

Money Creation and Banking: Theory and Evidence

Heon Lee

Department of Economics
University of Missouri



November 10, 2020

Introduction

- ▶ What determines the money multiplier?
- ▶ Motivations
 - ▶ since 2008, banks hold large excess reserves.
(required reserves ratios are zero, since March 26th 2020)
 - ▶ relationship between the money multiplier and the required reserve ratio is not clear in the data even before 2008.
- ▶ This paper
 - ▶ a profit maximizing bank creates inside money and determines whether to hold excess reserve endogenously.
 - ▶ credit conditions matter for the money multiplier.
 - ▶ different means of payments.

Motivation



Drop in Money Multiplier & Large Excess Reserves



$$\text{M1 Money Multiplier} = \frac{\text{M1}}{\text{Monetary Base}} = \frac{\text{Currency} + \text{Checkable Deposit}}{\text{Monetary Base}}$$

Motivation

Money Multiplier & Required Reserves Ratio



$$\frac{M1}{MB} = \frac{C + D}{C + R} = \frac{C/D + 1}{C/D + R/D} = \frac{cd + 1}{cd + req}$$


when banks are not holding excess reserves

- ▶ currency-deposit ratio (cd) determined by the public.
- ▶ required reserves ratio (req) determined by a central bank

Chow test for structural break

Motivation

Increase of Currency in Circulation



Demand for Currency

Motivation

- ▶ Banks are holding excess reserves since 2008
 - ▶ There is no negative relationship between money multiplier and required reserve ratio even pre-2008 period when banks are not holding excess reserves
 - ▶ Negative relationship between money multiplier and currency deposit ratio disappeared since 2008
 - ▶ Currency-output ratio of US economy is higher than ever since 1960
 - ▶ More physical currency than checkable deposits from 2002Q2 to 2010Q1
- ⇒ Can monetary theory explain these observation and money creation process?

This paper

I construct a search model of money and credit with fractional reserve banking:

- ▶ identify conditions and policies that characterize when banks hold excess reserves.
- ▶ identify effect of credit condition.

Key results

This paper

I construct a search model of money and credit with fractional reserve banking:

- ▶ identify conditions and policies that characterize when banks hold excess reserves.
- ▶ identify effect of credit condition.

Key results

- ▶ there are three types of equilibrium:
 1. ample-reserves, 2. scarce-reserves, 3. no-banking

This paper

I construct a search model of money and credit with fractional reserve banking:

- ▶ identify conditions and policies that characterize when banks hold excess reserves.
- ▶ identify effect of credit condition.

Key results

- ▶ there are three types of equilibrium:
 1. ample-reserves, 2. scarce-reserves, 3. no-banking
- ▶ interest rate is not too small → scarce-reserves

This paper

I construct a search model of money and credit with fractional reserve banking:

- ▶ identify conditions and policies that characterize when banks hold excess reserves.
- ▶ identify effect of credit condition.

Key results

- ▶ there are three types of equilibrium:
 1. ample-reserves, 2. scarce-reserves, 3. no-banking
- ▶ interest rate is not too small \rightarrow scarce-reserves
interest rate is small & interest on reserve \rightarrow ample-reserves

This paper

I construct a search model of money and credit with fractional reserve banking:

- ▶ identify conditions and policies that characterize when banks hold excess reserves.
- ▶ identify effect of credit condition.

Key results

- ▶ there are three types of equilibrium:
 1. ample-reserves, 2. scarce-reserves, 3. no-banking
- ▶ interest rate is not too small → scarce-reserves
interest rate is small & interest on reserve → ample-reserves
- ▶ calibrated model can generate many features of the evolution of money multiplier in the data.

Key ingredients

- ▶ Bank's lending constraint.
- ▶ Interaction of money and credit.

Key ingredients

- ▶ Bank's lending constraint.
 - ▶ consider zero-excess reserves (bank's lending constraint binds)

$$\begin{aligned} M &= C + \frac{\text{Reserves}}{\text{Reserve Requirement (RR)}} \\ &= \underbrace{C + \text{Reserves}}_{\text{Base Money}} + \underbrace{\text{Reserves} \times \left(\frac{1}{\text{RR}} - 1 \right)}_{\text{Created Inside Money through Lending}} \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ Interaction of money and credit.

Key ingredients

- ▶ Bank's lending constraint.
 - ▶ consider zero-excess reserves (bank's lending constraint binds)
 - ▶ consider bank's profit maximization

$$\begin{array}{l} \max_{\text{lending, other control vars}} \text{Bank's Profit} \\ s.t. \quad \underbrace{\text{Reserves} \times \left(\frac{1}{\text{RR}} - 1 \right)}_{\text{lending limit}} \underbrace{\geq}_{\equiv?} \text{lending} = \text{created inside money} \end{array}$$

- ▶ Doesn't need to bind. This need to be endogenous.
- ▶ Interaction of money and credit.

Key ingredients

- ▶ Bank's lending constraint.
- ▶ Interaction of money and credit.
 - ▶ follow Gu et al. (2016, ECTA)
 - credit is a substitute for money
 - an increase in credit only crowds out the real balance of money.

Related Literature

- ▶ Money and credit:
Gu et al. (2016, ECTA) Lotz & Zhang (2016, JET), Wang et al. (2019, IER), Bethune et al. (2020, REStud),
- ▶ Inside money and banking:
Freeman & Huffman (1991, IER), Berentsen et al. (2007, JET), Gu et al. (2013, REStud), Berentsen et al. (2015, REStud)

MODEL

Environment

- ▶ Time, goods
- ▶ Buyers, sellers
- ▶ Preferences

Environment

- ▶ Time, goods
 1. $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots, \infty$
 2. Each period has two subperiod:
 - Centralized Market (CM)
 - Decentralized Market (DM): bilateral trade, subject to anonymity, limited commitment
 3. Perishable DM/CM goods.

- ▶ Buyers, sellers

- ▶ Preferences

Environment

- ▶ Time, goods
- ▶ Buyers, sellers
 1. Buyer: measure 1; maximize life time utility;
 2. Seller: measure 1; maximize life time utility;
- ▶ Preferences

Environment

- ▶ Time, goods
- ▶ Buyers, sellers
- ▶ Preferences

$$\text{Buyer: } U(X) - H + u(q)$$

$$\text{Seller: } U(X) - H - c(q)$$

- ▶ CM consumption X ; CM disutility for production H ;
DM consumption q ; discount factor: β
- ▶ efficient DM consumption, q^* solves $u'(q^*) = c'(q^*)$.

Different DM meetings

- 1 DM1: sellers only accept cash
 - 2 DM2: sellers accept cash / claim on deposits / private bank note
 - 3 DM3: sellers accept cash / claim on deposits / private bank note / unsecured credit
(buyer's unsecured credit limit is exogenously given by $\bar{\delta}$)
- ▶ Type j DM meeting with prob σ_j
 - ▶ $\sigma_1 + \sigma_2 + \sigma_3 = 1$
 - ▶ In the CM, agents get to know which DM meeting they are going to

Bank

- ▶ A representative bank; max profit in each period;
- ▶ accepts deposits, d ;
issues claims on deposit (give deposit rate, i_d);
can keep deposits as reserves, r ;
may earn some interest on reserves $i_r \geq 0$
- ▶ lends bank loans ℓ by issuing private banknotes $b = \ell$;
earns interest i_l
- ▶ lending is constrained by reserves and reserve requirement;

$$\ell \leq \bar{\ell} = \frac{1 - \chi}{\chi} r$$

- ▶ cost for operating claims on deposit, k ;
- ▶ costly enforcement to repay ℓ , $\eta(\ell) = \nu \ell^\alpha$ where $\alpha > 1$;

Central bank

- ▶ M is monetary base issued by the central bank.
- ▶ M is distributed to the economy in two ways: (1) C as cash in circulation; (2) R as reserves hold by banks.

$$M = C + R$$

- ▶ i_r : interest on reserves; μ : money growth rate; T : lump-sum transfer (or tax); ϕ : price of money in terms of CM consumption good;
- ▶ The central bank's budget constraint can be written as

$$\mu\phi M = \phi(M - M_{-1}) = T + i_r\phi R$$

DM trade

- ▶ Bargaining is characterized by payment and quantity (p, q) .

DM trade

- ▶ Bargaining is characterized by payment and quantity (p, q) .
- ▶ Kalai (1977)'s proportional bargaining

$$\max u(q) - p \quad \text{s.t.} \quad u(q) - p = \theta [u(q) - c(q)]$$

- ▶ $\theta \in [0, 1]$ denotes the buyers' bargaining power.

DM trade

- ▶ Bargaining is characterized by payment and quantity (p, q) .
- ▶ Kalai (1977)'s proportional bargaining

$$\max u(q) - p \quad \text{s.t.} \quad u(q) - p = \theta [u(q) - c(q)]$$

- ▶ $\theta \in [0, 1]$ denotes the buyers' bargaining power.
- ▶ $p = v(q) = (1 - \theta)u(q) + \theta c(q)$

DM trade

- ▶ Bargaining is characterized by payment and quantity (p, q) .
- ▶ Kalai (1977)'s proportional bargaining

$$\max u(q) - p \quad \text{s.t.} \quad u(q) - p = \theta [u(q) - c(q)]$$

- ▶ $\theta \in [0, 1]$ denotes the buyers' bargaining power.
- ▶ $p = v(q) = (1 - \theta)u(q) + \theta c(q)$
- ▶ Define *liquidity premium*, $\lambda(q)$, as following

DM trade

- ▶ Bargaining is characterized by payment and quantity (p, q) .
- ▶ Kalai (1977)'s proportional bargaining

$$\max u(q) - p \quad \text{s.t.} \quad u(q) - p = \theta [u(q) - c(q)]$$

- ▶ $\theta \in [0, 1]$ denotes the buyers' bargaining power.
- ▶ $p = v(q) = (1 - \theta)u(q) + \theta c(q)$
- ▶ Define *liquidity premium*, $\lambda(q)$, as following

$$\lambda(q) = \frac{u'(q)}{v'(q)} - 1 = \frac{\theta[u'(q) - c'(q)]}{(1 - \theta)u'(q) + \theta c'(q)}, \quad \lambda'(q) < 0$$

DM trade

- ▶ Payment p is constrained by their liquidity position z .


$$v(q_1) = p_1 \leq z_1 = m_1$$

$$v(q_2) = p_2 \leq z_2 = m_2 + d_2(1 + i_d) + b_2$$

$$v(q_3) = p_3 \leq z_3 = m_3 + d_3(1 + i_d) + b_3 + \bar{\delta}$$

- ▶ Let p^* be a payment to get q^* with $p^* = v(q^*)$.
- ▶ When $z_j > p^*$, $p_j = p^*$ and when $z_j < p^*$, $p_j = z_j$.
- ▶ m : cash; d : deposit; $\bar{\delta}$: unsecured credit limit;
 b : private banknote issued by a bank; i_d : deposit rate;

Decentralized Market



Centralized Market

BUYER

- Realize their next DM meeting type
- Work & consume
- Redeem deposit with interest, $(1 + i_d)d_j$
- Repay loans $(1 + i_l)l_j$ & unsecured credit δ
- Acquire & adjust balance
 - cash m_j
 - deposit d_j to bank
 - acquire banknote b_j by borrowing $l_j = b_j$ from bank

Period t

Buyers' CM problem

CM value function for buyer

$$W^B(m, d, b, \ell, \delta) = \sum \sigma_j W_j^B(m, d, b, \ell, \delta)$$

CM value function for j type DM meeting buyer

$$W_j^B(m, d, b, \ell, \delta) = \max_{X, H, \hat{m}_j, \hat{d}_j, \hat{\ell}_j, \hat{b}_j} U(X) - H + \beta V_j^B(\hat{m}_j, \hat{d}_j, \hat{b}_j, \hat{\ell}_j)$$

subject to

$$(1 + \pi)\hat{m}_j + (1 + \pi)\hat{d}_j + X = m + (1 + i_d)d + b - \delta - (1 + i_l)\ell + H + \tau$$
$$\hat{b}_j = \hat{\ell}_j$$

π : inflation rate; τ : lump-sum transfer/tax to buyer;

DM1 buyer's problem

$$V_1^B(m, d, b, \ell) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d, b, \ell, 0)$$
$$p = \tilde{m}$$

DM1 buyer's problem

$$V_1^B(m, d, b, \ell) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d, b, \ell, 0)$$
$$p = \tilde{m}$$

DM1 buyer's DM trade surplus

$$\Delta = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d, b, \ell, 0) - W^B(m, d, b, \ell, 0)$$

DM1 buyer's problem

$$V_1^B(m, d, b, \ell) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d, b, \ell, 0)$$
$$p = \tilde{m}$$

DM1 buyer's DM trade surplus

$$\Delta = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d, b, \ell, 0) - W^B(m, d, b, \ell, 0)$$

Intermediate result: $\hat{d}_1 = \hat{\ell}_1 = \hat{b}_1 = 0$

DM2 & DM3 buyer's problem

DM2 value function

$$V_2^B(m, d, b, l) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, 0)$$

$$\text{where } p = \tilde{m} + (1 + i_d)\tilde{d} + \tilde{b}$$

DM2 & DM3 buyer's problem

DM2 value function

$$V_2^B(m, d, b, l) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, l, 0)$$

$$\text{where } p = \tilde{m} + (1 + i_d)\tilde{d} + \tilde{b}$$

DM2 buyer's DM trade surplus

$$\Delta = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, l, 0) - W^B(m, d, b, l, 0)$$

DM2 & DM3 buyer's problem

DM2 value function

$$V_2^B(m, d, b, l) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, 0)$$

$$\text{where } p = \tilde{m} + (1 + i_d)\tilde{d} + \tilde{b}$$

DM2 buyer's DM trade surplus

$$\Delta = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, 0) - W^B(m, d, b, \ell, 0)$$

DM3 value function

$$V_3^B(m, d, b, l) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, \delta)$$

$$\text{where } p = \tilde{m} + (1 + i_d)\tilde{d} + \tilde{b} + \delta \quad \delta \leq \bar{\delta}$$

DM2 & DM3 buyer's problem

DM2 value function

$$V_2^B(m, d, b, l) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, 0)$$

$$\text{where } p = \tilde{m} + (1 + i_d)\tilde{d} + \tilde{b}$$

DM2 buyer's DM trade surplus

$$\Delta = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, 0) - W^B(m, d, b, \ell, 0)$$

DM3 value function

$$V_3^B(m, d, b, l) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, \delta)$$

$$\text{where } p = \tilde{m} + (1 + i_d)\tilde{d} + \tilde{b} + \delta \quad \delta \leq \bar{\delta}$$

DM3 buyer's DM trade surplus

$$\Delta = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, \delta) - W^B(m, d, b, \ell, 0)$$

DM2 & DM3 buyer's problem

DM2 value function

$$V_2^B(m, d, b, l) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, 0)$$

$$\text{where } p = \tilde{m} + (1 + i_d)\tilde{d} + \tilde{b}$$

DM2 buyer's DM trade surplus

$$\Delta = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, 0) - W^B(m, d, b, \ell, 0)$$

DM3 value function

$$V_3^B(m, d, b, l) = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, \delta)$$

$$\text{where } p = \tilde{m} + (1 + i_d)\tilde{d} + \tilde{b} + \delta \quad \delta \leq \bar{\delta}$$

DM3 buyer's DM trade surplus

$$\Delta = u(q) + W^B(m - \tilde{m}, d - \tilde{d}, b - \tilde{b}, \ell, \delta) - W^B(m, d, b, \ell, 0)$$

Intermediate result: $\hat{m}_2 = \hat{m}_3 = 0$ when $i_d > 0$

Bank's problem

- ▶ A risk-neutral rep. bank max its profit by receiving deposits and lending loans.

Bank's problem

- ▶ A risk-neutral rep. bank max its profit by receiving deposits and lending loans.

$$\max_{r,d} (-i_d - i_r) d$$

- ▶ interest on reserves i_r . deposit operating cost k . loan, ℓ , enforcement cost $v\ell^\alpha$

FOCs

Bank's problem

- ▶ A risk-neutral rep. bank max its profit by receiving deposits and lending loans.

$$\max_{r,d} \quad i_r r + (-i_d - k) d$$

$$s.t. \quad r \leq d$$

- ▶ interest on reserves i_r . deposit operating cost k . loan, ℓ , enforcement cost $v\ell^\alpha$

FOCs

Bank's problem

- ▶ A risk-neutral rep. bank max its profit by receiving deposits and lending loans.

$$\max_{r,d} \quad i_r r + (-i_d - k)d$$

$$s.t. \quad r \leq d$$

- ▶ interest on reserves i_r . deposit operating cost k . loan, ℓ , enforcement cost $v\ell^\alpha$

FOCs

Bank's problem

- ▶ A risk-neutral rep. bank max its profit by receiving deposits and lending loans.

$$\max_{r,d,\ell} \quad i_r r + (-i_d - k)d + i_l \ell$$

$$s.t. \quad r \leq d$$

- ▶ interest on reserves i_r . deposit operating cost k . loan, ℓ , enforcement cost $v\ell^\alpha$

FOCs

Bank's problem

- ▶ A risk-neutral rep. bank max its profit by receiving deposits and lending loans.

$$\max_{r,d,\ell} \quad i_r r + (-i_d - k)d + i_l \ell - v\ell^\alpha$$

$$s.t. \quad r \leq d$$

- ▶ interest on reserves i_r . deposit operating cost k . loan, ℓ , enforcement cost $v\ell^\alpha$

FOCs

Bank's problem

- ▶ A risk-neutral rep. bank max its profit by receiving deposits and lending loans.

$$\begin{aligned} \max_{r,d,\ell} \quad & i_r r + (-i_d - k)d + i_l \ell - v\ell^\alpha \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & r \leq d \quad \& \quad \underbrace{\frac{1-\chi}{\chi} r}_{\text{lending limit}} \geq \ell \end{aligned}$$

- ▶ interest on reserves i_r . deposit operating cost k . loan, ℓ , enforcement cost $v\ell^\alpha$

FOCs

Bank's problem

- ▶ $r = d$
- ▶ Two cases

1. bank's lending is not binding.

$$0 = i_r - i_d - k \quad (1)$$

$$0 = i_l - \alpha v \ell^{\alpha-1} \quad (2)$$

$$\ell^* = \left(\frac{i_l}{\alpha v} \right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}} : \text{supply for loan where } \ell^* < \bar{\ell} = \frac{1-\chi}{\chi} d$$

2. bank's lending is binding.

$$0 = i_r - i_d - k + \left[i_l - \alpha v \left(\frac{1-\chi}{\chi} d \right)^{\alpha-1} \right] \frac{1-\chi}{\chi} \quad (3)$$

Definition of equilibrium

Focus on stationary equilibrium where real balances are constant $m = m^+$, $r = r^+$. $\pi = \mu$. $i \equiv (1 + \mu)/\beta - 1$.

Given monetary policy, (i, i_r, χ) and credit limit $(\bar{\delta})$, a stationary monetary equilibrium is consists of

- ▶ real quantities $(m_j, d_j, \ell_j)_{j=1}^3$,
- ▶ consumption quantities (q_1, q_2, q_3) ,
- ▶ prices (i_l, i_d) ,

satisfying the following:

1. $(i_d, i_l, q_1, q_2, q_3)$ solves agents' problem and bank's problem
2. The bank lending constraint satisfies, $\ell = \min(\bar{\ell}, \ell^*)$ where $\bar{\ell} = \frac{1-\chi}{\chi} r$ and $\ell^* = \left(\frac{i_l}{\alpha v}\right)^{\frac{1}{\alpha-1}}$
3. Asset markets clear

Three types of equilibrium

- ▶ $l^* \geq \bar{l} > 0$: A scarce-reserves equilibrium

$$l = \bar{l} = \frac{1 - \chi}{\chi} r < l^*$$

- ▶ $\bar{l} > l^* \geq 0$: A ample-reserves equilibrium

$$l = l^* < \bar{l} = \frac{1 - \chi}{\chi} r$$

- ▶ $\bar{l} = 0$: A no-banking equilibrium

$$l = \bar{l} = \frac{1 - \chi}{\chi} r = 0$$

Comparative statics

	scarce-reserve $\ell^* \geq \bar{\ell} > 0$	ample-reserve $\bar{\ell} > \ell^* \geq 0$	no-banking $\bar{\ell} = 0$				
ζ	$\frac{\partial r}{\partial \zeta}$	$\frac{\partial i_d}{\partial \zeta}$	$\frac{\partial r}{\partial \zeta}$	$\frac{\partial i_d}{\partial \zeta}$	$\frac{\partial r}{\partial \zeta}$	$\frac{\partial i_d}{\partial \zeta}$	$\frac{\partial \ell^*}{\partial \zeta}$
i	-	+	-	0	0	0	+
i_r	+	+	+	+	0	0	-

Result




Figure 1: Equilibria and Deposit Rates

Result

Proposition

For given $(i_r, \chi, \bar{\delta})$:

- (i) $\exists!$ scarce-reserves equilibrium iff $i \geq \max\{\hat{l}, \bar{l}\}$;
- (ii) $\exists!$ ample-reserves equilibrium iff $i \in (0, \bar{l})$ and $i_r \geq k$;
- (iii) $\exists!$ no banking equilibrium either $i \in [0, \hat{l})$ where $i_r < k$, or $i \in [0, i_r - k)$;

Proposition

\bar{l} is increasing in i_r , and \hat{l} is decreasing in i_r .

From scarce-reserve to ample-reserve

- ▶ constraint matters: $\ell = \min\{\bar{\ell}, \ell^*\}$
 - ▶ ℓ^* is increasing in i and decreasing in i_r .
 - ▶ $\bar{\ell} = \frac{1-\chi}{\chi}r$ is decreasing in i and increasing in i_r .
- ▶ consider the case that the central bank lowers the nominal interest rate from $i > \max\{\hat{i}, \bar{i}\}$ to $i' < \bar{i}$ with $i_r > k$.
 - ▶ from scarce-reserves to the ample-reserves.
⇒ decrease in money multiplier
 - ▶ huge increase in reserves

Role of credit condition

	scarce-reserve $l^* \geq \bar{l} > 0$ $\bar{\delta} < \hat{\delta} \quad \bar{\delta} > \hat{\delta}$	ample-reserve $\bar{l} > l^* \geq 0$ $\bar{\delta} < \tilde{\delta} \quad \bar{\delta} > \tilde{\delta}$	no-banking $\bar{l} = 0$
$\partial r / \partial \bar{\delta}$	- 0	- 0	0
$\partial i_d / \partial \bar{\delta}$	+ 0	0 0	0
$\partial l^* / \partial \bar{\delta}$	0 0	0 0	0

Role of credit condition




Figure 2: Demand for reserves and the monetary aggregate with different credit limits

Changes in credit access

scarce-reserve		ample-reserve		no-banking		
$l^* \geq \bar{l} > 0$		$\bar{l} > l^* \geq 0$		$\bar{l} = 0$		
$\frac{\partial r}{\partial \sigma_3}$	$\frac{\partial i_d}{\partial \sigma_3}$	$\frac{\partial r}{\partial \sigma_3}$	$\frac{\partial i_d}{\partial \sigma_3}$	$\frac{\partial r}{\partial \sigma_3}$	$\frac{\partial i_d}{\partial \sigma_3}$	$\frac{\partial l^*}{\partial \sigma_3}$
-	+	-	0	0	0	0

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS

Parameterization

- ▶ The utility functions for DM and CM are $u(q) = Aq^{1-\gamma}/(1-\gamma)$ and $U(X) = \log(X)$
- ▶ Cost function for DM is $c(q) = q$.
- ▶ In the model, the equilibrium is characterized by three policy variables (i, i_r, χ) and credit limit, $\bar{\delta}$.
- ▶
$$\frac{\sigma_3 \bar{\delta}}{1 + \sigma_1 v(q_1) + \sigma_2 v(q_2) + \sigma_3 v(q_3)} = \frac{\text{Unsecured Credit}}{\text{GDP}} \Rightarrow \bar{\delta}$$
- ▶ Model generates equilibrium by using $(i, i_r, \chi, \frac{\text{Unsecured Credit}}{\text{GDP}})$
- ▶ Calibration is based on 1968-2007. Compare in-sample fit (1968-2007) and out-of-sample fit (2008-2017)

Parameterization

Table 1: Model parametrization

Parameter	Value	Target/source	Data	Model
External Parameters				
enforcement cost curvature, α	2	Set directly		
DM3 matching prob, σ_3	0.4783	Durkin (2000)		
Jointly Determined Parameters				
bargaining Power, θ	0.454	avg. retail markup	1.384	1.384
enforcement cost level, ν	0.020	avg. UC/DM	0.387	0.378
DM1 matching prob, σ_1	0.189	avg. C/D	0.529	0.564
deposit operating cost, k	0.002	avg. R/Y	0.016	0.016
DM utility level, A	0.618	avg. C/Y	0.044	0.044
DM utility curvature, γ	0.398	semi-elasticity of C/Y to i	-3.716	-3.724

Note: C , R , DM , UC , Y denote currency in circulation, reserves, DM transactions, unsecured credit and nominal GDP, respectively. D denotes inside money.

Fitted money demand for currency

Sensitivity analysis for α and σ_3







Figure 3: In-sample Fit: 1968-2007







Figure 4: Out-of-sample Fit: 2008-2017





Figure 5: Composition of Monetary Base: Data vs. Model

Conclusion

- ▶ I construct monetary-search model of banking to investigate the money creation process.
- ▶ Use of unsecured credit crowds out inside money.
- ▶ When the central bank pay interest on reserves , money creation is not constrained by reserve requirements but still depends on the nominal interest rates and interests on reserves.
- ▶ Quantitatively, the calibrated model can account for the behavior of money creation.

THANK YOU!

APPENDIX

Chow test

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Money multiplier}_t &= \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{RequiredReserves/Deposit})_t \\ &+ \mathbf{1}_{t \geq 1992Q2}[\gamma_0 + \gamma_1(\text{RequiredReserves/Deposit})_t] \\ &+ \mathbf{1}_{t \geq 2008Q4}[\delta_0 + \delta_1(\text{RequiredReserves/Deposit})_t] + \epsilon_t \end{aligned}$$

F -statistics are obtained by testing $\gamma_0 = \gamma_1 = \delta_0 = \delta_1 = 0$.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Money multiplier}_t &= \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Currency/Deposit})_t \\ &+ \mathbf{1}_{t \geq 2008Q4}[\delta_0 + \delta_1(\text{Currency/Deposit})_t] + \epsilon_t \end{aligned}$$

F -statistics are obtained by testing $\delta_0 = \delta_1 = 0$. [Back to motivation](#)

Chow test for structural breaks

Table 2: Require Reserve Ratio

Dependent Variable: Money Multiplier	
RR	-0.601 (0.365)
RR $\times \mathbf{1}_{t \geq 1992Q2}$	132.279*** (0.031)
RR $\times \mathbf{1}_{t \geq 2008Q4}$	-147.943*** (8.574)
$\mathbf{1}_{t \geq 1992Q2}$	9.091*** (0.557)
$\mathbf{1}_{t \geq 2008Q4}$	0.074*** (0.611)
Constant	2.813*** (0.053)
Obs.	228
R^2	0.963
DF for numerator	4
DF for denominator	222
F Statistic for Chow test	1711.32
F Statistic for 1% sig. level	3.40
F Statistic for 0.1% sig. level	4.79

Chow test for structural breaks

Table 3: Currency Deposit Ratio

Dependent Variable: Money Multiplier	
CD	-1.301*** (0.027)
$CD \times \mathbf{1}_{t \geq 2008Q4}$	-52.018*** (4.995)
$\mathbf{1}_{t \geq 2008Q4}$	3.061*** (0.409)
Constant	3.159*** (0.015)
<hr/>	
Obs.	228
R^2	0.974
DF for numerator	2
DF for denominator	224
F Statistic for Chow test	1245.69
F Statistic for 1% sig. level	4.70
F Statistic for 0.1% sig. level	7.13

Fitted money demand for currency




Figure 6: Money demand for currency

Model-implied regression

Table 4: Model-implied regression coefficients, model vs. data

Dependent Variable:	Reserves/GDP (1968-2007)		M1 Money Multiplier (2009-2017)		Excess Reserve/Deposit (2009-2017)	
	Data (1)	Model (2)	Data (3)	Model (4)	Data (5)	Model (6)
Unsecured Credit/GDP	-0.123*** (0.004)	-0.190				
3 Month T-bill Rate	-0.083*** (0.011)	-0.072	1.004*** (0.156)	1.999	-2.447*** (0.423)	-3.771
Interest on Reserves			-0.892*** (0.150)	-2.034	2.137*** (0.405)	3.842
R^2	0.876	0.849	0.652	0.922	0.612	0.855

Notes: Columns (1)-(2) report the canonical cointegrating regression (CCR) estimates. First stage long-run variance estimation for CCR is based on Bartlett kernel and lag 1. Columns (3)-(6) report OLS estimates. For (3) and (5) Newey-West standard errors with lag 1 are reported in parentheses. ***, **, and * denote significance at the 1, 5, and 10 percent levels, respectively. Intercepts are included but not reported.

In-sample fit

Out-of-sample fit

Welfare




Figure 7: Cost of inflation

Welfare

	$i_r = 0\%$ $\chi = 0.1$ (1)	$i_r = 0.25\%$ $\chi = 0.1$ (2)	$i_r = 0\%$ $\chi = 0.5$ (3)	$i_r = 0.25\%$ $\chi = 0.5$ (4)	$i_r = 0\%$ $\chi = 0.9$ (5)	$i_r = 0.25\%$ $\chi = 0.9$ (6)
q_1	0.141	0.141	0.141	0.141	0.141	0.141
$q_2 = q_3$	0.263	0.263	0.204	0.206	0.152	0.154
$1 - \Delta$	0.0167	0.0167	0.0331	0.0324	0.0655	0.0638




Figure 8: Counterfactual analysis

Sensitivity analysis

Table 5: Alternative parametrizations

	Data	Baseline	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	M2
External Parameters							
α		2	1.8	2.2	1.8	2.2	2
σ_3		0.4783	0.3	0.3	0.4783	0.4783	0.4783
Calibration targets							
avg. retail markup	1.384	1.384	1.386	1.383	1.384	1.383	1.387
avg. C/Y	0.044	0.044	0.044	0.044	0.044	0.044	0.044
avg. R/Y	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.011
semi-elasticity of C/Y	-3.716	-3.724	-3.720	-3.729	-3.724	-3.729	-3.019
avg. C/D	0.529	0.564	0.574	0.557	0.564	0.557	
avg. UC/DM	0.387	0.378	0.379	0.377	0.378	0.377	
avg. C/D (M2)	0.090						0.103
avg. UC/DM (M2)	0.159						0.175

Note: C , R , DM , UC , Y denote currency in circulation, reserves, DM transactions, unsecured credit and nominal GDP, respectively.

Model parametrization









Figure 9: Model Fit with Different Specifications






Figure 10: Model fit with different measure of monetary policy

Sensitivity analysis

Table 6: Parametrizations with different measure of monetary policy

Interest/Inflation rate	3 Month T-bill		Federal Funds		CP		Core PCE	
	Data	Model	Data	Model	Data	Model	Data	Model
Targets								
avg. retail markup	1.384	1.384	1.384	1.384	1.384	1.384	1.384	1.384
avg. C/Y	0.044	0.044	0.044	0.044	0.044	0.044	0.044	0.044
avg. R/Y	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016	0.016
avg. C/D	0.529	0.564	0.529	0.531	0.529	0.554	0.529	0.551
avg. UC/DM	0.387	0.378	0.387	0.373	0.387	0.376	0.387	0.375
semi-elasticity of C/Y	-3.716	-3.724	-3.020	-3.012	-3.454	-3.440	-4.258	-4.220
Parameter								
bargaining power, θ		0.454		0.512		0.476		0.423
enforcement cost level, ν		0.020		0.019		0.016		0.016
DM1 matching prob, σ_1		0.189		0.184		0.189		0.201
deposit operating cost, k		0.002		0.002		0.002		0.002
DM utility level, A		0.618		0.598		0.611		0.642
DM utility curvature, γ		0.398		0.427		0.408		0.378

Note: C , R , DM , UC , Y denote currency in circulation, reserves, DM transactions, unsecured credit and nominal GDP, respectively.







Figure 11: Money demand for currency

References

- Berentsen, A., Camera, G. & Waller, C. (2007), 'Money, credit and banking', *Journal of Economic Theory* **135**(1), 171–195.
- Berentsen, A., Huber, S. & Marchesiani, A. (2015), 'Financial innovations, money demand, and the welfare cost of inflation', *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* **47**(S2), 223–261.
- Bethune, Z., Choi, M. & Wright, R. (2020), 'Frictional goods markets: Theory and applications', *The Review of Economic Studies* **87**(2), 691–720.
- Durkin, T. A. (2000), 'Credit cards: Use and consumer attitudes, 1970-2000', *Federal Reserve Bulletin* **86**, 623.
- Freeman, S. & Huffman, G. W. (1991), 'Inside money, output, and causality', *International Economic Review* pp. 645–667.
- Gu, C., Mattesini, F., Monnet, C. & Wright, R. (2013), 'Banking: A new monetarist approach', *Review of Economic Studies* **80**(2), 636–662.

Gu, C., Mattesini, F. & Wright, R. (2016), 'Money and credit redux', *Econometrica* **84**(1), 1–32.

Kalai, E. (1977), 'Proportional solutions to bargaining situations: Interpersonal utility comparisons', *Econometrica* pp. 1623–1630.

Lotz, S. & Zhang, C. (2016), 'Money and credit as means of payment: A new monetarist approach', *Journal of Economic Theory* **164**, 68–100.

Wang, L., Wright, R. & Liu, L. Q. (2019), 'Sticky prices and costly credit', *International Economic Review* .