

# Lecture 18: Hold-Up

Compensation in Organizations

Jacob Kohlhepp

January 29, 2026

# Discussion: Klein, Crawford, Alchian (1978)

(This reading was optional)

How much was Elijah Wood's base salary for all three LOTR movies?

How much was Elijah Wood's base salary for all  
three LOTR movies?

(Screen-time: 2 hours, 4 minutes)

How much was Elijah Wood's base salary for all  
three LOTR movies?

(Screen-time: 2 hours, 4 minutes)

\$250,000

How much was Elijah Wood paid for *The Hobbit* trilogy?

How much was Elijah Wood paid for *The Hobbit*  
trilogy?

(Screen-time: less than 4 minutes)

How much was Elijah Wood paid for *The Hobbit*  
trilogy?

(Screen-time: less than 4 minutes)

\$1,000,000

Discussion: Why this difference?

## Human Asset Specificity

- ▶ *The Fellowship of the Ring* (movie 1) was enormously successful.
- ▶ Frodo is the ring bearer (the closest to a main character)
- ▶ Elijah Wood essentially becomes Frodo after the first movie.
- ▶ Elijah Wood gets the specific asset of being Frodo.
- ▶ He cannot be replaced, and he is extremely valuable after the first movie.

## From Specificity to Holdup

- ▶ This alone is not a problem.
- ▶ It becomes a problem when:
  - ▶ There are things that must be done after Elijah Wood becomes merged with Frodo.
    - ▶ They needed to make *The Two Towers* and *Return of the King*.
  - ▶ This generates a problem called hold-up.

## The Model

- ▶ Players: Elijah Wood (EW), New Line Cinema (NLC)
- ▶ NLC decides whether or not to start LOTR, which entails simultaneously announcing EW as Frodo, and paying fixed cost of production  $c > 0$ .
- ▶ After this, EW proposes a wage  $w$  for all movies.
- ▶ If NLC rejects, EW gets outside option  $\bar{u}$  and NLC makes 0 box office revenue.
- ▶ If they accept, NLC receives box office revenue from LOTR  $b$ .
- ▶ Assume indifference is broken in favor of making LOTR.

## Diagram of the Model

See the board!

## Solving the Model

See the board!

# Hold-Up Solution

## Theorem 1

*For all values of fixed costs  $c$ , outside option  $\bar{u}$ , and box office revenue  $b$ , LOTR is never made.*

- ▶ Elijah Wood “holds up” NLC and gets all box office revenue.
- ▶ Therefore LOTR is never made!
- ▶ Whenever box office revenue exceeds the real costs ( $b \geq \bar{u} + c$ ) this is inefficient.
- ▶ *Fellowship* revenue was approx. \$900 million, and total budget of all 3 movies was less than \$300 million

## Making *The Lord of the Rings Trilogy*

- ▶ Suppose you are deciding how to make the three LOTR movies.
- ▶ You have two options:

## Making *The Lord of the Rings Trilogy*

- ▶ Suppose you are deciding how to make the three LOTR movies.
- ▶ You have two options:
  1. Make all at once and then release.

## Making *The Lord of the Rings Trilogy*

- ▶ Suppose you are deciding how to make the three LOTR movies.
- ▶ You have two options:
  1. Make all at once and then release.
  2. Make them sequentially, with releases in between.
- ▶ What are the main benefits of option 1?
  - ▶ No aging of actors between movies.
  - ▶ Conserve on fixed costs (setting up infrastructure, negotiating contracts, etc.)
- ▶ What are the main benefits of option 2?
  - ▶ Can see if the first does well before making the second.
  - ▶ Can learn from the first when making the second.

## Hold-Up with Back-to-Back Filming

- ▶ Let's modify the original game.
- ▶ Specifically: EW proposes a wage to NLC before production starts.
- ▶ After accepting the wage, NLC starts production and incurs the fixed cost.

New Diagram

See the board!

## Solving the Model

See the board!

## Fixing Hold-Up: Back-to-Back Filming

### Theorem 2

*Under back-to-back filming, LOTR is made whenever  $b \geq \bar{u} + c$ .*

- ▶ Now EW proposes an acceptable wage:  $w = b - c$
- ▶ Changing timing “fixes” hold-up!
- ▶ EW now internalizes the fixed cost of production.
- ▶ EW still gets all of the surplus, but...
- ▶ By changing NLC’s outside option we can fix this to be more realistic.

## Discussion

Is this a realistic solution?

## Back-to-Back Has Drawbacks

- ▶ *Superman* and *Superman II* were shot back to back.
- ▶ Actors signed on to both upfront.
- ▶ However there was conflict between the producers and the original director.
- ▶ So the producers hired a new director.
- ▶ As a result, most “concurrent” footage was not used.

## Renegotiation/Slacking

- ▶ We ignored the fact that filming is a process.
- ▶ We also ignored that most employment in the US is at will.
- ▶ EW could potentially threaten to slack or quit part way through.
- ▶ EW could then propose a contract partway through when he has a lot of leverage.
- ▶ This means our solution is vulnerable in some sense.