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## 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?
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- Micro data with macro identification of policy rate changes.


## Our Approach

- 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.


## Our Approach

$\square$ 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.


## Our Approach

$\square$ 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.
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- 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-> $\rightarrow$ lower asset values $\rightarrow$ borrowing falls $\rightarrow$ 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.)
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## 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.


## Empirical Specification

$$
\Delta_{h} X_{i, t+h}=\gamma_{i}^{h}+\sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{g}^{h} \cdot \mathrm{I}\left[Z_{i, t-1} \in g\right] \cdot R_{t}+\sum_{g=1}^{G} \alpha_{g}^{h} \cdot \mathrm{I}\left[Z_{i, t-1} \in g\right]+\epsilon_{i, t+h}
$$

- 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

## United States



United Kingdom


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
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## 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.

Credit scores



Dividends \& Bonds



## Leverage and Liquidity by AGE

## Younger firms are less leveraged/hold more liquid assets




## 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:

- lower leverage and higher liquid assets
- faster growth and higher (average) Tobin's Q
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## Response of Investment by AGE



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

## 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: $95 \%$ Cl 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:

1. Size charis
2. Leverage charts
3. Liquidity charis
4. Firm growth charts and Tobin's $Q$

- charts

5. Risk see secilion 7.2 in the paper

## Outline

## 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.

## Younger \& NO dividends



Older \& Paying dividends




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

$$
\Delta B_{i, t}=\sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{1, g} \cdot \mathrm{I}\left[Z_{i, t-1} \in g\right] \cdot \text { COLL }_{i, t-1}+\sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{2, g} \cdot \mathrm{I}\left[Z_{i, t-1} \in g\right] \cdot \text { EBITDA }_{i, t-1}+X_{i, t}^{\prime} \gamma+\epsilon_{i, t}
$$
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| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| COLLATERAL |  |  |
| EBITDA |  |  |

## Dependent variable: $\Delta$ 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.
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## Borrowing: Asset vs. Earning-Based

$$
\Delta B_{i, t}=\sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{1, g} \cdot \mathrm{I}\left[Z_{i, t-1} \in g\right] \cdot \operatorname{COLL} L_{i, t-1}+\sum_{g=1}^{G} \beta_{2, g} \mathrm{I}\left[Z_{i, t-1} \in g\right] \cdot E B I T D A_{i, t-1}+X_{i, t}^{\prime}+\epsilon \epsilon_{i, t}
$$

| COLLATERAL | Houng / No Div. $\begin{array}{r}\text { U.K. }\end{array}$ |  | U.S. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Young / No Div | $\frac{\mathrm{Old} / \mathrm{Div}}{0.012}$ | Young / No Div | Old / Div |
|  | $0.025^{* * *}$ | 0.012 | $0.063^{* * *}$ | 0.038** |
|  | (0.009) | (0.009) | (0.013) | (0.014) |
| EBITDA | -0.013 | 0.069*** | 0.007 | 0.048** |
|  | (0.011) | (0.019) | (0.016) | (0.018) |
| Dependent variable: $\Delta$ 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
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## $E$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0



Older \& Paying dividends



## Response of EARNINGS

Younger \& NO dividends


United Kingdom




## 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

## High-frequency Surprises



Policy Shocks

## Investment: National Statistics vs Micro data

Levels


| $\varepsilon$ |
| :--- |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |



Growth rates



## The response of aggregate investment



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

## The response of selected macro variables



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

[^0]
## The U.S. average effect reported at annual frequency

## United States



United Kingdom


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



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

## ‘Controlling’ for (SMALLER) size

NO dividends \& Younger

$E$
0
0
0
0
0
0
0

PAY dividends \& Older



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

[^1]
## Investment response by ASSET GROWTH



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

## ‘Controlling’ for (FASTER) asset growth



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

## 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

## NO dividends \& Younger




PAY dividends \& Older



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

## Investment response by LIQUIDITY



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

## ‘Controlling’ for (HIGHER) liquidity

NO dividends \& Younger



PAY dividends \& Older



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

## Investment response by TOBIN'S Q

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

## ‘Controlling’ for (HIGHER) Tobin’s Q



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

## 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)

## NO dividends \& Younger PAY dividends \& Older

$\mathscr{0}$
0
0
$\widetilde{8}$
$\frac{\pi}{2}$

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

## Young \& NO dividends



## Old \& Paying dividends



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

## More homogeneous INTEREST PAYMENTS response

Younger \& NO dividends



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

## SHARE PRICE falls

## Younger \& NO dividends




Older \& Paying dividends



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

## Response of EBITDA

Younger \& NO dividends


United Kingdom


Older \& Paying dividends



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


[^0]:    Back to average effect

[^1]:    - Back to robustness summary

