

On the Welfare and Distributional Implications of International Financial Integration*

António Antunes[†] Tiago Cavalcanti[‡]

February, 2009

Abstract

International financial integration has been a controversial issue among researchers and policy makers. From a simple (theoretical) growth argument, however, for a given level and growth rate of TFP, international financial integration enables capital-scarce countries to raise capital inflows with positive effects on investment and on the speed of convergence, by reducing the cost of capital. It also benefits capital abundant countries by allocating their savings into more productive investment. In an important exercise, Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006) show in a standard neoclassical growth model that financial openness increases the speed of convergence towards the steady-state with a positive effect on domestic welfare. Such benefits, however, seem to be limited. We use the same model as in Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006), but we consider an economy with incomplete markets. We show that the introduction of uninsurable idiosyncratic risks on labor productivity boosts aggregate welfare effects. For an economy with the average capital to output ratio, welfare increases by at least a factor of 5 compared to the complete markets Arrow-Debreu economy. In addition, the average welfare gain hides important distributional implications: savers have a vested interest on capital

*We thank Albert Marcet and Tom Krebs for helpful conversation. We are responsible for any remaining error.

[†]Departamento de Estudos Económicos, Banco de Portugal. Email: antunesaa@gmail.com.

[‡]Faculty of Economics, University of Cambridge. Email: tvdvc2@cam.ac.uk.

market closeness, while borrowers might have large welfare gains from international financial integration. For capital scarce economies, the openness of the capital market decreases the interest rate. This decreases borrowing costs and loosens borrowing limits with positive effects on the welfare of borrowers. Lenders can also benefit of such reform, since they with positive probability might face persistent bad shocks on their labor productivity. However, interest income will decrease affecting negatively lenders welfare.

JEL Classification: E21; E60; F30

Keywords: Financial integration; Welfare; Distribution

1 Introduction

As emphasized by Kose, Prasad, Rogoff, and Wei (2006) the merits and effects of financial globalization have generated a passionate debate among researchers and policy makers. The empirical literature, based on cross country regressions, finds that financial liberalization is not a sufficient condition for rapid economic growth. There are other important factors that are key for growth and financial integration *per se* does not deliver a higher rate of economic growth.¹ This is not very surprising since other factors such those (e.g., institutions) that affect total factor productivity (TFP) are key to explain economic growth. In a recent paper, Gupta and Yuan (2008) show using a firm level panel data that liberalization reduces financing constraints, and industries that are more externally dependent and face better growth opportunities grow faster following capital market liberalization.²

From a simple (theoretical) growth perspective, however, for a given level and

¹See Kose, Prasad, Rogoff, and Wei (2006) for a review of the literature on growth and financial openness. See also the arguments emphasized by Lucas (1990).

²They show that the growth impact of stock market liberalization is larger if it is accompanied by competition enhancing reforms, such as price liberalization and reduction in entry barriers.

growth rate of TFP, international financial integration enables capital-scarce countries to raise capital inflows with positive effects on investment and on the speed of convergence, by reducing the cost of capital. It also benefits capital abundant countries by allocating their savings into more productive investment.³ In an important exercise, Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006) show in a standard neoclassical growth model that financial openness increases the speed of convergence towards the steady-state with a positive effect on domestic welfare. Such benefits, however, seem to be limited.⁴ They posit that: “*For the typical non-OECD country, the welfare gain from switching from complete financial autarky to perfect capital mobility is equivalent to a permanent increase in consumption of about 1%.*” According to them, international financial integration would lead to important quantitative effects only if it can “import” foreign productivity (if it increases total factor productivity (TFP)).

In this paper, we follow Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006) and investigate the quantitative welfare implications of international financial integration in a neoclassical growth model. The only difference from our model to the the deterministic neoclassical growth model studied by Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006) is that households in our framework face uninsurable idiosyncratic shocks on their labor productivity and there are borrowing constraints.⁵ There is no aggregate uncertainty in our framework, but

³There is also a literature on financial integration and output volatility (see Kose, Prasad, Rogoff, and Wei (2006) for a review of this literature). The theoretical literature shows that financial integration might allow poor countries to diversify their narrow production bases and therefore reduce macroeconomic volatility. However, it can increase specialization in open middle income countries, increasing output volatility. Financial integration could also expose countries to world interest rate shocks. We will abstract from the effects of financial integration and output volatility and will emphasize its role on output converge and consumption smoothness.

⁴They also show that results are robust to the introduction of human capital and others robustness exercises.

⁵We consider both a Kehoe and Levine (1993) endogenous borrowing constraint and an Aiyagari

households trade intertemporally among each other. As in the deterministic growth model, openness in the capital market allows agents to borrow (at lower cost) in international markets to anticipate future increases in labor productivity. However, when agents face idiosyncratic shocks on their labor productivity there is also an additional reason for agents to engage in intertemporal trade. Given the economy wide average productivity and its trend, some households might be experiencing good shocks while others might be facing bad shocks. The latter might need to borrow to insure smooth consumption. The integration of the economy to international capital markets decreases borrowing costs in capital scarce countries and allows current borrowers to increase their consumption possibility frontier. Lower interest rates make loose borrowing constraint with also positive welfare effects on borrowers. The two effects might even increase the value function of current savers, since with positive probability they may need to borrow in the future due to the possibility of them to face negative labor productivity shocks. However, with a lower interest rate rich agents will also be affected negatively, since interest income will be lower.

We show that the introduction of uninsurable idiosyncratic risks on labor productivity boosts aggregate welfare effects. For an economy with the average capital to output ratio, welfare increases by at least a factor of 5 compared to the complete markets Arrow-Debreu economy. In addition, savers have a vested interest on capital market closeness, while borrowers might have large welfare gains from international financial integration. Current savers have an average welfare loss of about 5 percent of their consumption equivalent to the baseline level and borrowers have an average welfare gain of 12 percent.

There is a vast literature on the welfare implications of financial integration. Most of this literature focuses on how financial integration might lead to risk sharing among

(1994) natural borrowing limit.

countries and evaluate the benefits of cross countries risk sharing. Interestingly, Athanasoulis and van Wincoop (2000) find large benefits from risksharing. The gain for a 35-year horizon, corresponding to a welfare equivalent permanent increase in consumption, is 6.6 percent when based on a set of 49 countries. Recently, Townsend and Ueda (2009) analysis how capital market openness can affect financial deepening (in a similar way to Greenwood and Jovanovic (1990), and Acemoglu and Zilibotti (1997)) by reducing transaction costs. They also find large welfare effects. We emphasize different channels on how financial integration might affect welfare. We focus on two distinct channels: (i) the first one, which is similar to the one studied by Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006), corresponds on how financial integration allows capital scarce countries to grow faster towards the long run equilibrium; (ii) the other channel is how capital market openness affects the ability of households to insure against idiosyncratic risks, by decreasing borrowing costs and loosening borrowing limits. Both channels benefit the poor, but the second one decreases the welfare of the rich.⁶ Notice that there is no aggregate uncertainty in our model. We show that the second effect can generate large welfare effects of financial liberalization. We see our exercises as complementary to those implemented by Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006). In fact, they emphasize the importance to depart from the Arrow-Debreu

⁶Mendoza, Quadrini, and Ríos-Rull (2007) find the opposite. In their exercises, financial globalization hurts the poor in countries with less developed financial markets. In countries with depressed financial market, liberalization will increase borrowing costs and therefore producing distributional effects in opposite direction to others. In their model, the only difference among countries is the exogenous borrowing constraint. In a closed economy, countries with tighter borrowing constraints have lower interest rate. When these countries open their financial capital market, interest raises. In our model, borrowing constraints are either the endogenous or the natural one, and the only difference among countries are the level of capital scarcity. This explains the difference in our findings to theirs.

environment to evaluate the effects of international financial integration.⁷ We do this by considering an economy with incomplete markets.

The paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 describes the model economy and defines the competitive equilibrium. Section 3 describes the model calibration and contains policy experiments designed to evaluate the welfare effects of international financial integration. Section 4 concludes.

2 The model

The model economy is characterized by a standard neoclassical growth model based on Aiyagari (1994) of infinite-lived households who are *ex-ante* identical. Households, however, face idiosyncratic shocks on their labor productivity but there is no aggregate uncertainty. This allows us to study the effects of financial integration on welfare in a world where individuals use financial assets to smooth consumption not only over time, but also across different states. The production sector is represented by a technology that exhibits constant returns to scale. The produced good can be used for consumption or investment. Below we describe the economy in detail.

2.1 The production sector

At any time period t there is a production technology that converts capital, K_t , and efficient units of labor, $A_t L_t$, into output Y_t according to:

$$Y_t = K_t^\alpha (A_t L_t)^{1-\alpha}. \quad (1)$$

⁷Marcet and Marimon (1992) also investigate the welfare effects of capital market openness in a non Arrow-Debreu environment under enforcement, informational, and commitment problems. Depending on the friction considered, financial openness can also lead to large aggregate welfare implications.

Parameter $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ corresponds to the capital income share. Capital depreciates at rate $\delta \in (0, 1)$, and labor productivity, A_t , grows at rate $1 + g_t = \frac{A_{t+1}}{A_t}$. Households competitively rent units of efficient labor and capital to firms and input rental prices are given by their net marginal productivity:

$$w_t = (1 - \alpha)K_t^\alpha A_t^{1-\alpha} L_t^{-\alpha}, \quad (2)$$

$$r_t^K = \alpha K_t^{\alpha-1} (A_t L_t)^{1-\alpha}. \quad (3)$$

Because the production function is homogeneous of degree one, profits are zero, and firm ownership is unimportant. We therefore assume a representative firm.

2.2 The household sector

The economy is inhabited by a continuum of infinitely lived and *ex-ante* identical households with measure one. The household size, N_t , grows at exogenous rate $1 + n = \frac{N_{t+1}}{N_t}$. Each Household member supplies inelastically one unit of labor per period, and face idiosyncratic shocks on labor productivity. A household with shock z_t receives labor income $w_t N_t z_t$. We assume that z_t follows a finite state Markov process with support \mathcal{Z} and transition probability matrix $\mathcal{P}(z, z') = \Pr(z_{t+1} = z' | z_t = z)$. The Markov chain generating z_t has just one ergodic set, no transient states and no cyclically moving subsets. Each household has preferences defined over stochastic processes for consumption per household member, c_t , given by the following utility function:

$$E_0 \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \beta^t N_t u(c_t) \right], \quad \beta \in (0, 1). \quad (4)$$

The one-period utility function is represented by:

$$u(c) = \frac{c^{1-\sigma} - 1}{1 - \sigma}.$$

Households do not have access to state contingent contracts but can sell and buy financial assets in the form of a debt contract. At each period t households are distinguished by their labor productivity shock, z_t and asset holdings, a_t . Households' one-period budget constraint is given by:⁸

$$N_t c_t + a_{t+1} \leq (1 + r_t) a_t + w_t N_t z_t. \quad (5)$$

For robustness, we consider two types of borrowing limits: the natural borrowing limit and the endogenous borrowing limit. We study each case separately. As in Aiyagari (1994), we define the natural borrowing limit by the value such that in an agent's worst possible state interest payments are not higher than the agent's labor income. We also consider the endogenous borrowing limit, which makes debt contract incentive compatible. In this case, we follow Kehoe and Levine (1993) and assume that the penalty for those who default in their debt is the exclusion from future intertemporal trade and the borrowing limit is defined such that it is never in agents' best interest to default.

For computational purposes we transform variables in order to make the economic system into a stationary one. The transformations are standard: aggregate variables, Y and K , are divided by AN , and individual variables and factor prices that grow over time in the balanced growth path at the rate g , are divided by the technology level, A . Therefore, define:

$$\hat{Y} = \frac{Y}{AN}; \quad \hat{K} = \frac{K}{AN}; \quad \hat{c} = \frac{c}{A}; \quad \hat{a} = \frac{a}{AN}; \quad \hat{L} = \frac{L}{N}; \quad \hat{w} = \frac{w}{A}.$$

Define $\underline{\hat{a}}$ as the overall lower bound on assets per efficiency unit of labor which will be determined endogenously. We assume an upper bound on assets per efficiency unit of labor, $\bar{\hat{a}}$, such that if assets are larger than $\bar{\hat{a}}$ agents would choose to decrease asset

⁸Notice that $r_t = r_t^K - \delta$.

holding. Define $X = [\hat{a}, \hat{a}] \times \mathcal{Z}$ and let χ be the associated Borel σ -algebra. For each $B \in \chi$, $\lambda(B)$ corresponds to the mass of households whose individual state vectors lie in B . The agent's value function depends not only on the current idiosyncratic state and asset holding, but also on aggregate variables such as the wage and the interest rate, which are affected by the current measure λ_t . To compute such measure in the next period, the households need to know the current period's entire measure λ_t , and an aggregate law of motion, which we will call H , such that $\lambda_{t+1} = H(\lambda_t)$. We will define $H(\cdot)$ shortly. In order to use the standard notation in dynamic programming we denote future variables by superscript prime (e.g., $a_{t+1} = a'$).

Let \underline{z} be the agents' worst possible state. Then the natural borrowing limit is given by:

$$\hat{a}' \geq \hat{a}^{NB} = -\frac{1}{1+r_t} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\hat{w}_{t+j} \underline{z}}{\prod_{s=0}^j (1+r_{t+s})}.$$

In order to define the endogenous borrowing limit, it is necessary to calculate the utility under default. Recall that in case of default, households are excluded from intertemporal trade. Then, the value of the household problem under autarky is:

$$\underline{v}(z, \lambda) = u(\hat{w}z) + \beta E[\underline{v}(z', \lambda')|z],$$

where $\lambda' = H(\lambda)$.

The value function of a household with net worth \hat{a} and labor productivity z is defined by the following maximization problem:⁹

$$v(\hat{a}, z, \lambda) = \max_{\hat{a}'} \{u(\hat{a}(1+r) + \hat{w}z - (1+g)(1+n)\hat{a}') + \beta E[v(\hat{a}', z', \lambda')|z]\} \quad (6)$$

subject to either the natural borrowing limit

$$\hat{a}' \geq \hat{a}^{NB}, \quad (7)$$

⁹Here we used budget constraint (5) into the one-period utility function.

or the endogenous borrowing limit,

$$v(\hat{a}', z, \lambda) \geq \underline{v}(z, \lambda), \quad \forall z' \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (8)$$

and

$$\lambda' = H(\lambda). \quad (9)$$

Constraint (8) guarantees that agents will honor their promises and they will not default in their debt. Value function $v(\hat{a}, z, \lambda)$ is non-decreasing in a , therefore (8) defines a lower bound $\underline{\hat{a}}^{EB}$, such that $\hat{a}' \geq \underline{\hat{a}}^{EB}$.

2.3 Equilibrium

Let $x = (\hat{a}, z)$ be the individual state vector of a particular agent. The policy function associated with problem (6) is $\hat{a}' = h(x, \lambda)$. Given policy function $h(x, \lambda)$ we can compute $\hat{c} = h_{\hat{c}}(x, \lambda)$ using the budget constraint. Define $Q(x, \lambda, B; h)$ as the endogenous transition probability of the households' state vector. It describes the probability that a household with state $x = (\hat{a}, z)$ will have a state vector lying in B next period, given the current asset distribution λ and decision rule h . Therefore,

$$Q(x, \lambda, B; h) = \sum_{(h(x, \lambda), z') \in B} \mathcal{P}(z, z').$$

The aggregate law of motion implied by transition function Q is an object $T(\lambda, Q)$ that assigns a measure to each Borel set B . It can be computed as

$$T(\lambda, Q)(B) = \int_X Q(x, \lambda, B; h) d\lambda. \quad (10)$$

Note that $\lambda'(\cdot) = T(\lambda, Q)(\cdot)$.

Definition 1 *A **Recursive Competitive Equilibrium** for this economy consist of value function $v(\hat{a}, z, \lambda)$; policy functions $\hat{a}' = h(x, \lambda)$ and $\hat{c} = h_{\hat{c}}(x, \lambda)$; vector of prices (\hat{w}, r^K, r) ; and aggregate measure $H(\lambda)$, such that*

1. Given prices and aggregate measure $H(\lambda)$, policy function $\hat{a}' = h(x, \lambda)$ solves $v(\hat{a}, z, \lambda)$;
2. Factor prices are determined competitively: $\hat{w} = (1-\alpha)\hat{K}^\alpha\hat{L}^{-\alpha}$, $r^K = \alpha\hat{K}^{\alpha-1}\hat{L}^{1-\alpha}$; and $r = r^K - \delta$.
3. Markets clear:

$$\hat{L} = \int_X z d\lambda. \quad (11)$$

$$\int_X h(x, \lambda) d\lambda = \hat{K}' \quad (12)$$

$$\int_X h_{\hat{c}}(x, \lambda) d\lambda + (1+g)(1+n)\hat{K}' = \hat{K}^\alpha\hat{L}^{1-\alpha} + (1-\delta)\hat{K} \quad (13)$$

4. Distributions are consistent with individual behavior: $H(\lambda)$ coincides with $T(\lambda, Q)$.

Definition 2 A stationary equilibrium is an equilibrium where the probability measure λ is stationary, i.e., $\lambda(B) = T(\lambda, Q)(B)$ for all $B \in \chi$.

3 Quantitative experiments

The purpose of the quantitative analysis is to provide a numerical assessment of the welfare and distributional effects of financial integration. The quantitative exercises require us to calibrate the theoretical model. We must determine values for a set of parameters, which are related to (i) preferences, (ii) technology, and (iii) stochastic process on labor productivity. We calibrate parameter values such that they are consistent to the U.S. economy.

3.1 Calibration and benchmark economy

Below we describe how we set parameter values. The model period is taken to be one year.

Calibration: For comparison purpose, we set parameter values for technology, population growth, and labor productivity growth similar to those chosen by Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006). One important point is that interest rate is depressed relative to the deterministic neoclassical growth model because each household has an additional self-insurance (or precautionary) incentive to save. These additional savings increase the capital-labor ratio and reduce the equilibrium interest rate. Therefore, we decrease the value of the subjective discount factor β in order to make the interest rate of the model with idiosyncratic risks similar to the one defined by the deterministic model. Otherwise, the welfare differences in the two models might be driven by the distance of the initial and long run marginal productivity of capital, which will be larger in the model with ex-post heterogenous agents. Therefore, to make the numbers comparable we chose β such that the two models generate the same interest rate in the long run - for each capital to output ratio the distance to the steady-state will be identical, which is by assumption similar to the international interest rate.

For robustness, in appendix A, we also report the welfare implications of capital market integration when all parameters (including β) are identical to the calibration reported by Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006), except for the introduction of labor productivity shocks. This is also important since in the models with idiosyncratic shocks on labor productivity there is precautionary saving which implies that to generate the same interest rate in the long run, the value of β has to be smaller than in the deterministic case. When β decreases households value relative more the present than the future. Therefore, for those with a negative asset position capital market

integration can generate large welfare gains. As we show the two effects (distance to the steady-state and lower value of β) almost cancel each other. Table 1 contains the calibrated parameter values. It remains, however, to define the income labor process, since in their economy labor productivity is constant over time. We followed Krueger and Perri (2004). As in Aiyagari (1994), they use a finite approximation of an $AR(1)$ process:

$$\ln(z') = \rho \ln(z) + \epsilon, \quad \epsilon \sim iidN(0, \sigma_\epsilon^2). \quad (14)$$

They set $\rho = 0.989$, which is a value estimated by Storesletten, Telmer, and Yaron (2004). By allowing heterogeneity in the labor process, Guvenen (2008), however, estimated a significantly lower persistence for the $AR(1)$ process ($\rho = 0.82$). We set ρ to be equal to 0.9. Since not all difference on income comes from idiosyncratic shocks, Krueger and Perri (2004) regressed household earnings from the US Consumer Expenditure Survey data on age, race, sex, and education. They interpret the residuals as idiosyncratic shocks on labor productivity. Parameter σ_ϵ^2 was calibrated such that the cross-sectional variance of idiosyncratic household income is similar to the data, i.e., equal to 0.719.

Benchmark economy: Table 2 reports statistics for the US economy and model, under the two different borrowing constraints. The model with endogenous borrowing limit matches well the wealth Gini index. In the two types of borrowing constraint, the model has less earnings inequality than the data, but observe that not all inequality in the data comes from idiosyncratic shocks to labor productivity. Part is also due to differences in individual characteristics, such as schooling and experience.

When we evaluate the distribution of assets, table 2 shows that the model predictions for this distribution depend on the form of the borrowing limit. The first row of table 2 shows that in the data, the top 1 percent of households have 29.6 percent

Table 1: Parameter values, baseline economy. *Calibration 1:* values similar to those in Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006). *Calibration 2:* alternative calibration.

Parameters	Calibration	Comment/Observations
σ	1	Risk aversion coefficient
α	0.30	Capital income share
$\beta_{deterministic}$	0.96	Subjective discount factor
$\beta_{exclusion}$	0.954	Subjective discount factor
$\beta_{natural}$	0.95	Subjective discount factor
δ	0.06	Depreciation rate
g	0.012	Growth rate of labor productivity
n	0.0074	Population growth rate
ρ	0.9	Intermediate value from Storesletten et al (2004) and Guvenen (2008)
σ_{ϵ}^2	0.719	Cross-sectional variance of shocks based on Krueger and Perri (2004)

of all wealth. Under the borrowing constraint with permanent exclusion, the top 1 percent of households hold only 14 percent of total wealth and the bottom 20 percent have more negative wealth than in the data. This model misses the top and bottom tails of the distribution, but does a reasonable job in the middle.¹⁰ The model with a natural borrowing produces less inequality, but it still does not match the tail of the asset distribution.

3.2 Welfare

3.2.1 Model without idiosyncratic shocks on labor productivity

In the absence of labor productivity shocks, our economy is identical to the standard neoclassical growth model used by Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006) in their quantitative exercises. We therefore first replicate their main result. In this economy capital to output ratio in the long run is equal to 2.63 and the interest rate is equal to 5.42 percent. In order to focus on the impact of international financial integration on consumption smoothing, we assume that this number corresponds to the world interest rate.

We reproduce figure 1 in Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006). This figure presents the welfare gains¹¹ measured by the equivalent variation from international financial integration as a function of the initial capital to output ratio. The vertical line

¹⁰Quadrini and Ríos-Rull (1997) and Castañeda, Díaz-Giménez, and Ríos-Rull (2003) note that this is a common feature of neoclassical growth models with heterogeneous agents and uninsurable idiosyncratic shocks to earnings. Quadrini (2000), for instance, shows that entrepreneurs accumulate more assets because they face risk associated with business activities and higher returns on savings than workers. Therefore, entrepreneurs play an active role in shaping the wealth distribution.

¹¹As Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006), we calculate the consumption equivalent for the baseline economy and for the economy after the policy change.

Table 2: Selected statistics: US data and benchmark. Data for the US economy are from Castañeda, Díaz-Giménez, and Ríos-Rull (2003)

	Capital- output ratio	Wealth Gini (%)	Income Gini (%)	Percentage wealth				
				in the top			in the bottom	
				1%	5%	10%	20%	60%
US data	3.0	78	63	29.6	54.0	66	-0.39	7.1
Part I: $\sigma = 1$								
Deterministic model	2.63							
Model with idiosyncratic shocks (Endogenous)	2.63	76	44	14	51	80	-20	-31
Model with idiosyncratic shocks (Natural)	2.63	58	44	12	41	65	-10	-14
Part II: $\sigma = 2$								
Deterministic model	2.63							
Model with idiosyncratic shocks (Endogenous)	2.63	76	44	14	51	80	-20	-31
Model with idiosyncratic shocks (Natural)	2.63	58	44	12	41	65	-8	-4




Figure 1: Welfare gains from international financial integration and the capital to output ratio. The welfare measure corresponds to the equivalent variation. Solid black line: $\sigma = 1$. Dotted gray line: $\sigma = 2$.

corresponds to the long run level of the capital to output ratio. This figure shows that a country must have a very low capital to output ratio to significantly benefit from international financial integration. The capital–output ratio must fall below 1.29 for the gains from integration to exceed 2 percent of annual consumption. Using the Heston, Summers, and Aten (2006) Penn World Tables 6.2, we construct the capital

to output ratio for 157 non-OECD countries in 2000.¹² The average capital to output ratio for this sample is 1.47 and the population-weighted average is 1.91.

This analysis is important to show that welfare gains from international financial integration emphasized by standard growth arguments are not substantial. Our goal, however, is to: (i) investigate how welfare benefits change when we introduce individual risk but not aggregate uncertainty; and (ii) study the distributional implications from financial integration: who are the winners and losers of such reform?

3.2.2 Model with idiosyncratic shocks on labor productivity

As in the deterministic model, the economy with idiosyncratic shocks on labor productivity also implies that international financial integration raises capital inflows in capital-scarce countries. Capital inflows might increase the speed of convergence towards the long run equilibrium and allow households to better smooth consumption over time. With openness in the capital market, agents can borrow in international markets to anticipate future increases in labor productivity, a feature also present in the standard deterministic growth model.

When agents face idiosyncratic shocks on their labor productivity there is, however, an additional motive for agents to engage in intertemporal trade. Given the economy wide average productivity and its trend, some households might be experiencing good shock while others might be facing bad shocks. The latter might need

¹²In order to construct the capital to output ratio in 2000, we calculate:

$$\left(\frac{K}{Y}\right)_{2000} = \frac{\left(\frac{I}{Y}\right)_{2000}}{\delta + n + g},$$

where $\left(\frac{I}{Y}\right)_{2000}$ corresponds to the average investment rate from 1990 to 2000, $\delta = 0.06$, $g = 0.012$, and n is the average population growth from 1990 to 2000. See Klenow and Rodriguez-Clare (1997) for a similar approach. For some transition countries, because of data availability we use the average from 1995 to 2000.

to borrow to insure against such shocks. Therefore, in an economy in which households can trade intertemporally and face idiosyncratic shocks on labor productivity there is, in each point in time, a mass of agents with positive and negative net asset position. The integration of the economy to international capital markets decreases borrowing costs in capital scarce countries and allows current borrowers to increase their consumption possibility frontier. This certainly increases the welfare of such agents. In addition, borrowing constraints loose with lower interest rate (in both natural and endogenous borrowing limits). These two effects might even positively affect the welfare of current savers, since with positive probability they may need to borrow in the future due to the possibility of future bad labor productivity shocks. However, with a lower interest rate rich agents will also be affected negatively, since interest income will be lower.

Figure 2 displays a three dimensional graph of the welfare gains of decreasing intermediation costs from 3.9 to 1.¹³ The welfare gains are on the *z-axis*, while the *x-axis* and *y-axis* contain the capital to output ratio ($\frac{k}{y}$) and agent net worth (a), respectively.¹⁴ Quantitatively, agents with negative net asset position benefit from this policy, while welfare decreases for most current savers. Notice that the more scarce is capital in the economy the larger are the effects of openness of capital markets on welfare. For some households, the effects are sizeable. For a country with the observed average capital to output ratio (roughly 1.5), the welfare gains for some households with negative asset position can reach about 15 percent of their baseline consumption. While for households with positive net wealth, the welfare loss

¹³This figure reports the effects on welfare of international financial integration in a model with endogenous borrowing constraint (Kehoe and Levine (1993)). The shape of the figure is similar for a model with natural borrowing limit and for the sake of space we do not report it here.

¹⁴We use the shocks and the net worth of the each agent in the period before the policy change.

can reach about of the same order of magnitude. The average effect depends on the welfare gains/losses of each household.




Figure 2: Distribution of welfare gains per capita to output ratio.

Figure 3 displays the average welfare measure¹⁵ (green line) of an economy that switches from financial autarky to perfect capital mobility for each level of capital scarcity. In the endogenous borrowing constraint model, the average welfare gain of a country with the observed mean of the capital to output ratio is about 7.5 percent of consumption equivalent of the baseline level. This is about 5 times larger than the welfare gains of the same policy in a deterministic version of the neoclassical growth model. In addition, for the average welfare gain to exceed 2 percent of the baseline consumption, the capital to output ratio should be lower than 2.2, instead of 1.29 as in the deterministic case. When the natural borrowing constraint is in

¹⁵This is a weighted average of the welfare gains/losses of all agents in the economy.

effect, we have that for countries with the average capital to output ratio the average welfare benefits of financial capital openness are about 10 times larger than in the deterministic case.¹⁶ Figure 3 also reports the welfare gain of households with the average level of asset value. Welfare gains at the average asset value are lower than the average welfare gains, but they are still positive and are larger than the aggregate welfare gains of financial openness for economies without idiosyncratic shocks on labor productivity. Observe that the welfare benefits of financial integration for households with the average asset position are similar in the model where the penalty for default is the intertemporal trade exclusion or when the borrowing constraint is defined by natural borrowing limit.

Finally, figure 4 displays the average welfare gain of net savers and net borrowers per different levels of the capital to output ratio. As shown in figure 2, depending on the net asset position, households might incur in welfare losses or gains when the country opens its financial capital market. In the model with endogenous borrowing constraint, at the average level of the capital to output ratio, current savers have a loss in welfare of about 5 percent of their consumption equivalent of the baseline level, while current borrowers have an average welfare gain of about 12 percent. When we use the natural borrowing limit lenders in an economy with the average capital to output ratio loose a bit less (roughly 2 percent - instead of 5 - of their baseline consumption) than in the model with endogenous borrowing limit. However, for borrowers at the average capital to output ratio the welfare gains of capital market openness are about twice that observed in the model with the intertemporal exclusion restriction.

¹⁶Even though there is less borrowing in the natural limit, average welfare is still larger than in the endogenous borrowing limit. The difference might be explained on how financial liberalization looses borrowing constraints in the two cases.




Figure 3: Green line: Average welfare gain versus capital to output ratio; blue line: Welfare gain of households with the average asset value versus capital to output ratio. Solid line: Model with endogenous borrowing limit; dotted line: Model with natural borrowing limit.

From the exercises above we can learn two important lessons: (i) When households face idiosyncratic shocks on their labor productivity, international financial integration decreases the cost of borrowing, improving therefore the ability of households to insure against such shocks. In our calculations, comparing to the model that abstracts from uninsurable productivity shock, the average welfare gains can increase by, at least, a factor of 5; and (ii) the average welfare measure hide important distributional effects: while there are some losses among net savers, there are large gains for borrower. International financial integration benefits the poor.




Figure 4: Green line: Average welfare gain versus capital to output ratio; blue line: Welfare gain of households with the average asset value versus capital to output ratio. Solid line:

3.2.3 Risk aversion coefficient sensitivity

Calibration: In this exercise we decrease the elasticity of intertemporal substitution (increased the coefficient of relative risk aversion), by assuming that σ is equal to 2 instead of 1.¹⁷ We also choose the subjective discount factor β such that the

¹⁷Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006) also do some sensitivity analysis with respect to the the elasticity of intertemporal substitution (EIS). It has long been recognized in the macroeconomics literature (e.g., King and Rebelo (1990)) that the welfare effects of economic policies critically depend on the elasticity of inter-temporal substitution (EIS), where $\sigma = \frac{1}{EIS}$. In addition, There is a large literature on empirical estimates of the EIS and a large range of estimates. The point is that individual data estimates tend to be higher (higher than 2) than the aggregate data - time series - estimates (lower than two and close to one). See Guvenen (2006) for a important discussion. See Gourinchas and Parker (2002) for a model based estimation of the EIS.

capital to output ratio is similar to the one in the model with log utility 2.63. We accomplish this by setting $\beta = 0.9715$ in the deterministic model, and for the models with uninsurable shocks on labor productivity the values are $\beta = 0.93$ and $\beta = 9214$, when the borrowing constraint is the endogenous and the natural one, respectively. The other parameters are identical to those reported in Table 1.

From table 2 we observe that the model produces lower inequality than in the data, but they do a better job on the lower tail of the wealth distribution. Figure 1 shows that in the deterministic model welfare gains from international financial integration is monotonically higher when the coefficient of relative risk aversion is equal to 2 instead of 1. The farther the economy is from its long run equilibrium, the larger is the difference in welfare gains of the two economies. A higher coefficient of relative risk aversion implies that households value more consumption smoothing and capital market openness allows households to borrow and consumption jumps to its long run value.¹⁸ With $\sigma = 2$, at the observed average capital to output ratio the welfare gain of switching from complete autarky to perfect capital mobility is roughly 1.65 percent of consumption equivalent to its baseline value, instead of 1.2 as in the economy in which $\sigma = 1$.

When we introduce uninsurable shocks on labor productivity, then the quantitative effects change dramatically from those when the coefficient of relative risk aversion is equal to 2 instead of 1. Notice that a large σ implies that agents value more consumption smoothing and a lower interest rate makes borrowing costs and consumption smoothing less costly, specially for those at the lower tail of the wealth distribution. A lower interest rate also loosens borrowing constraints, which also increases welfare.

¹⁸When we just modify σ , but keep the same value of β as in the first calibration, then (as in Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006)) the welfare does not change monotonically. See appendix ??.




Figure 5: Green line: Average welfare gain versus capital to output ratio; blue line: Welfare gain of households with the average asset value versus capital to output ratio. Solid line: Model with endogenous borrowing limit; dotted line: Model with natural borrowing limit.

Figure 5 reports the average welfare impacts of capital market liberalization per level of the capital to output ratio when $\sigma = 2$. When the penalty for default is the permanent exclusion from intertemporal trade, the average welfare gain is about 12 percent of consumption equivalent of the baseline level for a country with the observed mean of the capital to output ratio. This is about 60 percent larger than when the coefficient of relative risk aversion is equal to 1. Moreover, for the average welfare gain to exceed 2 percent the capital to output ratio has to be smaller than 2.38 only. Similar quantitative differences are also observed for the model with natural borrowing constraints when we compare results with the lower and the higher coefficient of relative risk aversion. More specifically, when $\sigma = 2$ average welfare gains for each level of the

capital to output ratio are about 1.6 times higher than when $\sigma = 1$. The distribution of the average welfare gains between lenders and borrowers looks similarly to those of Figure 4, there is only shifts in the numbers of welfare benefits of capital market liberalization.¹⁹ For instance, when there are endogenous borrowing constraints, at the average capital to output ratio the average welfare gain of capital market openness for borrowers is about 20 percent of the baseline consumption, while when σ was equal to 1 it was about 12 percent. There is a smaller welfare loss for lenders when $\sigma = 2$ than when it is equal to 1. This is because households value more consumption smoothing when σ increases and since there is a positive probability that lenders might have to resort on borrowing (due to bad shocks on productivity) to smooth consumption. This compensates, in terms of welfare, the decrease in interest income.

4 Concluding remarks

In this paper, we investigate the welfare effects of financial liberalization on developing economies. We use a standard neoclassical growth model with incomplete markets and two types of borrowing constraints (endogenous and natural limits). We show that the introduction of uninsurable idiosyncratic risks on labor productivity boosts aggregate welfare effects. For an economy with the average capital to output ratio, welfare increases by at least a factor of 5 compared to the complete markets Arrow-Debreu economy. In addition, the average welfare gain hides important distributional implications: savers have a vested interest on capital market closeness, while borrowers might have large welfare gains from international financial integration. For capital scarce economies, the openness of the capital market decreases the interest rate. This decreases borrowing costs and looses borrowing limits with positive effects on the wel-

¹⁹Therefore, for the sake of space, we do not report this graph in this model.

fare of borrowers. Lenders can also benefit of such reform, since they with positive probability might face persistent bad shocks on their labor productivity. However, interest income will decrease affecting negatively lenders welfare.

A policy implication from our analysis is related to the optimal capital structure during capital market liberalization. Garcia-Milà, Marcet, and Ventura (2008), for instance, show that poor households might experience large welfare losses if capital income taxes were eliminated. This is because, during the transition a decrease in the capital income tax will lead to an increase in the labor tax and on the interest rate, hurting therefore poor agents that have a large wage/wealth ratio. Greulich and Marcet (2008) show in a standard growth model with heterogeneous agents that the optimal tax reform is to cut labor taxes and leave capital taxes very high in the short and medium run. Only in the very long run would capital taxes be zero. Since in our model capital market openness benefits heavily the poor, financial liberalization might compensate the poor when the government decides to cut capital income taxes. Therefore, a zero tax on capital income might be optimal not only on the long run but also on the short run.

References

- ACEMOGLU, D., AND F. ZILIBOTTI (1997): “Was Prometheus Unbound By Chance? Risk, Diversification and Growth,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 105(4), 709–751.
- AIYAGARI, S. R. (1994): “Uninsured Idiosyncratic Risk and Aggregate Saving,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 109(3), 659–684.
- ATHANASOULIS, S. G., AND E. VAN WINCOOP (2000): “Growth uncertainty and risksharing,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 45(3), 477–505.

- CASTAÑEDA, A., J. DÍAZ-GIMÉNEZ, AND J.-V. RÍOS-RULL (2003): “Accounting for the U.S. Earnings and Wealth Inequality,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 111(4), 818–857.
- GARCIA-MILÀ, T., A. MARCET, AND E. VENTURA (2008): “Supply Side Interventions and Redistribution,” *Working Paper, Institute for Economic Analysis*.
- GOURINCHAS, P., AND O. JEANNE (2006): “The Elusive Gains from International Financial Integration,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 73(3), 715–741.
- GOURINCHAS, P., AND J. A. PARKER (2002): “Consumption Over the Life Cycle,” *Econometrica*, 70(1), 47–89.
- GREENWOOD, J., AND B. JOVANOVIĆ (1990): “Financial Development, Growth, and Distribution of Income,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 1076–1107.
- GREULICH, K., AND A. MARCET (2008): “Pareto-Improving Optimal Capital and Labor Taxes,” *Working Paper, Institute for Economic Analysis*.
- GUPTA, N., AND K. YUAN (2008): “On the Growth Effect of Stock Market Liberalizations,” *Forthcoming Review of Financial Studies*.
- GUVENEN, F. (2006): “Reconciling Conflicting Evidence on the Elasticity of Intertemporal Substitution: A Macroeconomic Perspective,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 53(7), 1451–1472.
- (2008): “Learning Your Earning: Are Labor Income Shocks Really Very Persistent?,” *Forthcoming American Economic Review*.
- HESTON, A., R. SUMMERS, AND B. ATEN (2006): “Penn World Table Version 6.2,” Center for International Comparisons at the University of Pennsylvania (CICUP).

- KEHOE, T., AND D. LEVINE (1993): “Debt-Constrained Asset Markets,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 60, 865–888.
- KING, R. G., AND S. REBELO (1990): “Public Policy and Economic Growth: Developing Neoclassical Implications,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 98(5), 126–150.
- KLENOW, P. J., AND A. RODRIGUEZ-CLARE (1997): “The Neoclassical Revival in Growth Economics: Has It Gone Too Far?,” in *NBER Macroeconomics Annual 1997*, ed. by B. Bernanke, and J. Rotemberg. MIT Press.
- KOSE, M. A., E. PRASAD, K. ROGOFF, AND S.-J. WEI (2006): “Financial Globalization: A Reappraisal,” *International Monetary Fund Working Paper*, WP/06/189.
- KRUEGER, D., AND F. PERRI (2004): “Understanding Consumption Smoothing: Evidence from the US Consumer Expenditure Data,” *Journal of European Economic Association*, 3(2-3), 340–350.
- LUCAS, JR, R. E. (1990): “Why Doesn’t Capital Flow from Rich to Poor Countries?,” *American Economic Review*, 80(2), 92–96.
- MARCET, A., AND R. MARIMON (1992): “Communication, Commitment, and Growth,” *Journal of Economic Theory*, 58, 219–249.
- MENDOZA, E. G., V. QUADRINI, AND J.-V. RÍOS-RULL (2007): “On the Welfare Implications of Financial Globalization without Financial Development,” *NBER International Seminar on Macroeconomics 2007*.
- QUADRINI, V. (2000): “Entrepreneurship, Saving, and Social Mobility,” *The Review of Economic Dynamics*, 3(1), 1–40.

QUADRINI, V., AND J. V. RÍOS-RULL (1997): “Understanding the U.S. Distribution of Wealth,” *Federal Reserve Bank of Minneapolis Quarterly Review*, 22(2), 22–36.

STORESLETTEN, K., C. TELMER, AND A. YARON (2004): “Consumption and Risk Sharing Over the Life Cycle,” *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 51(3), 609–633.

TOWNSEND, R. M., AND K. UEDA (2009): “Welfare Gains from Financial Liberalization,” *Forthcoming International Economic Review*.

A Similar β

In this appendix, we consider the welfare implications of capital market liberalization when all parameters (including β) are identical to the calibration reported by Gourinchas and Jeanne (2006), except for the introduction of labor productivity shocks. First, let’s investigate the effects in the deterministic version of the model. Notice that when σ increases but we do not adjust β , then the long run level of the capital to output ratio decreases 2.63 to 2.34. Observe that now the welfare does not change monotonically for this case, when we compare the two economies with different levels of relative risk aversion. However, for a higher σ the farther the economy is from its long run equilibrium, the larger are the welfare effects compared for an economy with a smaller σ . For the gain from integration to exceed 2 percent of annual per capita consumption, the capital to output ratio must fall below 1.4 instead of 1.26. At the average observed level of the capital to output ratio, the welfare gains are roughly the same in the two economies.

For the economy with uninsurable idiosyncratic risks on labor productivity, the average welfare gains of financial liberalization for countries with the observed mean of the capital to output ratio are about 8 percent and 14 percent of consumption

equivalent for an endogenous and a natural borrowing constraint, respectively. For the average welfare to exceed 2 percent of consumption equivalent to the baseline consumption, the capital to output ratio has to be lower than 2.57 and 2.6 for the economy with endogenous and natural borrowing limits, respective. These numbers are quantitatively of the same order of magnitude to the calibration of when we changed the value of β to match the capital to output ratio of the deterministic case. Figure 8 produces results similar to those reported in figure 4. Therefore, our results on section 3.2.2 are not driven by changing the subjective discount factor.




Figure 6: Welfare gains from international financial integration and the capital to output ratio. The welfare measure corresponds to the equivalent variation. Solid black line: $\sigma = 1$. Dotted gray line: $\sigma = 2$.




Figure 7: Green line: Average welfare gain versus capital to output ratio; blue line: Welfare gain of households with the average asset value versus capital to output ratio. Solid line: Model with endogenous borrowing limit; dotted line: Model with natural borrowing limit.




Figure 8: Green line: Average welfare gain versus capital to output ratio; blue line: Welfare gain of households with the average asset value versus capital to output ratio. Solid line: