

Discussion

Bank Competition, Lending Technologies, and Credit Availability: Evidence Using Antitrust Regulatory Frictions

by Allen N. Berger and Dasol Kim

Eduardo Dávila

Yale and NBER

ASSA Meetings
San Diego
January 2020

Summary

- ▶ Important question
 - ▶ How does bank competition affect credit supply?
- ▶ Theory is quite inconclusive: no strong priors
- ▶ Empirics is mixed
- ▶ This paper
 - ▶ Explores impact of mergers on credit supply
 - ▶ Δ loan supply on Δ concentration
- ▶ Key innovations
 1. Construct measures of loan supply at the market level using *market-level* deposit data and *bank-level* loan/deposit ratios
 2. Exploits legal decision that scrutinizes mergers based on *deposit Herfindahl* (not loan Herfindahl)
- ▶ Interesting idea

Roadmap of my discussion

1. Summarize approach and results
2. Make some comments

Data

- ▶ Period: 1996-2015
- ▶ Annual data at market, bank level
- ▶ Key variables
 - ▶ New loan origination by bank in each local market: CRA (Community Reinvestment Act)
 - ▶ Deposit data: Call Reports, SoD
 - ▶ Merger Data

Data Construction

- ▶ Data limitation: Loan \times market data not observed
 - ▶ Single local market banks: loan-market balances are observed
 - ▶ Key measure for banks that operate in multiple markets is constructed as follows
 - ▶ $LD_{i,t} = \text{Loan}_{i,t}/\text{Deposit}_{i,t}$ (at the bank-level)
 - ▶ $\text{Loan}_{i,t}^j = \text{Deposit}_{i,t}^j \times LD_{i,t}$ (at the market-level)
- ▶ Relationship lending is imputed (small and large banks)
 - ▶ Small Bank: 1 if assets $< 10b$
 - ▶ Large Bank: 1 if assets $> 50b$
- ▶ Legal ruling uses deposits HHI, not loans HHI
 - ▶ Loan-to-deposit ratios vary
 - ▶ Loan composition varies too

Main Specifications

$$\Delta \ln(Loan)_{i,t+1}^j = \mu_1 \times \text{LenderTechnology}_{i,t-1} \times \Delta \ln(\text{LoanHHH})_{t-1}^{j,\text{ProForma}} + \Psi_{j,t} + \Phi_{i,t} + \varepsilon_{i,j,t+1}$$

- ▶ The variable $\Delta \ln(\text{LoanHHH})_{t-1}^{j,\text{ProForma}}$ takes value of zero whenever there are no mergers
- ▶ Focus on
 - ▶ Behavior of non-merged banks on LHS
 - ▶ Loan size $< \$100k$
 - ▶ Bank-year fixed effect $\Phi_{i,t}$ (differences over year averages)
 - ▶ Market-year fixed effect $\Psi_{j,t}$

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta \ln(Loan)_{i,t+1}^j = & \lambda_1 \times \text{LenderTechnology}_{i,t-1} \times \Delta \ln(\text{LoanHHI})_{t-1}^{j,\text{ProForma}} + \\ & \lambda_2 \times \text{LenderTechnology}_{i,t-1} \times \text{Deposit Trigger}_{t-1}^{j,\text{ProForma}} \\ & \lambda_3 \times \text{LenderTechnology}_{i,t-1} \times \Delta \ln(\text{LoanHHI})_{t-1}^{j,\text{ProForma}} \times \\ & \text{Deposit Trigger, freeform} + \psi_{j,t} + \phi_{i,t} + \xi_{i,j,t+1}\end{aligned}$$

Main Tables

Dependent Variable:	(1) $\Delta \ln(\text{Loan})$	(2) $\Delta \ln(\text{Loan})$	(3) $\Delta \ln(\text{Loan})$
SmallBank $\times \Delta \ln(\text{LoanHHI})$	0.109*** (0.031)		0.090*** (0.034)
LargeBank $\times \Delta \ln(\text{LoanHHI})$		-0.094*** (0.029)	-0.061** (0.031)
Market \times Year FEs	YES	YES	YES
Bank \times Year FEs	YES	YES	YES

- ▶ Rival small banks expand their lending (relationship lenders)
- ▶ Rival large banks contract (transactional lenders)

Main Tables

Dependent Variable:	(1) $\Delta \ln(\text{Loan})$	(2) $\Delta \ln(\text{Loan})$	(3) $\Delta \ln(\text{Loan})$
SmallBank $\times \Delta \ln(\text{LoanHHI})$	0.126*** (0.044)		0.094** (0.047)
SmallBank $\times \text{DepositTrigger}$	0.013 (0.018)		0.016 (0.019)
SmallBank $\times \Delta \ln(\text{LoanHHI}) \times \text{DepositTrigger}$	-0.063 (0.065)		-0.050 (0.065)
LargeBank $\times \Delta \ln(\text{LoanHHI})$		-0.153*** (0.050)	-0.119** (0.054)
LargeBank $\times \text{DepositTrigger}$		0.006 (0.018)	0.011 (0.019)
LargeBank $\times \Delta \ln(\text{LoanHHI}) \times \text{DepositTrigger}$		0.077 (0.078)	0.060 (0.078)
Market $\times \text{Year FEs}$		YES	YES
Bank $\times \text{Year FEs}$		YES	YES

- ▶ Effects only in cases where there is unlikely to be regulatory scrutiny

Comments

1. Equating small size with relational lending is questionable
 - ▶ I know the literature does it, but still
2. The paper should validate the imputation approach
 - ▶ Look at some other data source
 - ▶ Even better, not to use the imputation
3. More data on how the legal merger decisions work
 - ▶ How often is a merger denied?
 - ▶ How does this depend on the trigger being violated?
 - ▶ Some summary statistics

Comments

4. Describe better the actual mergers
 - ▶ More/better summary statistics
 - ▶ Random mergers? Simultaneity issues
5. Explore non-linearities
 - ▶ Effects of competition very nonlinear
 - ▶ Cases with only two banks left?
6. More detailed discussion of collinearity?
 - ▶ Cases with only one bank left who operates in a single market