on the adjustment cost function $h(I)$. This has the effect of, say, reducing the marginal cost of investment and hence increasing the marginal efficiency of investment. Greenwood, Hercowitz and Huffman (1988) achieve this by way of a shock to the marginal productivity of investment.