Aggregate and Regional Implications of Bank Heterogeneity to the Bank-Lending Channel of Monetary Policy in Monetary Union

Mai Hakamada¹, Akatsuki Sukeda²

¹University of California, Santa Cruz

²London School of Economics and Political Science

October 08 2020

Research Question

- We observe huge heterogeneities in banks' net interest income and leverage ratio
 - This is at odds with the assumption of homogeneous degree of the financial friction
- When regional heterogeneity of the financial friction is taken into account, what are the implications of the union-wide monetary policy?
 - Does different degree of the financial friction imply different effectiveness of monetary policy?
- Does using a model imply different degree of financial friction compared to the case only micro data is used without a model?
 - In models, we can track behaviors of all the agents and macroeconomic interactions

Figure: Banks' Net Interest Income (%) (Left) and Market Value Bank Leverage (Right): **Core** (top) vs **Peripheral** (bottom) countries



3/9

What We Do

- 1 New-Keynesian with financial acceleration: Gertler and Karadi (2011)
 - Monetary policy bank lending channel
- 2 Two country, monetary union, complete market model: Groll and Monacelli (forthcoming)
 - Single union with two regions, single monetary policy
- 3 Compare the estimates of the degrees of the financial friction
 - Panel Regression
 - ★ We observe data on each EU country

Results

- In the model, the effects of monetary policy depends on the degree of the financial friction
 - The monetary policy works more when the degree of financial friction is lower
- The estimates of the financial friction is much tighter in the periphery countries when estimated with panel regression

Model Environment

- Single country with two states/regions, single central bank
 - Two types of tradable goods: Home-produced goods and Foreign-produced goods
 - Households in the two regions can borrow/lend between them, complete market
- Agents: Household, Bank, Intermediate firm, Capital goods producer, Retail firm, Central Bank
 - Households: Deposit to bank, and supply labor to intermediate firm.
 - Banks: Supply loans to intermediate firms by raising deposits from household.
 - Intermediate firms: They finance themselves from bank loan and produce intermediate goods.
 - Capital goods producers: Produce capital under adjustment cost of investment.
 - Retail firms: Produce final goods while set prices under infrequent Calvo pricing opportunity.

Bank Optimization and Risk Sharing

• Bank faces incentive constraint $V_t \ge \theta Q_t s_t$ which induces spreads

$$E_t \tilde{\Lambda}_{t,t+1}[(R_{k,t+1} - R_{t+1})] = \theta \frac{\lambda_t}{1 + \lambda_t}$$
(1)

Consumption of home-produced and foreign-produced goods

$$C_{t} \equiv \left[(1-\gamma)^{\frac{1}{\eta}} C_{H,t}^{\frac{\eta-1}{\eta}} + \gamma^{\frac{1}{\eta}} C_{F,t}^{\frac{\eta-1}{\eta}} \right]^{\frac{\eta}{\eta-1}}$$
(2)
$$\gamma \equiv (1-n)\alpha$$
(3)

where *n* is the relative size of Home, $1 - \alpha$ is home bias • Risk sharing condition

$$(1 - \gamma - \gamma^*)T_t = \sigma(c_t - c_t^*) \tag{4}$$

$$T_t \equiv \frac{P_{F,t}}{P_{H,t}} \tag{5}$$

▶ When $\alpha = 0$ (no home bias) and n = 1/2 (same size), $c_t = c_t^*$

Estimation: Panel Regression

Based on the structural equation,

$$\frac{L_t^i}{N_t^i} = \frac{E_t R_{t+1}^i}{\theta - E_t [R_{t+1}^{K,i} - R_{t+1}^i]}.$$
(6)

• Estimate the following equation.

$$L_{t}^{i} = \alpha^{i} + \beta_{1}^{i} R_{t+1}^{i} + \beta_{2}^{i} N_{t}^{i} + \beta_{3}^{i} Spread_{t+1}^{i} + D_{t} + \epsilon_{t}^{i}.$$
(7)

where D_t is control variables.

• The structural relationship between β_2^i and θ^i is

$$\hat{\beta}_{3}^{i} = \frac{\beta Spread}{\theta - \beta Spread},\tag{8}$$

Estimation Results

| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
|-----------------------------|-----------|-----------|------------|
| VARIABLES | Aggregate | Core | Peripheral |
| | | | |
| Deposit Rate | 0.0139 | 0.648* | 1.140 |
| | (0.212) | (0.342) | (0.831) |
| Bank Equity ¹ | 0.396*** | 0.363** | 0.521** |
| | (0.113) | (0.142) | (0.234) |
| Spreads ² | 5.612*** | 8.753*** | 12.64** |
| | (1.156) | (1.588) | (5.279) |
| Lending Demand ³ | 0.00573 | -0.00691 | 0.00766 |
| - | (0.00488) | (0.00826) | (0.00626) |
| Constant | 9.251*** | 7.270*** | 5.426** |
| | (1.446) | (2.724) | (2.716) |
| Time FE | Yes | Yes | Yes |
| Observations | 116 | 59 | 57 |
| Number of country_id | 8 | 4 | 4 |
| | | | |

• The implied values of the degree of financial degree are

$$\hat{\theta}_{Peripheral} = 0.512, \ \hat{\theta}_{Core} = 0.260.$$

¹Logged value.

²Average loan rate minus average deposit rate.

Simulation for core and peripheral countries



Interest Rate Shock

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

Appendix: Conclusion

- With an union model with bank-lending channel, we studied how different degree of the financial friction affects the responses to monetary policy
- The region with tighter friction has smaller responses to monetary policy
- With data on EU countries, we estimate the degree of the financial friction with panel regression
- Core countries have much looser financial constraint and the peripheral countries have very tight financial constraint

Appendix: Calibration

Table: Calibration

| | Parameters | Home | Foreign |
|--------------------------|---|-------|---------|
| Financial Intermediaries | | | |
| X | Proportional transfer to the entering bankers | 0. | 002 |
| σ | Continuation rate of the bankers | 0. | 972 |
| θ | Fraction of asset that can be diverted | 0.260 | 0.512 |
| efp _{ss} | Steady-state external finance premium | 0.0 | 025 |
| Open economy | | | |
| n | Relative size of Home region | 1 | /2 |
| $1-\alpha$ | The degree of Home bias | 0.6 | 0.6 |

This implies the steady-state level of leverage is 5.7773 in Home and 1.1208 in Foreign.

Appendix: Estimation Data

| Bank / Financial Variables | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---------|--------------------------------|---------------|--|--|
| Variables | Level | Sources | Quarters | | |
| Bank Net Worth (MTM) | Country | ECB Statistical Data Warehouse | 1989Q3-2020Q1 | | |
| Bank Loan | Country | ECB Statistical Data Warehouse | 1999Q1-2019Q4 | | |
| Spreads (NIM) | Country | ECB Statistical Data Warehouse | 2003Q1-2020Q1 | | |
| Deposit Rate | Country | ECB Statistical Data Warehouse | 2003Q1-2020Q1 | | |
| Lending Demand | Country | ECB Bank Lending Survey | 2000Q1-2020Q1 | | |

/ ---

.

Other Economic Variables

| Variables | Level | Sources | Quarters |
|----------------------|---------|--------------------------------|---------------|
| Output | Country | OECD | 1989Q3-2020Q1 |
| Consumption | Country | OECD | 1989Q3-2020Q1 |
| Inflation (CPI) | Country | OECD | 1989Q3-2020Q1 |
| Hours Worked | Country | ECB Statistical Data Warehouse | 2000Q2-2015Q2 |
| Wage | Country | OECD | 1989Q3-2020Q1 |
| Investment (GFCF) | Country | OECD | 1989Q3-2019Q1 |
| Monetary Policy Rate | Country | Deutsche Bundesbank | 1999Q1-2020Q1 |