Monetary Policy, Corporate Finance & Investment

James Cloyne (UC Davis, NBER & CEPR) Clodo Ferreira (Bank of Spain) Maren Froemel (LBS & BoE) Paolo Surico (LBS & BoE)

March 2019

The views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Bank of Spain, the Euro-system, Bank of England, MPC, FPC or PRA. This research has been funded by the European Research Council.

Monetary Policy and Firm Finance

How does monetary policy affect firm investment? Which type of firms are most responsive?

How do firms' balance sheets respond?

How important are financial frictions?

Firm-level panel approach for the US and UK

- Heterogeneity in the dynamic effects of policy across firms.
- Micro data with macro identification of policy rate changes.

Firm-level panel approach for the US and UK

- Heterogeneity in the dynamic effects of policy across firms.
- Micro data with macro identification of policy rate changes.

Which firms change investment the most?

- Which proxies for financial constraints should we focus on?
- Age, size, growth, leverage, liquidity, dividend status, Q
- Multivariate heterogeneity analysis.

Firm-level panel approach for the US and UK

- Heterogeneity in the dynamic effects of policy across firms.
- Micro data with macro identification of policy rate changes.
- Which firms change investment the most?
 - Which proxies for financial constraints should we focus on?
 - Age, size, growth, leverage, liquidity, dividend status, Q
 - Multivariate heterogeneity analysis.
- What happens to these firms' balance sheets?
 - Borrowing, equity, earnings/cash flows, share prices.

Firm-level panel approach for the US and UK

- Heterogeneity in the dynamic effects of policy across firms.
- Micro data with macro identification of policy rate changes.

Which firms change investment the most?

- Which proxies for financial constraints should we focus on?
- Age, size, growth, leverage, liquidity, dividend status, Q
- Multivariate heterogeneity analysis.
- What happens to these firms' balance sheets?
 - Borrowing, equity, earnings/cash flows, share prices.

Heterogeneity used to examine the transmission mechanism.

Main Findings

Investment

- 1. Age is a robust predictor: Younger firms respond the most. Quantitatively important to account for the aggregate response.
- 2. Especially pronounced for firms not paying dividends.
- 3. Robust to controlling for more traditional characteristics.

Main Findings

Investment

- 1. Age is a robust predictor: Younger firms respond the most. Quantitatively important to account for the aggregate response.
- 2. Especially pronounced for firms not paying dividends.
- 3. Robust to controlling for more traditional characteristics.

Firm Finance

- 4. Younger firms: lower earnings, lower credit scores and leverage. Less likely to pay dividends. Borrowing is more asset-based.
- 5. After a contractionary monetary policy, net worth falls for all firms. But borrowing falls the most for younger firms paying no dividends.

Main Findings

Investment

- 1. Age is a robust predictor: Younger firms respond the most. Quantitatively important to account for the aggregate response.
- 2. Especially pronounced for firms not paying dividends.
- 3. Robust to controlling for more traditional characteristics.

Firm Finance

- 4. Younger firms: lower earnings, lower credit scores and leverage. Less likely to pay dividends. Borrowing is more asset-based.
- 5. After a contractionary monetary policy, net worth falls for all firms. But borrowing falls the most for younger firms paying no dividends.
- **Interpretation of the evidence/channel:** *higher interest rates*-> -> *lower asset values* -> *borrowing falls* -> *investment falls.*

Literature

Empirics...

- > Age & employment (Haltiwanger et al., 2013, Bahaj et al., 2018)
- Age, size, leverage & business cycles (Dinlersoz et al., 2018, Crouzet & Mehrotra 2018)
- Firm Finance & business cycles (Covas & den Haan, 2011, Begenau & Salomao, 2018)
- Investment & financial frictions (Fazzari et al. 1988, Gertler & Gilchrist 1994, Ottonello & Winberry 2018, Jeenas, 2018)
- Firm borrowing constraints (Lian & Ma, 2018, Drechsel, 2018)

Financial frictions...

- Age & growth prospects (Cooley-Quadrini, 2001, Cooper et al. 2006)
- Leverage, asset prices/collateral values & monetary policy (Bernanke, Gertler & Gilchrist, 1999, Kiyotaki & Moore, 1997, etc.)

Outline

Data & Approach

Age as a Proxy for Financial Constraints

Heterogeneity in the Response of Investment

Firm Finance and Balance Sheet Response

Concluding remarks

Firm Data: Panel of Public Firms

- Compustat quarterly panel (US). Worldscope annual panel (UK). Sample period: 1986-2016.
- Also make use of corporate bonds and asset price data (CRSP and Thomson Reuters)
- Key variables of interest:
 - Investment: capital expenditure/net PPE.
 - Age: Worldscope years since incorporation.
 - Other variables: assets, debt, leverage (debt/assets), liquidity, Tobin's Q, equity, share prices, earnings/sales, dividends paid, interest payments.

Monetary Policy: Identification

- Gertler-Karadi approach: High frequency surprises in short rate futures around policy announcements.
- Instrument available since 2001 for the U.K. (Gerko-Rey) and 1991 for the U.S. (Gertler-Karadi).
- Gertler-Karadi (2015)/Mertens-Ravn (2013): surprises as proxies for structural shocks in the Vector Autoregression.
- Identifies a series of monetary policy shocks for the full sample.
 SHOCK SERIES

Empirical Specification

$$\Delta_h X_{i,t+h} = \gamma_i^h + \sum_{g=1}^G \beta_g^h \cdot \mathbf{I} \left[Z_{i,t-1} \in g \right] \cdot R_t + \sum_{g=1}^G \alpha_g^h \cdot \mathbf{I} \left[Z_{i,t-1} \in g \right] + \epsilon_{i,t+h}$$

- Baseline X_{i,t+h}: capex/net PPE at horizon *h*. Also look at equity, borrowing, earnings, share prices etc.
- > $Z_{i,t-1}$: variable defining a group: age, size, growth, leverage, beta, paying dividends in previous year. Could be multivariate.
- *R_t*: interest rate in GK/GR instrumented with structural shocks.

Sense Check: The Average Effect



Response of the investment ratio to a 25 basis point increase in interest rates. Confidence bands 90%. Firm-time clustering.

Consistent with MACRO EVIDENCE using data from national statistics. IRFs even more similar when reporting at the same MANNUAL FREQUENCY



Data & Approach

Age as a Proxy for Financial Constraints

Heterogeneity in the Response of Investment

Firm Finance and Balance Sheet Response

Concluding remarks

Size, Growth and Earnings by AGE

Younger firms are smaller, have lower cash-flows but grow faster



Regressions of the variable of interest on age, squared age, sectorsXtime fixed effects (and size).

Financial Characteristics by AGE

Younger firms: lower credit scores/less likely to pay dividends.



Based on regressions of the variable of interest on age, squared age, sectorsXtime fixed effects (and size).

Leverage and Liquidity by AGE

Younger firms are less leveraged/hold more liquid assets



Based on regressions of the variable of interest on age, squared age, sectorsXtime fixed effects (and size).

Summary: What Does Age Capture?

Younger firms tend to:

- be smaller
- have lower earnings
- have lower
 - credit scores
 - probability of paying dividends

But younger firms also have:

- Iower leverage and higher liquid assets
- faster growth and higher (average) Tobin's Q



Data & Approach

Age as a Proxy for Financial Constraints

Heterogeneity in the Response of Investment

Firm Finance and Balance Sheet Response

Concluding remarks

Response of Investment by AGE



Investment Response by AGE & DIVIDENDS: U.S.



Investment Response by AGE & DIVIDENDS: U.K.



YOUNGER Firms Drive the Average Effect

	Younger		Older	
	No Div	Paid Div	No Div	Paid Div
U.S.	75.5%	6.7%	13.0%	4.8%
	[68.1 , 82.8]	[-1.6 , 15.5]	[11.7 , 14.5]	[1.9 , 7.4]
U.K.	83.6%	13.1%	2.9%	0.4%
	[70.4 , 96.8]	[2.9 , 23.2]	[-2.2 , 8.1]	[-5.9 , 6.9]

Notes: 95% CI in square brackets

Multidimensional Heterogeneity Analysis

Age is correlated with a range of other factors. Do our IRFs simply capture one of these other factors? **No**.

Results are robust to conditioning on:





Data & Approach

Age as a Proxy for Financial Constraints

Heterogeneity in the Response of Investment

Firm Finance and Balance Sheet Response

Concluding remarks

BORROWING responds most for Younger/No Div.



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%. Muted, more homogeneous and less persistent response of interest payments

Borrowing: Asset vs. Earning-Based

$$\Delta B_{i,t} = \sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{1,g} \cdot \mathbf{I} [Z_{i,t-1} \in g] \cdot COLL_{i,t-1} + \sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{2,g} \cdot \mathbf{I} [Z_{i,t-1} \in g] \cdot EBITDA_{i,t-1} + X_{i,t}' \gamma + \epsilon_{i,t}$$



Note: regressions include time-sector, group and firm fixed effects, plus a range of other lagged firms' characteristics as controls. Standard errors are clustered by time and firm.

Borrowing: Asset vs. Earning-Based

$$\Delta B_{i,t} = \sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{1,g} \cdot \mathbf{I} \left[Z_{i,t-1} \in g \right] \cdot COLL_{i,t-1} + \sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{2,g} \cdot \mathbf{I} \left[Z_{i,t-1} \in g \right] \cdot EBITDA_{i,t-1} + X_{i,t}' \gamma + \epsilon_{i,t}' \gamma + \epsilon_{i$$



Note: regressions include time-sector, group and firm fixed effects, plus a range of other lagged firms' characteristics as controls. Standard errors are clustered by time and firm.

Borrowing: Asset vs. Earning-Based

$$\Delta B_{i,t} = \sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{1,g} \cdot \mathbf{I} \left[Z_{i,t-1} \in g \right] \cdot COLL_{i,t-1} + \sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{2,g} \cdot \mathbf{I} \left[Z_{i,t-1} \in g \right] \cdot EBITDA_{i,t-1} + X'_{i,t}\gamma + \epsilon_{i,t}\gamma$$

	U.K.		U.S.				
	Young / No Div	Old / Div	Young / No Div	Old / Div			
	0.025***	0.012	0.063***	0.038**			
GOLLAIENAL	(0.009)	(0.009)	(0.013)	(0.014)			
	-0.013	0.069***	0.007	0.048**			
EDITUA	(0.011)	(0.019)	(0.016)	(0.018)			
Dependent variable: Δ long-term debt							

Note: regressions include time-sector, group and firm fixed effects, plus a range of other lagged firms' characteristics as controls. Standard errors are clustered by time and firm.

EQUITY (MKT. VALUE) falls



Response of **EARNINGS**



Transmission Mechanism

To recap:

- Net worth falls for all groups.
- Borrowing of younger-no dividend firms is more correlated with asset values than with earnings.
- Borrowing only significantly falls for these firms.

Other channels?

- 1. Demand
- 2. Growth and profitability
- 3. Liquidity
- 4. Risk

Sensitivity analysis

Results are robust to

- survival bias
- information effect
- sectoral heterogeneity
- ending the sample in 2007

Our contribution: FIVE NEW FINDINGS...

- 1. Younger firms respond more than any other group and drive the aggregate response of investment to interest rate changes
- 2. Results are more pronounced for young firms paying no dividends and robust to controlling for other firm characteristics

Our contribution: FIVE NEW FINDINGS...

- 1. Younger firms respond more than any other group and drive the aggregate response of investment to interest rate changes
- 2. Results are more pronounced for young firms paying no dividends and robust to controlling for other firm characteristics

- 3. Younger firms' borrowing is more asset-based (than earning-based)
- 4. Net worth and share prices move for all firms
- 5. Borrowing responds most for younger firms.

...and **AN INTERPRETATION**

- Younger firms tend to borrow against the value of their assets to fund capital expenditure.
- Rate increases push down asset prices and collateral values.
- Borrowing constraints tighten: borrowing and investment falls.
- Younger firms account for a sizable part of the aggregate response of investment.

Young firms face financial frictions. Fluctuations in collateral and asset values can play a key role in the MTM.

Extra Slides

Monetary Policy Surprises and Shocks





Investment: National Statistics vs Micro data

United States

United Kingdom



The response of aggregate investment



Monetary Policy shock: 25 basis point increase. Bootstrapped Standard errors.

Back to average effect

The response of aggregate investment



Monetary Policy shock: 25 basis point increase. Bootstrapped Standard errors.

The response of selected macro variables



The U.S. average effect reported at annual frequency



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%.

Back to average effect

Investment responses by **PAYING DIVIDENDS**



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%.

Investment response by SIZE



'Controlling' for (SMALLER) size



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%. Back to robustness summary

Investment response by ASSET GROWTH



'Controlling' for (FASTER) asset growth



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%.

Back to robustness summary
Back to mechanism

Investment response by LEVERAGE



²⁵ basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%.

'Controlling' for (LOWER) leverage



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%.

Back to robustness summary

Investment response by LIQUIDITY



'Controlling' for (HIGHER) liquidity



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%. Back to robustness summary Y Back to mechanism

Investment response by TOBIN'S Q



'Controlling' for (HIGHER) Tobin's Q



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%.

Back to robustness summary
Back to mechanism

US Investment Response by BETA and ALPHA



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%.

'Controlling' for (HIGH) Alpha/Beta (US)



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%.

Back to robustness summary > Back to mechanism

Firms Who Grow Old



More homogeneous INTEREST PAYMENTS response



25 basis point increase in interest rates. Standard errors clustering by firm and time. Confidence band: 90%.

Back to Borrowing

SHARE PRICE falls



Monetary Policy shock: 25 basis point increase. Standard errors clustering: by firms and time. Confidence band: 90%.

Response of EBITDA

