Nonbanks, Banks, and Monetary Policy: US Loan-Level Evidence Since the 1990s¹

David ElliottBank of EnglandRalf R. MeisenzahlFederal Reserve Bank of ChicagoJosé-Luis PeydróImperial College London & CEPRBryce C. TurnerHarvard Business School

¹ The views expressed here are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Bank of England, Board of Governors, Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, or staff of the Federal Reserve System. $+ \Box \rightarrow \langle \overline{\Box} \rangle + \langle \overline{\Box} \rangle +$

 Credit markets have dramatically changed, with nonbank credit intermediaries now crucial.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- Credit markets have dramatically changed, with nonbank credit intermediaries now crucial.
- We test the nonbank credit channel of monetary policy:
 - 1. MP "gets in *all* the cracks" as it directly acts on market rates and spreads that affect all institutions (Stein 2013).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- Credit markets have dramatically changed, with nonbank credit intermediaries now crucial.
- We test the nonbank credit channel of monetary policy:
 - 1. MP "gets in *all* the cracks" as it directly acts on market rates and spreads that affect all institutions (Stein 2013).

2. MP may affect *funding* of banks and nonbanks differently (Drechsler, Savov, Schnabl 2017; Xiao 2020).

- Credit markets have dramatically changed, with nonbank credit intermediaries now crucial.
- We test the nonbank credit channel of monetary policy:
 - 1. MP "gets in *all* the cracks" as it directly acts on market rates and spreads that affect all institutions (Stein 2013).

- 2. MP may affect *funding* of banks and nonbanks differently (Drechsler, Savov, Schnabl 2017; Xiao 2020).
- 3. Banks are regulated, most nonbanks are not.

- Credit markets have dramatically changed, with nonbank credit intermediaries now crucial.
- We test the nonbank credit channel of monetary policy:
 - 1. MP "gets in *all* the cracks" as it directly acts on market rates and spreads that affect all institutions (Stein 2013).
 - 2. MP may affect *funding* of banks and nonbanks differently (Drechsler, Savov, Schnabl 2017; Xiao 2020).
 - 3. Banks are regulated, most nonbanks are not.
- Key empirical questions:
 - 1. Do nonbanks attenuate or strengthen the credit channel?

- Credit markets have dramatically changed, with nonbank credit intermediaries now crucial.
- We test the nonbank credit channel of monetary policy:
 - 1. MP "gets in *all* the cracks" as it directly acts on market rates and spreads that affect all institutions (Stein 2013).
 - 2. MP may affect *funding* of banks and nonbanks differently (Drechsler, Savov, Schnabl 2017; Xiao 2020).
 - 3. Banks are regulated, most nonbanks are not.
- Key empirical questions:
 - 1. Do nonbanks attenuate or strengthen the credit channel?

2. How does monetary policy affect nonbank risk taking?

- Credit markets have dramatically changed, with nonbank credit intermediaries now crucial.
- We test the nonbank credit channel of monetary policy:
 - 1. MP "gets in *all* the cracks" as it directly acts on market rates and spreads that affect all institutions (Stein 2013).
 - 2. MP may affect *funding* of banks and nonbanks differently (Drechsler, Savov, Schnabl 2017; Xiao 2020).
 - 3. Banks are regulated, most nonbanks are not.
- Key empirical questions:
 - 1. Do nonbanks attenuate or strengthen the credit channel?
 - 2. How does monetary policy affect nonbank risk taking?
 - 3. Does the nonbank credit channel affect real outcomes?

To identify the effects of MP on credit supply of nonbanks, we exploit U.S. loan-level data for firms and households since the 1990s in conjunction with monetary policy shocks.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

To identify the effects of MP on credit supply of nonbanks, we exploit U.S. loan-level data for firms and households since the 1990s in conjunction with monetary policy shocks.

 Monetary policy: Cumulative Gertler-Karadi (2015) monetary policy shocks based on monetary policy surprises (robustness: shadow rates, Fed Funds Rate)

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

To identify the effects of MP on credit supply of nonbanks, we exploit U.S. loan-level data for firms and households since the 1990s in conjunction with monetary policy shocks.

 Monetary policy: Cumulative Gertler-Karadi (2015) monetary policy shocks based on monetary policy surprises (robustness: shadow rates, Fed Funds Rate)

Corporate loans: Syndicated loans from Dealscan

To identify the effects of MP on credit supply of nonbanks, we exploit U.S. loan-level data for firms and households since the 1990s in conjunction with monetary policy shocks.

- Monetary policy: Cumulative Gertler-Karadi (2015) monetary policy shocks based on monetary policy surprises (robustness: shadow rates, Fed Funds Rate)
- Corporate loans: Syndicated loans from Dealscan
- Consumer loans: NY Fed/Equifax Consumer Credit Panel

To identify the effects of MP on credit supply of nonbanks, we exploit U.S. loan-level data for firms and households since the 1990s in conjunction with monetary policy shocks.

- Monetary policy: Cumulative Gertler-Karadi (2015) monetary policy shocks based on monetary policy surprises (robustness: shadow rates, Fed Funds Rate)
- Corporate loans: Syndicated loans from Dealscan
- Consumer loans: NY Fed/Equifax Consumer Credit Panel

Mortgages: Confidential HMDA

 When MP tightens, real-economy credit supply shifts from banks to nonbanks, resulting in significant attenuation of the credit and risk-taking channels of MP.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- When MP tightens, real-economy credit supply shifts from banks to nonbanks, resulting in significant attenuation of the credit and risk-taking channels of MP.
 - 1. Corporate loans: Firms/Industries with nonbank relationships increase leverage and investment, but substitution is limited.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- When MP tightens, real-economy credit supply shifts from banks to nonbanks, resulting in significant attenuation of the credit and risk-taking channels of MP.
 - 1. Corporate loans: Firms/Industries with nonbank relationships increase leverage and investment, but substitution is limited.
 - 2. Consumer loans: Perfect substitution from bank to nonbank credit, except for low nonbank-dependence counties.

- When MP tightens, real-economy credit supply shifts from banks to nonbanks, resulting in significant attenuation of the credit and risk-taking channels of MP.
 - 1. Corporate loans: Firms/Industries with nonbank relationships increase leverage and investment, but substitution is limited.
 - 2. Consumer loans: Perfect substitution from bank to nonbank credit, except for low nonbank-dependence counties.
 - 3. Mortgages: Nonbanks expand more in jumbo loans, and nonbank credit is associated with increases in house prices.

- When MP tightens, real-economy credit supply shifts from banks to nonbanks, resulting in significant attenuation of the credit and risk-taking channels of MP.
 - 1. Corporate loans: Firms/Industries with nonbank relationships increase leverage and investment, but substitution is limited.
 - 2. Consumer loans: Perfect substitution from bank to nonbank credit, except for low nonbank-dependence counties.
 - 3. Mortgages: Nonbanks expand more in jumbo loans, and nonbank credit is associated with increases in house prices.

▶ In *all* markets, effects are larger for riskier borrowers.

Key Take-Away

The potency of monetary policy in lending markets depends on the respective size of the nonbank presence.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Corporate Loans

 Syndicated loans are large corporate loans originated by a syndicate of lenders.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- Syndicated loans are large corporate loans originated by a syndicate of lenders.
- Originally banks dominated this market; nonbanks are now dominant in the secondary market for term loans (Irani, Iyer, Meisenzahl, Peydro, 2021).

- Syndicated loans are large corporate loans originated by a syndicate of lenders.
- Originally banks dominated this market; nonbanks are now dominant in the secondary market for term loans (Irani, Iyer, Meisenzahl, Peydro, 2021).

 Nonbank lenders in primary market: Investment Banks, Broker-Dealers, Finance Companies

- Syndicated loans are large corporate loans originated by a syndicate of lenders.
- Originally banks dominated this market; nonbanks are now dominant in the secondary market for term loans (Irani, Iyer, Meisenzahl, Peydro, 2021).
- Nonbank lenders in primary market: Investment Banks, Broker-Dealers, Finance Companies
- Limit of nonbanks: no deposit base means nonbanks need to access short-term funding market in case borrowers draw on credit lines.

 Challenge: Monetary policy affects credit supply and credit demand.

- Challenge: Monetary policy affects credit supply and credit demand.
- Solution:
 - 1. Exploit composition of the syndicate and use within-syndicate variation (borrower-quarter fixed effects $\alpha_{b,t}$).

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- Challenge: Monetary policy affects credit supply and credit demand.
- Solution:
 - 1. Exploit composition of the syndicate and use within-syndicate variation (borrower-quarter fixed effects $\alpha_{b,t}$).
 - 2. Include interactions with macro controls (GDP, GDP Forecast, Inflation, VIX).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

- Challenge: Monetary policy affects credit supply and credit demand.
- Solution:
 - 1. Exploit composition of the syndicate and use within-syndicate variation (borrower-quarter fixed effects $\alpha_{b,t}$).
 - 2. Include interactions with macro controls (GDP, GDP Forecast, Inflation, VIX).

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

3. Check if banks retrench from the riskiest borrowers first.

- Challenge: Monetary policy affects credit supply and credit demand.
- Solution:
 - 1. Exploit composition of the syndicate and use within-syndicate variation (borrower-quarter fixed effects $\alpha_{b,t}$).
 - 2. Include interactions with macro controls (GDP, GDP Forecast, Inflation, VIX).
 - 3. Check if banks retrench from the riskiest borrowers first.

 $\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Log}(\mathsf{Quantity})_{b,l,t} &= \alpha_{b,t} + \beta_1 \, (\mathsf{Nonbank}_l \times \mathsf{Monetary} \, \mathsf{Policy}_{t-1}) \\ &+ \beta_2 \, (\mathsf{Nonbank}_l \times \mathsf{Macroeconomic} \, \mathsf{Controls}_{t-1}) \\ &+ \delta_l + \varepsilon_{b,l,t} \end{aligned}$

・ロト・日本・モート モー うへぐ

Sample period: 1990Q1-2012Q3 (Gertler-Karadi series).

	Log(Total Credit Amount)					
	All	Term	8(All	Term	
	Loans	Loans	Revolvers	Loans	Loans	Revolvers
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Nonbank × MP	0.135***	0.193***	0.0585**	0.0549	0.308**	-0.0135
	(0.0309)	(0.0488)	(0.0268)	(0.0387)	(0.128)	(0.0512)
Nonbank × High yield				0.0748*	0.190**	0.0255
				(0.0395)	(0.0861)	(0.0506)
Nonbank × High yield × MP				0.205***	-0.0261	0.194***
				(0.0456)	(0.103)	(0.0520)
Double Interactions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Triple Interactions	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Borrower-quarter FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lender FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	92,971	14,956	54,312	46,900	4,887	25,107
R-squared	0.811	0.817	0.829	0.792	0.819	0.804

Impact of US monetary policy on US corporate lending

 Nonbanks relatively increase credit supply by 12% in response to a 1sd increase in MP measure.

	Log(Total Credit Amount)					
	All	Term		All	Term	
	Loans	Loans	Revolvers	Loans	Loans	Revolvers
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Nonbank × MP	0.135***	0.193***	0.0585**	0.0549	0.308**	-0.0135
	(0.0309)	(0.0488)	(0.0268)	(0.0387)	(0.128)	(0.0512)
Nonbank × High yield				0.0748*	0.190**	0.0255
				(0.0395)	(0.0861)	(0.0506)
Nonbank × High yield × MP				0.205***	-0.0261	0.194***
				(0.0456)	(0.103)	(0.0520)
Double Interactions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Triple Interactions	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Borrower-quarter FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Lender FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	92,971	14,956	54,312	46,900	4,887	25,107
R-squared	0.811	0.817	0.829	0.792	0.819	0.804

Impact of US monetary policy on US corporate lending

 Stronger effects for high-yield firms, risk shifts to nonbanks → Reduction in the risk-taking channel of monetary policy.

Very Robust Finding

- Using alternative MP measures
 - 1. Shadow Rate from Wu and Xia (2016)
 - 2. Federal Funds Rate
- Splitting sample by type of nonbank lender

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Considering pre-crisis period only.

Nonbank Lending and Corporate Policies

Does this substitution affect corporate policies?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Nonbank Lending and Corporate Policies

- Does this substitution affect corporate policies?
- Idea: Firms with existing nonbank relationships should have more access to credit from nonbanks when MP tightens.

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

Impact of US monetary policy on US corporate lending by prior nonbank relationship

	Total debt	Leverage	Liquidity	Fixed assets
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Nonbank relation x MP	<mark>0.070**</mark>	0.032***	-0.009**	0.011***
	(0.029)	(0.007)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Double interactions	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Borrower size control	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Borrower FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry-quarter FEs	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	316,909	355,957	382,979	368,897
R-squared	0.89	0.61	0.70	0.90

Nonbank Lending and Industry-level Outcomes

Does nonbank lending affect more aggregated outcomes?
Nonbank Lending and Industry-level Outcomes

Does nonbank lending affect more aggregated outcomes?

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

• Aggregate to the industry level.

Nonbank Lending and Industry-level Outcomes

- Does nonbank lending affect more aggregated outcomes?
- Aggregate to the industry level.
- Use industry-level nonbank share 1990-1996 as measure of access to nonbank credit (some outcome variables only available from 1997).

Industry-Level Outcomes

Quarterly Industry Level Outcomes

	Total debt	Leverage	Liquidity	Fixed assets
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Nonbank share × GK	1.054**	0.217*	<mark>-0.065</mark>	<mark>0.151**</mark>
	(0.446)	(0.096)	(0.040)	(0.059)
Macrovar Interactions	YES	YES	YES	YES
Industry FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Quarter FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Observations	4,115	4,115	4,115	4,115
R-squared	0.98	0.80	0.81	0.96

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

Consumer Loans

▶ Auto loans account for about 30% of consumer loans.

- Auto loans account for about 30% of consumer loans.
- Nonbank lenders account for 40-50 percent of auto loan originations (Benmelech, Meisenzahl, Ramcharan 2017).

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

- Auto loans account for about 30% of consumer loans.
- Nonbank lenders account for 40-50 percent of auto loan originations (Benmelech, Meisenzahl, Ramcharan 2017).
- Nonbank lenders: Captive Finance Companies (e.g. Ford Motor Credit), Independent Finance Companies

- Auto loans account for about 30% of consumer loans.
- Nonbank lenders account for 40-50 percent of auto loan originations (Benmelech, Meisenzahl, Ramcharan 2017).
- Nonbank lenders: Captive Finance Companies (e.g. Ford Motor Credit), Independent Finance Companies
- Nonbank lenders finance themselves via short-term markets: ABCP, ABS (warehouse lines)

- Auto loans account for about 30% of consumer loans.
- Nonbank lenders account for 40-50 percent of auto loan originations (Benmelech, Meisenzahl, Ramcharan 2017).
- Nonbank lenders: Captive Finance Companies (e.g. Ford Motor Credit), Independent Finance Companies
- Nonbank lenders finance themselves via short-term markets: ABCP, ABS (warehouse lines)
- Limit of nonbanks: Long-term dealer-lender contracts limit geographical expansion.

- Auto loans account for about 30% of consumer loans.
- Nonbank lenders account for 40-50 percent of auto loan originations (Benmelech, Meisenzahl, Ramcharan 2017).
- Nonbank lenders: Captive Finance Companies (e.g. Ford Motor Credit), Independent Finance Companies
- Nonbank lenders finance themselves via short-term markets: ABCP, ABS (warehouse lines)
- Limit of nonbanks: Long-term dealer-lender contracts limit geographical expansion.
- NY Fed/Equifax Consumer Credit Panel, starting in 1999Q1.

Auto Loan Market - Identification

 Challenge: Monetary policy affects credit supply and credit demand.

(ロ)、(型)、(E)、(E)、 E) の(の)

Auto Loan Market - Identification

- Challenge: Monetary policy affects credit supply and credit demand.
- Solution:
 - 1. Exploit county-level dependence of nonbank auto credit (Benmelech, Meisenzahl, Ramcharan, 2017) and county-level controls.

Auto Loan Market - Identification

- Challenge: Monetary policy affects credit supply and credit demand.
- Solution:
 - 1. Exploit county-level dependence of nonbank auto credit (Benmelech, Meisenzahl, Ramcharan, 2017) and county-level controls.
 - 2. Include interactions with macro controls.

Nonbank Dependence in the Auto Loan Market



County-Level Dependence (1999Q1)

Source: Federal Reserve Board / Equifax

Household-Level Effects on Auto Loans

	Log Amount				
	Nonbank	Bank	Total		
	(1)	(2)	(3)		
MP x Share 1999	0.031***	-0.032***	<mark>-0.000</mark>		
	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.001)		
Double Interactions	YES	YES	YES		
Household Controls	YES	YES	YES		
County FE	YES	YES	YES		
Time FE	YES	YES	YES		
Birth Year FE	YES	YES	YES		
Observations	54,243,317	54,243,317	54,243,317		
R^2	0.005	0.007	0.010		

Household controls include risk score, mortgage balance, consumer loan balance, credit card balance, bankruptcy indicator, and county-level income.

Is there an Effect on Auto Sales?

 Perfect substitution between banks and nonbanks suggests that monetary policy should have little effect on auto sales.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

Is there an Effect on Auto Sales?

- Perfect substitution between banks and nonbanks suggests that monetary policy should have little effect on auto sales.
- > Data on new auto registrations from Polk from 2002 on.

Is there an Effect on Auto Sales?

- Perfect substitution between banks and nonbanks suggests that monetary policy should have little effect on auto sales.
- > Data on new auto registrations from Polk from 2002 on.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathsf{Log}(\mathsf{Auto Sale})_{j,t} &= \beta_1 \mathsf{Nonbank Share 1999Q1}_{j,t-1} \times MP_{t-1} + \\ \alpha_j + \theta_{lt} + \gamma X_{j,t-1} + \varepsilon_{j,t} \end{aligned}$$

County-Level Effects on Auto Sales

Auto Credit							
	Nonbank	Bank	То	Total		Auto sales	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
$MP \times 1999$ Share	0.503***	-0.587***	<mark>0.109</mark>		<mark>0.034</mark>		
	(0.099)	(0.119)	(0.107)		(0.023)		
MP x Low Share				-0.117*		-0.075***	
				(0.068)		(0.023)	
Macro Interactions	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
County Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
County FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Observations	158,461	158,461	158,461	158,461	122,991	122,991	
R^2	0.49	0.49	0.52	0.54	0.99	0.99	

◆□ ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 ▶ < 圖 • 의 Q @</p>

County-Level Effects on Auto Sales: Low Nonbank Presence

Auto Credit							
	Nonbank	Bank	To	Total		Auto sales	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	
MP × 1999 Share	0.503***	-0.587***	0.109		0.034		
	(0.099)	(0.119)	(0.107)		(0.023)		
MP x Low Share				-0.117*		-0.075***	
				(0.068)		(0.023)	
Macro Interactions	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
County Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
County FE	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
Observations	158,461	158,461	158,461	158,461	122,991	122,991	
R ²	0.49	0.49	0.52	0.54	0.99	0.99	

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

Mortgages

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

 Nonbank lenders now account for around half of mortgage lending.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

 Nonbank lenders now account for around half of mortgage lending.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆三▶ ◆三▶ 三三 のへぐ

 Nonbanks lenders: Mortgage Companies, REITs

- Nonbank lenders now account for around half of mortgage lending.
- Nonbanks lenders: Mortgage Companies, REITs
- Nonbank lenders finance themselves via short-term markets: ABCP (e.g. GMAC Mortgage), Warehouse Lines

- Nonbank lenders now account for around half of mortgage lending.
- Nonbanks lenders: Mortgage Companies, REITs
- Nonbank lenders finance themselves via short-term markets: ABCP (e.g. GMAC Mortgage), Warehouse Lines
- Limit of nonbanks: mortgage lending requires some local presence. Balance sheet capacity is limited (Buchak et al, 2020).

- Nonbank lenders now account for around half of mortgage lending.
- Nonbanks lenders: Mortgage Companies, REITs
- Nonbank lenders finance themselves via short-term markets: ABCP (e.g. GMAC Mortgage), Warehouse Lines
- Limit of nonbanks: mortgage lending requires some local presence. Balance sheet capacity is limited (Buchak et al, 2020).

・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・
・

Confidential HMDA

1. Exploit 1995Q1 county-level dependence of nonbank mortgage credit and county-level controls.

◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ 臣 の�?

- 1. Exploit 1995Q1 county-level dependence of nonbank mortgage credit and county-level controls.
- 2. Include interactions with macro controls (GDP, GDP Forecast, Inflation, VIX).

- 1. Exploit 1995Q1 county-level dependence of nonbank mortgage credit and county-level controls.
- 2. Include interactions with macro controls (GDP, GDP Forecast, Inflation, VIX).
- 3. If funding is important it should show up in the loans held on the balance sheet.

- 1. Exploit 1995Q1 county-level dependence of nonbank mortgage credit and county-level controls.
- 2. Include interactions with macro controls (GDP, GDP Forecast, Inflation, VIX).
- 3. If funding is important it should show up in the loans held on the balance sheet.

Nonbank Dependence in the Mortgage Market

Dependence 1995Q1



◆□▶ ◆□▶ ◆臣▶ ◆臣▶ ─臣 ─ のへで

County-Level Mortgage Lending: Conforming loans

	Held New Loans Conforming			
	Bank Nonbank Total Nonbank Sha			Nonbank Share
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Nonbank Share 1995Q1 × MP	<mark>0.045</mark>	<mark>0.367*</mark>	<mark>0.309</mark>	<mark>0.049</mark>
	(0.425)	(0.214)	(0.319)	(0.069)
Macro Variable Interactions	YES	YES	YES	YES
Time-varying Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
County FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Observations	59,547	59,547	59,547	59,547
Adjusted R ²	0.78	0.80	0.78	0.75

County-Level Mortgage Lending: Jumbo loans

	Held New Loans Jumbo			
	Bank Nonbank Total Nonbank Sha			Nonbank Share
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Nonbank Share 1995Q1 × MP	-0.691	3.192***	-0.064	0.390***
	(0.913)	(0.886)	(0.856)	(0.040)
Macro Variable Interactions	YES	YES	YES	YES
Time-varying Controls	YES	YES	YES	YES
Time FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
County FE	YES	YES	YES	YES
Observations	59,547	59,547	59,547	59,547
Adjusted R ²	0.79	0.73	0.78	0.62

House Prices and Nonbank Lending

	All New	All	House
	Mortgages	Mortgages	Prices
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Nonbank Share 1995Q1 × MP	<mark>0.583†</mark>	<mark>0.509†</mark>	0.425**
	(0.370)	(0.318)	(0.191)
Macro Variable Interactions	YES	YES	YES
County Income	YES	YES	YES
County FE	YES	YES	YES
Observations	55,062	55,062	55,062
Adjusted R ²	0.98	0.98	0.84

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

Towards General Equilibrium Effects

 So far, identification of credit supply by controlling for demand with granular fixed effects (e.g. Borrower-Time or County-Time Fixed effects).

Towards General Equilibrium Effects

- So far, identification of credit supply by controlling for demand with granular fixed effects (e.g. Borrower-Time or County-Time Fixed effects).
- Allow for demand effects and control for macro variables.
Towards General Equilibrium Effects

- So far, identification of credit supply by controlling for demand with granular fixed effects (e.g. Borrower-Time or County-Time Fixed effects).
- Allow for demand effects and control for macro variables.
- Check whether nonbanks attenuate real effects of monetary policy in each of the three markets.

Instrument FFR with Gertler-Karadi measures.

Table : Corporate Borrowing and Real Outcomes

	Corporate Borrowing and Output		Auto Loans & Sales		Mortgages &	
					House Prices	
	Total	Annual	Total	Auto	New	House
	Debt	Output	Loans	Sales	Mortgages	Prices
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
FFR x Past Nonbank Share	0.228**	0.278**	0.026	0.007	<mark>0.164†</mark>	0.139***
	(0.101)	(0.112)	(0.025)	(0.022)	(0.03)	(0.050)
FFR	-0.012	-0.032***	-0.110**	-0.032*	-0.057	-0.102***
	(0.011)	(0.012)	(0.050)	(0.018)	(0.053)	(0.028)
Macro Cont.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Macro Cont. x Past Nonbank Share	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Industry FE	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
Industry Controls	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
County FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
County Controls	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Crisis Interactions	No	No	Yes	Yes	No	No
Kleinbergen-Paap first-stage F-Stat	260.83	97.26	19.78	132.89	29.19	29.19
Observations	4,115	863	158,461	122,991	55,062	55,062

 After a monetary contraction, increased nonbank credit supply to firms and households (partially) offsets the reduction in bank credit.

 After a monetary contraction, increased nonbank credit supply to firms and households (partially) offsets the reduction in bank credit.

▶ In all markets, the results are stronger for riskier borrowers.

 After a monetary contraction, increased nonbank credit supply to firms and households (partially) offsets the reduction in bank credit.

- ▶ In all markets, the results are stronger for riskier borrowers.
- Nonbank credit channel has real effects in *all* markets.

- After a monetary contraction, increased nonbank credit supply to firms and households (partially) offsets the reduction in bank credit.
- ▶ In all markets, the results are stronger for riskier borrowers.
- Nonbank credit channel has real effects in *all* markets.
- Potency of monetary policy in lending markets depends on respective size of nonbank presence.