

## Accepted Manuscript

Title: The Macroeconomic Relevance of Bank and Nonbank  
Credit: An Exploration of U.S. Data

Authors: Alexander Herman, Deniz Igan, Juan Solé

PII: S1572-3089(17)30452-7  
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.jfs.2017.06.009>  
Reference: JFS 559

To appear in: *Journal of Financial Stability*

Received date: 19-9-2016  
Revised date: 14-6-2017  
Accepted date: 22-6-2017

Please cite this article as: Herman, Alexander, Igan, Deniz, Solé, Juan, The Macroeconomic Relevance of Bank and Nonbank Credit: An Exploration of U.S. Data. *Journal of Financial Stability* <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jfs.2017.06.009>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.



## **The Macroeconomic Relevance of Bank and Nonbank Credit: An Exploration of U.S. Data**

Alexander Herman<sup>a</sup>

U.S. Department of Treasury

Deniz Igan<sup>b</sup>

International Monetary Fund

Juan Solé<sup>c,d</sup>

International Monetary Fund

<sup>a</sup>U.S. Department of Treasury, 1500 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Washington, DC, 20220, USA.

<sup>b</sup>International Monetary Fund, 700 19<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Washington, DC, 20431, USA.

<sup>c</sup>International Monetary Fund, 700 19<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Washington, DC, 20431, USA.

<sup>d</sup>Corresponding author. Postal address: International Monetary Fund, 700 19<sup>th</sup> Street NW, Washington, DC, 20431, USA. Tel: +1 202 623 8401; fax: +1 202 589 8401. Email: [jsole@imf.org](mailto:jsole@imf.org).

### **Paper Highlights**

- We examine the cyclical behavior of bank and nonbank credit in the United States.
- We find that bank and nonbank credit exhibit different dynamics throughout the business cycle.
- This divergence likely supports the view that measures targeting specific sub-segments of the financial sector may be needed to address financial stability risks.
- We then illustrate a method to conduct macro-financial stability assessments focusing on the role of bank and nonbank credit in the creation of financial interconnections.

## Abstract

This paper exploits the Financial Accounts of the United States to derive long time series of bank and nonbank credit to different sectors, and to examine the cyclical behavior of these series in relation to (i) the long-term business cycle, (ii) recessions and recoveries, and (iii) systemic financial crises. We find that bank and nonbank credit exhibit different dynamics throughout the business cycle. We also examine the role of bank and nonbank credit in the creation of financial interconnections and illustrate a method to conduct macro-financial stability assessments.

**Keywords:** Macro-financial linkages, Financial intermediation, Liquidity transformation, Nonbank financial institutions

**JEL Classification Numbers:** E44, E52, G21

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The 2007–08 financial crisis made poignantly evident that neither policymakers nor the academic community understood the extent of the risks involved in nonbank financial activity, which became of macroeconomic relevance as the crisis unfolded. This painful lesson unleashed a massive research and policy agenda seeking to understand, measure, and (re-) regulate the nonbank sector. Progress has been made in various fronts, ranging from the quantification and monitoring of the nonbank sector (e.g., Pozsar et al., 2010) to an ongoing important regulatory reform (cf., FSB, 2011). However, we still know little about the cyclical behavior of credit provided by banks and nonbanks and their relationship with the rest of the economy.

In this paper, we use the Financial Accounts (FAs) of the United States (formerly known as the Flow of Funds) to construct measures of credit among all sectors of the economy. Our aim is to take another step toward filling the knowledge gap in our understanding of credit-real sector interactions, with a focus on bank-nonbank differences and with an eye on deriving insights for policy makers. Differing from previous papers, we carefully distinguish between financial flows intermediated by banks and by nonbanks, and then examine the behavior of these credit measures in relation to (i) the long-term business cycle, (ii) recessions and recoveries, and (iii) the last two systemic financial crises in the United States (namely, the Savings & Loans crisis of the 1980s and the Global Financial Crisis of 2007–08).

Our analytical approach allows us to document which type of credit follows the business cycle closer, and whether bank and nonbank credit to different sectors move in synchrony. We also investigate which forms of credit are associated with deeper recessions and with stronger recoveries. Finally, we demonstrate how our approach can be used to examine the role of bank and nonbank credit in creating systemic vulnerabilities, notably the creation of financial interconnections. The time series analysis we perform and the documentation of credit

developments around recessions and recoveries delve into credit-real sector interactions, while the analysis of intra-financial sector interconnections with a particular focus around systemic crises illustrate how the demonstrated procedure can help with macro-financial surveillance and risk monitoring.

This study joins a series of recent papers that have helped improve our understanding of nonbanks and shadow banking. Gallin (2013) shows how to derive an estimate of funding provided by shadow banks to nonfinancial businesses, households, and governments, defining shadow banking as the set of entities and activities that provide short-term funding outside of the traditional commercial banking system.<sup>1</sup> Pozsar (2014) builds on the database constructed in Pozsar et al. (2010), to present an accounting framework for measuring the sources and uses of short-term funding in the global financial system, identify the gaps in the current data landscape, and make recommendations to fill the gaps so that his proposed framework can be applied. Duca (2014) analyzes how capital regulation and other factors shaped the use of shadow-bank-funded, short-term business debt since the early 1960s. Errico et al. (2014) use external stock and flow matrices to map claims between sector-location pairs to document that external debt liabilities of the U.S. financial sector are procyclical and are closely aligned with domestic credit growth. Our approach complements these papers and aims to provide a more complete (albeit perhaps a more macro, and thus high-level) view of the credit links between banks, nonbanks, and the nonfinancial sector and their co-movement with the business cycle.

Our findings yield important lessons at two levels. First, from a surveillance standpoint, our analysis illustrates the relatively untapped potential of the FAs to conduct macro-financial stability assessments. Second, from a policy perspective, understanding how credit and output co-move through the business cycle is necessary to design effective macroeconomic and macroprudential policies that appropriately balance growth and financial stability objectives.

In rather broad terms, our analysis appears to be more supportive of placing greater emphasis on macroprudential measures to contain risks to the financial system, than of using interest rates to address these vulnerabilities. To be more specific, our main results are listed below:

- Credit and business cycles have different dynamics: cycles of bank and nonbank credit to the private sector (households and businesses) are longer than the output cycle, although these cycles have similar amplitudes to the GDP cycle (except for nonbank credit to households). Bank credit to households and bank credit to nonfinancial businesses have the shallowest cycles, but are the most similar in amplitude to GDP. Bank-to-bank credit and bank-to-nonbank credit tend to exhibit shorter cycles. And although shorter, these cycles tend to be relatively deep.

---

<sup>1</sup> There are various definitions of shadow banking in the literature. Shin and Shin (2010) lay it out as a conceptual distinction between core (traditional deposits) and noncore liabilities of the banking sector. Harutyunyan et al. (2015) propose an alternative approach to shadow banking as all noncore liabilities of both bank and nonbank financial institutions. In our analysis, we focus on the bank-nonbank distinction and the maturity of various funding sources.

- Nonbank credit tends to be more procyclical than bank credit, while credit within the financial system is less procyclical than credit to the nonfinancial sector.
- Credit outflows to the rest of the world tends to be less procyclical than credit to the private sector, with nonbank credit being substantially more synchronized with the business cycle than bank credit.
- In the era since 1980, bank credit to the private sector has become markedly less procyclical. Nonbank credit to the private sector has changed less. Bank and nonbank credit cycles have generally become less synchronized. An exception to this finding is bank credit to nonbanks and nonbank credit to nonbanks, which have become slightly more synchronized.
- External credit has become markedly more procyclical, especially lending to businesses and to nonbanks. Meanwhile, the amount of financing that the rest of the world intermediates through the U.S. financial system has maintained a constant level of synchronicity with the U.S. business cycle.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes how we exploit the Financial Accounts of the United States to construct a database to estimate credit across a range of sectors and financial instruments. In Sections 3 and 4, we take an increasingly narrower approach to study the behavior of these credit measures. First, we analyze the cyclical behavior of the estimated series throughout the entire sample—from 1952 to 2014—focusing on recessions and recoveries (Section 3). Then, we examine the two last systemic financial crises in the United States—the Savings & Loans (S&L) crisis in the 1980s and the 2007–08 Global Financial Crisis (GFC)—(Section 4). Section 5 discusses the policy implications of our analysis.

## **2. A MAPPING EXERCISE USING THE FINANCIAL ACCOUNTS**

### **2.1. The Database**

The FAs provide the most comprehensive overview of financial transactions in the United States. The database contains information on 25 sectors of the economy (e.g., households, depository institutions, money market mutual funds) and on the flows and levels of their assets and liabilities, broken down into 22 different financial instruments (e.g., home mortgages, corporate equities). The data are available on a quarterly frequency, in most cases going as far back as 1952.

As a whole, the FAs paint a picture of who owes what. Unfortunately, however, the FAs do not contain information on the financial interconnections between counterparties. In other words, the FAs do not provide information on the “whom-to-whom lending.”<sup>2</sup> An example helps clarify what is contained or not in the FAs: regarding commercial paper, Table L.208 shows that, as of 2014Q4, of the \$930 billion outstanding commercial paper, \$182 billion had

---

<sup>2</sup> Industry-specific sources sometimes provide more details (e.g., the NAIC on credit in the insurance sector) but combining those with the FAs is not straightforward and may require critical assumptions.

been issued by nonfinancial corporations and \$65 billion by asset-backed security (ABS) issuers. The table also contains information on the holders: for instance, \$36 billion worth of commercial paper was held by pension funds and \$334 billion by money market mutual funds. However, the table does not specify how much of the commercial paper held by pension funds was issued by the nonfinancial corporations, by the ABS issuers, or by some other issuer. That is, the FAs do not specify the connection between pension funds and ABS issuers via commercial paper.

In Section 2.2, we outline a method to construct such interconnections with the data at hand. While subject to certain caveats, the construction of these whom-to-whom statistics allow us go beyond analysis of aggregate patterns (which can and has been conducted elsewhere, for instance, by using bank credit to the nonfinancial private sector), distinguish bank versus nonbank credit, and dig deeper into intra-financial sector patterns—our main contribution to the literature.

## 2.2. Estimating Financial Interconnections

We are interested in measuring financial linkages across different sectors of the economy. These linkages are established via specific financial instruments, with more than one instrument being used most of the time. For example, banks and households are linked via mortgages and consumer loans. At the same time, banks are linked to money market mutual funds via commercial paper. It is through such linkages that credit and funding risks among different sectors arise, facilitating the transmission and potential amplification of shocks to a specific asset class or sector. Often these linkages are an under-used source of information and measuring them is paramount to monitoring risks to the financial system and the economy as a whole.

To get a measure of financial interconnections, we first obtain assets and liabilities of each sector for each *debt* instrument in the FAs. We focus on debt instruments because these contracts carry the features that are more likely to enable the transmission and amplification of shocks throughout the system.<sup>3</sup> We then assume that the whom-to-whom lending (for each specific instrument) is proportional to each sector's asset holdings of that instrument.<sup>4</sup> A step-by-step description and example of this procedure is helpful:

1. For each instrument, we obtain the assets and liabilities held by each sector from Tables L.204 to L.226. For example, Table L.210 (partially reproduced in Figure 1) indicates

---

<sup>3</sup> Debt instruments are contracts that require a fixed payment to the holder, usually with interest. The promise of a fixed payment to debt instrument holders creates the possibility of default and, thus, facilitates the transmission of shocks across agents when debt instruments appear on both sides of balance sheets. Equity instruments, on the other hand, are claims on the earnings and assets of an entity or project. Equity instrument holders, thus, are expected by contract to absorb the losses stemming from the underlying investment.

<sup>4</sup> To the best of our knowledge, Bhatia and Bayoumi (2012) were the first to apply this method for attempting to derive cross-sectoral holdings of financial assets. Gallin (2013) follows a similar approach. However, contrary to Gallin (2013), we are interested in measuring direct gross exposures among sectors, and hence we do not attempt to unravel the linkages as he does.

that, in 2010, there was a total of \$7,598 billion in agency- and GSE-backed securities issued by budget agencies (\$24.2 billion), government-sponsored enterprises (\$6,435 billion), and agency- and GSE-backed mortgage pools (\$1,140 billion). The same table shows that private pension funds held \$184 billion out of the total amount. But note that the table does not specify who issued the securities the pension funds held—budget agencies, government-sponsored enterprises, or agency- and GSE-backed mortgage pools.

2. With the information on asset holdings by each sector provided in the same table, we calculate the share of assets held by each sector. For instance, private pension funds held 2.4 percent of the total amount of agency- and GSE-backed securities outstanding in 2010 (that is, \$184 billion out of \$7,598 billion).
3. Finally, we allocate each sector's liabilities obtained in step 1 uniformly according to the asset shares computed in step 2. For example, private pension funds held 2.4 percent of the agency- and GSE-backed securities issued by budget agencies (i.e., 2.4 percent of \$24.2 billion = \$0.6 billion), by government-sponsored enterprises (i.e., 2.4 percent of \$6,435 billion = \$156 billion), and by agency- and GSE-backed mortgage pools (i.e., 2.4 percent of \$1,140 billion = \$28 billion).

Applying this procedure to each instrument we are interested in yields 22 three-dimensional matrices of size 25-by-25-by-252 (22 being the number of instruments; 25 being the number of sectors, and 252 being the number of quarters from 1952Q1 to 2014Q4). We then consolidate these matrices to arrive at a more general breakdown of sectors and instruments. In particular, we consolidate the Financial Accounts sectors and create the following groupings for the analysis:

- Households (HSH): Households and nonprofit organizations;
- Nonfinancial business (NFB): Nonfinancial corporate and nonfinancial non-corporate businesses;
- Banks (BNK): U.S.-chartered depository institutions, foreign banking offices in the United States, banks in U.S.-affiliated areas, credit unions;
- Nonbanks (NoBNK): Property-casualty insurance, life insurance companies, private pension funds, state and local government retirement funds, federal government retirement funds, money market mutual funds, mutual funds, closed-end funds, ETFs, government-sponsored enterprises, agency- and GSE-backed mortgage pools, ABS issuers, finance companies, REITs, broker-dealers, funding corporations, holding companies;<sup>5</sup>
- Rest of the World (RoW).

---

<sup>5</sup> This grouping includes most asset managers. Note that in the FAs, hedge funds, private equity funds, and personal trusts are reported under the household grouping.

Regarding instruments, recall that we are interested in studying the pattern of different types of credit over the business cycle. Hence, we make a distinction between those instruments that are equity or equity-like (such as corporate equities and mutual fund shares), and those that are debt and debt-like (i.e., those instrument that embed a *de jure* or *de facto* promise to repay at par). Thus we group the FAs' instruments into the following categories:

- Equity-like: corporate equities and mutual fund shares;
- Debt and debt-like:
  - Short-term (and non-insured): Shares of money market funds, fed funds and repo agreements, open market paper (mostly commercial paper);
  - Long-term: Checkable deposits, time and savings deposits, Treasuries, GSE-backed securities, municipal securities and loans, corporate and foreign bonds, bank loans not classified, other loans, total mortgages (home, multifamily, commercial, and farm), consumer credit, trade credit, and security credit.

Before proceeding, some comments and caveats about our procedure are in order. Section 2.3 discusses these in detail.

### **2.3. Underlying Assumptions and Potential Pitfalls**

First, we compute these matrices using the 'level' of credit tables from the FAs and derive real credit series by deflating them in the same manner as GDP (i.e., using the GDP deflator). This is a reasonable approach to the extent that nominal credit is affected by the same nominal factors as nominal GDP.

Second, by assuming that the whom-to-whom linkages are proportional to sectors' holdings of each instrument, we are abstracting from specific concentrations and/or risk profiles that may be present in the data. That could be the case, for instance, if there is relationship lending at the sector level or a sectoral preference by specific lenders for a specific type of assets issued by a specific type of borrower. For instance, in the previous example, this may be the case if pension funds preferred to hold agency- and GSE-backed securities issued only by budget agencies. Similarly, our approach treats all debt from a given sector as equally risky and may be ignoring preferences or institutional constraints that create demand for specific asset classes. For example, pension funds may be required to hold only investment-grade assets. This may generate inaccuracies especially when classifications of debt securities have subcomponents with very different characteristics, such as municipal securities and loans. Unfortunately, the lack of comprehensive information on such investor preferences and granular data on risk profiles prevents the construction of a more accurate database. That said, the distribution we propose is anchored in the data, minimizes the number of required assumptions, and is the one followed by other authors (cf., Bhatia and Bayoumi, 2012; Gallin, 2013).<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Errico et al. (2014) combine several sources in addition to the FAs and also make assumptions when allocating assets of one sector as liabilities of the other. They, however, assume that some investors only invest in some types of assets (e.g., stakes in U.S. pension funds do not figure in the "securities other than shares" category).



A lack of alternative, comprehensive data sources makes it difficult to cross-check the figures we obtain using this methodology to the “real” values. With that caveat in mind, we compare the series obtained using the methodology outlined with those reported at the Federal Reserve Board website.<sup>7</sup> The most obvious series to check, namely, total bank credit as issued by the central bank, also use the FAs as a source of information. The series we “construct” and those reported at the Federal Reserve Board website (under assets and holdings of commercial banks) are, thus, move closely together: the latter series start in 1973 and the correlation coefficient during the period between 1973 and 2014 is 0.9951 (Table 1). The two series are also close to each other in levels: the average nominal value for the constructed series is \$4.42 trillion during this period while the minimum and maximum values observed are \$711 billion and \$9.98 trillion respectively, compared to an average of \$4.19 trillion, a minimum of \$588 billion and \$10.9 trillion for the series from the central banks. We also check the subcomponents where possible and arrive at a similar conclusion: bank credit to households as constructed using the methodology here has a mean of \$4.15 trillion, minimum of \$3.31 trillion, and a maximum of \$4.58 trillion over the period between 2004 and 2014, while a comparable series computed as the sum of residential real estate loans and consumer credit has the comparable statistics of \$2.88 trillion, \$2.08 trillion, and \$3.27 trillion, respectively.<sup>8,9</sup> The correlation between the two series is 0.8282.

As an additional cross-check focusing on the validity of the proportionality assumption we make (that is, how we split the liabilities of a sector as asset holdings of various financial institutions), we compare the numbers we obtain to the data reported in institutional ownership filings (SEC Form 13F) and to the data published by individual institutions, such as Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac in the case of the GSEs. The proportionality assumption does not seem to distort the picture much. For instance, using the proportionality assumption, we compute the share of GSE-issued securities held by insurance and pension funds to be about 9 percent of the total GSE-issued securities outstanding on average during our sample period. This share is reported to be 7.8 percent in the instrument-by-instrument breakdown provided by Freddie Mac as of end-2015.<sup>10</sup> Similarly, 13F filings suggest that institutional investors (investment managers, pension funds, insurance companies, etc.) hold about half of Fannie Mae debt securities, as of mid-2016. Our computations give estimates ranging between 41 and 45 percent across the years in our sample period.

Third, some of the credit instruments are allocated as assets of domestic nonfinancial sectors, perhaps contradictory to economic intuition. For instance, one imagines consumer credit to

---

<sup>7</sup> Available at <https://www.federalreserve.gov/econresdata/statisticsdata.htm>

<sup>8</sup> Note that the residential versus commercial real estate loan breakdown start only in 2004 for the latter series, hence the comparison period.

<sup>9</sup> Note that Federal Reserve Board statistics also indicate that depository institutions and credit unions hold about 70 percent of consumer credit (<https://www.federalreserve.gov/releases/g19/current/default.htm>), similar to the ratio between the two series.

<sup>10</sup> Available at <http://www.freddiemac.com/debt/html/sactivitymain.html>

extended only by the financial sector, but the way the matrices are derived allocates some of this consumer credit to the domestic nonfinancial sectors given the mechanics of the methodology. This is a limitation of data: as noted in footnote 5, the household sector in the FAs include several nonbank financial entities (hedge funds, private equity funds, personal trusts). Hence, we exercise and urge caution that the constructed series may contain inaccuracies. Note that most instruments we analyze are predominantly held by the domestic financial sectors.

Fourth, our measures capture *gross* and *direct* linkages. We do not attempt to net out the amount of lending between two sectors that is intermediated via a third sector. That is, in measuring credit from banks to households, we estimate direct loans that banks make to households, as opposed to trying to estimate the amount of credit that banks give to households via nonbanks (see Gallin, 2013, for an analysis along these lines). Therefore, our approach is appropriate for the purpose of documenting differences in bank and nonbank credit patterns throughout the macroeconomic cycle and around systemic events.

Fifth, since we are interested in the macroeconomic role of credit linkages, some level of aggregation of nonbank entities is needed in Section 3. However, grouping financial institutions with different business models and risk characteristics may also prevent the identification of different behavioral patterns among types of entities. To address this concern, we use a more disaggregated definition of nonbanks to examine the role of financial interconnections around systemic crises in Section 4.

### **3. THE ROLE OF CREDIT IN MACROECONOMIC MOVEMENTS**

In this section, we study the cyclical co-evolution of several credit measures with GDP. Then, we turn to the behavior of credit during recessions and recoveries. The credit cycle dating analysis we perform and the documentation of credit developments around recessions and recoveries demonstrate how the procedure outlined in Section 2 can be used to deliver additional insights for the literature on macro-financial linkages (see Borio, 2012; Claessens et al., 2011; Drehmann et al., 2012; and the references therein).<sup>11</sup>

#### **3.1. Business and Credit Cycles**

As argued, understanding how credit and output co-move through the business cycle is necessary to design effective macroeconomic and macroprudential policies that appropriately balance growth and financial stability objectives. With this goal in mind, we follow Claessens

---

<sup>11</sup> As a side exercise, we also use Vector Autoregressions (VARs) to explore the relationship between interest rates and credit. For details, we refer the interested reader to Igan, Herman, and Sole (2015). The main finding that emerges in a range of robustness checks is that the direction of the (medium-term) response of each type of credit to an interest rate shock is most often not significant. We treat these results with caution and view them as a prompt for further and more detailed research using more disaggregated data on each of the different types of credit (e.g., ABS issuers, GSEs, etc.).

et al. (2012) and apply Harding and Pagan (2002)'s algorithm to our various credit series.<sup>12</sup> In this manner, we identify the phases that each series has undergone in our 63-year sample. That is, we determine when a series reached a peak or trough, and when it was in a boom or bust phase. After that, we assess the length and depth of credit cycles compared to the business cycle. We also measure the ratio of synchronicity between various series. In other words, we measure how frequently both series are in the same phase of the cycle (e.g., both booming, both at a peak, etc.).<sup>13</sup>

The main patterns detected by this exercise are as follows (Table 2):

- The cycles of bank and nonbank credit to the private sector (households and businesses) are longer than the output cycle.<sup>14</sup> However, these cycles have similar amplitudes to the GDP cycle (except for nonbank credit to households).
- Bank-to-bank credit and bank-to-nonbank credit tend to exhibit shorter cycles. And although shorter, these cycles tend to be relatively deep.
- Bank credit to households and bank credit to nonfinancial businesses have the shallowest cycles, but are the most similar in amplitude to GDP.

In terms of the cyclical dynamics, we find that (Table 3):

- Nonbank credit tends to be more procyclical than bank credit. This can be seen by comparing the synchronicity ratios in segment *a* of Table 3 to those in segment *b*. For instance, nonbank credit to businesses is in the same phase as output 79 percent of the time, whereas bank credit to businesses coincides with output 72 percent of the time.
- Credit within the financial system is less procyclical than credit to the nonfinancial sector. For example, bank-to-bank credit has a coefficient of 0.43 compared to 0.71 for bank credit to households and 0.72 for bank credit to businesses (cf., segment *a*). Similarly, nonbank credit to banks (0.68) and to nonbanks (0.75) is also less procyclical than nonbank credit to households (0.78) and to businesses (0.79), (cf., segment *b*).

---

<sup>12</sup> Harding and Pagan (2002) followed Bry and Boschan (1971) to design their algorithm, which identifies the turning points in an economic series. The basic logic of this methodology consists in finding a sequence of local maxima and minima that allow segmenting the series into expansions and contractions. Note that, for the business cycle, we use the readily-available NBER recession and expansion dates in an effort to preserve comparability to other studies of U.S. business cycles. Applying the Harding-Pagan algorithm to real GDP series to determine business cycle turning points instead of using NBER-determined dates does not alter the results.

<sup>13</sup> Note that our synchronicity measure is defined slightly differently than the concordance measure in Claessens et al. (2012). The latter measures how frequently two series are in a boom or bust, whereas our synchronicity also measures how frequently two series are at a peak or a trough. This is why our synchronicity ratios tend to be slightly lower than their respective concordance indices.

<sup>14</sup> This is in line with the findings in Drehman et al. (2012).

- Credit outflows to the rest of the world tends to be less procyclical than credit to the private sector, with nonbank credit being substantially more synchronized with the business cycle (0.69, at the bottom of segment *b*) than bank credit (0.50, at the bottom of segment *a*).

One interpretation for the longer cycles of credit to the private sector is that some lending linkages take longer to build and to unwind than some real variables (e.g., jobs can be created and destroyed very quickly in the United States). For banks, this may be a consequence of “relationship lending” whereas for nonbanks the longer cycle could reflect the slow-moving nature of real estate cycles that underlies a large fraction of nonbank lending. More generally, the same mechanisms that explain the close interaction between financial conditions and macroeconomic developments could also explain the longer duration of credit cycles.<sup>15</sup> For example, financial accelerator models demonstrate the importance of feedback effects across financial markets. In other models with credit frictions, financial cycles occur not only because financial variables reflect developments in the real economy but also because they act as propagation mechanisms themselves. Yet other models focus on the special role played by banks in financial intermediation and emphasize the bank lending channel, where a negative liquidity or interest rate shock limits banks’ access to funding and forces them to adjust their lending with consequences for asset prices. A similar argument can be applied to financial intermediaries more broadly: leverage and balance sheet health affects intermediaries’ ability to lend and has implications for asset prices, including through fire sales and contagion across institutions as well as asset classes.

Next, we explore whether the findings above apply across subperiods. We split our sample into two subsamples (from 1952 to 1979 and from 1980 to 2014) to account for the considerable transformation undergone by the financial system after the 1970s, when new financial instruments, such as money market mutual funds, commercial paper, repos, and mortgage securitization took off and redefined financial activity. Our findings are detailed below.

- Bank credit to the private sector has become markedly less procyclical (segments *c* and *d*). During 1980-2014, bank credit to households was in the same cyclical phase as output 61 percent of the time, compared to 84 percent in the previous three decades. Bank credit to businesses has also become less procyclical (with a coefficient going from 0.79 to 0.66). Nonbank credit to the private sector has changed less.
- Bank and nonbank credit cycles have generally become less synchronized, as revealed by comparing the higher synchronization ratios in segment *e* to those of segment *f* (of course, this result is another manifestation of the growing divergence in procyclicality mentioned above). An exception to this finding is bank credit to nonbanks and nonbank credit to nonbanks, which have become slightly more synchronized (bottom of segments *e* and *f*).
- External credit has become markedly more procyclical, especially lending to businesses and to nonbanks, which increased their coefficients from 0.65 to 0.80 and from 0.61 to

---

<sup>15</sup> The theoretical literature on the interaction between financial and business cycles, starting with Bernanke and Blinder (1988), Bernanke and Gertler (1989), and Kiyotaki and Moore (1997), is expansive. See Allen and Gale (2007) and Adrian and Shin (2010) for reviews.

0.83, respectively (segments *g* and *h*). Interestingly too, the amount of financing that the rest of the world intermediates through the U.S. financial system has maintained a constant level of synchronicity with the U.S. business cycle (cf., coefficient of 0.64).

We also explore if it matters whether output is in an upswing or downturn for the cyclicity of credit. That is, conditioning on the phase of the business cycle, we compute how frequently each credit cycle is in the same phase as output. The difference in coefficients is remarkable, with the synchronicity ratios being much higher during output upswings than downturns (last two columns of Table 3). This is due to the fact that GDP and credit series are more often in expansion phases than in contraction phases. That is, expansions tend to be protracted, whereas contractions are sudden and sharper.

Additionally, we investigate the degree to which bank credit and nonbank credit are simultaneously synchronized with the business cycle (Table 4). Although synchronization ratios are broadly lower with respect to their bank and nonbank counterparts, they exhibit similar properties. As with both bank credit and nonbank credit, joint synchronization between both forms of credit to nonfinancial businesses and output in the full sample is the most procyclical (0.69) while external credit and credit to banks are the least procyclical (0.40 and 0.35, respectively). Similarities to bank and nonbank cyclical patterns extend across subsamples, as well as in upswings and downturns.

### **3.2. Credit in Recessions and Recoveries: A Brief Historical Retrospective**

In this subsection, we examine the typical credit dynamics around recessions as well as expansions. We use recession dates as determined by the NBER. Given the structural changes the U.S. economy has undergone over the sample period, one may argue that the average or median dynamics are not representative. Hence, we provide the change experienced in each of the credit series prior to each business cycle peak and after each business cycle trough in Tables 5 and 6. In Appendix I, we provide a narrative of the evolution of credit measures around each of the ten post-war recessions. To guide the discussion of the typical dynamics, we plot median quarterly growth in annualized terms across time for each type of credit in Figures 2 and 3.

We note that the growth of credit to the private sector (households and businesses) begins to slow down prior to the onset of the recession, and does not pick up again before four quarters into the recession. Bank credit to households tends to have a wider range of negative growth in recessions, whereas nonbank credit to households may recover as early as two quarters post-peak. Intra-financial system credit (i.e., bank and nonbank credit to banks and nonbanks), on the other hand, exhibits more volatility before and after recessions, and it is hard to discern a clear pattern.<sup>16</sup> Note also that the scale of these variations is quite significant.

---

<sup>16</sup> There appears to be some pick-up in nonbank lending to banks (and nonbanks) prior to the business cycle peak. Assuming systemic risks are rising as the business cycle gets closer to the peak—which is not far-fetched given widely documented procyclicality of lending standards, for instance—, this increasing pattern is consistent with the claims that noncore bank liabilities can be an indication of systemic risk buildup and financial vulnerability (see, for example, Hahm et al. 2013). The mechanism behind is likely related to the stickiness in core deposits and the tendency to resort to noncore funding sources when credit growth is above trend, as it happens to be in the run-up to the business cycle peak.

We also construct parallel event studies for credit behavior around business cycle troughs. Here, we find that credit to households tends to recover quickly, typically within two to three quarters. Credit recoveries tend to vary widely for credit to households, while credit to businesses is more stable and recovers after three quarters. As before, interbank and inter-nonbank credit is volatile after troughs, recovering after about four quarters.

#### **4. THE ROLE OF FINANCIAL INTERCONNECTIONS IN SYSTEMIC CRISES**

Next we look at the evolution of financial interconnections around the last two systemic crises in the United States: the S&L crisis of the 1980s and the GFC in 2007–08. We recount these episodes through the lens of our estimated credit measures to argue that certain factors underlying the first crisis turned into mounting trends that aggravated the second, larger crisis. That is, we contend that, starting in the mid-1970s, increasing competition from nonbanks pushed banks to venture into riskier activities, eventually leading to the S&L crisis (cf. also Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, 2011). The trend of steepening competition continued for decades, fuelling what became an unsustainable level of lending to households.<sup>17</sup> Against this backdrop, we rely on our estimated series to construct two measures of credit and funding exposures among financial entities, and argue that the secular rise of simple risk gauges like these—had they been available—may have helped suscite concerns in the run-up to the crisis.

##### **4.1. The 1980s: Financial Deregulation, a Banking Crisis, and New Interconnections**

Financial regulation underwent fundamental changes in the 1970s and 1980s. Money market mutual funds were created in the mid-1970s and, contrary to banks and thrifts, were not subject to deposit rate ceilings. Such exemption soon became a major competitive threat for depository institutions, who then urged Congress to phase out the cap on interest rates and broaden the range of acceptable investments by banks.<sup>18</sup> Contemporaneously, critical legislative changes were enacted to spur the growth of GSEs and their sponsored vehicles.<sup>19</sup> Notably, GSEs were allowed to securitize assets, granted credit lines with the Treasury, given exemptions from certain state and local taxes, and held to lower capital requirements than banks and thrifts. And

---

<sup>17</sup> Two excellent sources explaining these crises with a wealth of detail are FDIC (1997) and Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission (2011).

<sup>18</sup> Relevant new legislation included the Depository Institutions Deregulation and Monetary Control Act of 1980, the Garn-St. Germain Depository Institutions Act of 1982, various changes to OCC rules between 1983 and 1994, and modifications to the Glass-Steagall Act in 1987. Legislation passed in 1968 and 1970 authorized Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac to buy conventional fixed-rate mortgages, and to securitize assets. However, securitization by the agencies did not start in earnest until the 1980s (cf., FDIC, 1997, and Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, 2011, for details).

<sup>19</sup> With a slight abuse of the term, we use the term “GSE” here to refer mostly to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac. However, note that the FAs do not provide a breakdown of the GSEs into Fannie Mae, Freddie Mac, and others.

beyond the direct advantage these measures afforded, GSEs began to benefit from the ‘quasi-sovereign’ status granted by markets who funded them at rates close to that of Treasuries. Unsurprisingly, GSEs progressively became dominant players in the housing market.

Banks responded to the regulatory changes. Recognizing that the expansion of nonbanks in the home mortgage landscape posed challenges to the traditional originate-to-hold model, they not only started to switch to an originate-to-distribute model but also quickly took advantage of the laxer regulatory environment to take on more profitable but riskier projects, such as commercial real estate and high-yielding leveraged buyouts, oil extraction, and off-balance-sheet products (including vehicles created to securitize the loans they originated). Thus, in less than a decade, banks reshuffled their portfolios by boosting credit to businesses in an amount equivalent to 7 percentage points of GDP and cutting down loans to households albeit by a smaller magnitude (4 percentage points of output; Figure 4a).

Risks then materialized in two waves. First, as the regional real estate bubbles sequentially burst—moving from Texas to the Southeast and Mid-Atlantic to California and Arizona—bank and thrift failures skyrocketed. A second round of defaults erupted as risky corporate investments began to grossly underperform. The final tally was close to 3,000 failed depository institutions worth nearly a trillion dollars, with 70 percent of the losses coming from savings and loans thrifts, thus giving name to the episode.

But as bank lending to households began to decline in 1980, nonbanks stepped in to provide increasing amounts of credit over a three-decade climb that culminated with the 2007–08 Financial Crisis (see Section 4.2 below). Nonbank credit to households reached 30 percent of GDP by mid-1990s, up from less than 10 percent a couple of decades earlier (Figure 4b). A large part of this growth was driven by the GSEs (Figure 4c). Within a decade, GSEs doubled their mortgage portfolios while agency- and GSE-backed mortgage pools swelled almost ten-fold. By 1990, the market volume of GSE securities surpassed \$1.1 trillion, or 16 percent of GDP, compared to less than \$190 billion at end-1979.<sup>20</sup> Other nonbank financial institutions had only modest expansion in their credit to the nonfinancial private sector, (Figure 4d).<sup>21</sup>

The vigorous expansion of nonbank credit to households was accompanied by a structural change that redefined the U.S. financial system in a way that became consequential thirty years later. This fundamental transformation was the creation of new and growing interconnections among all types of financial entities, but most notably among nonbanks (Figure 5a). During the 1980s, estimated credit among nonbanks ballooned to reach a size equivalent to almost one-third of GDP by end-1990. Remarkably, interconnections between banks and nonbanks

---

<sup>20</sup> GSE mortgage portfolios went from \$87 billion at end-1979 to \$156 billion at end-1990, while agency- and GSE-backed mortgage pools grew from \$95 billion to \$1,020 billion in the same period.

<sup>21</sup> Given the unique features of and the role played by the GSEs, we repeat the VAR analysis mentioned in Section 3 for GSEs and non-GSE nonbank financial institutions separately instead of combing them under the nonbank category. The impulse-responses obtained confirm that nonbank dynamics are driven by the GSEs when the series of interest is credit to the households but by non-GSEs when the series of interest is credit to nonfinancial businesses and other (bank and nonbank) financial institutions.

also grew, but remained stable at around 14 percent of GDP until the 2000s (this can be seen by adding the blue and black lines in Figure 5a).

The strong growth of new financial interconnections begs a further inquiry into their implications for financial stability. Is a more interconnected system desirable since it helps diversify risks—as it was often argued before 2007—or do new linkages mask vulnerabilities that surpass potential benefits? In Section 4.2, we argue that the key financial interconnections that proved fatal in the 2007–08 crisis had a gestation period of almost thirty years and that they might have been ‘macroeconomically’ visible through analyses like ours.

#### **4.2. From the 1990s to 2007: More Nonbank Interconnections and a Full-Blown Financial Crisis**

To investigate further how the interconnections that swelled over the three decades preceding the GFC bear on financial stability, we take a more granular look at the different types of nonbank entities. We split the nonbank sector into three subgroups: long-term funders (LTF), short-term funders (STF), and intermediate funders (IntF).<sup>22</sup>

- *Long-term funders* (LTF) are financial intermediaries with typically long-term investment horizons. This category includes private and public pension funds, casualty and life insurance companies, mutual funds, ETFs and closed-end funds.
- *Short-term funders* (STF), on the other hand, are intermediaries with genuinely short investment horizons and whose liabilities are redeemable on demand. This category is comprised of money market mutual funds.<sup>23</sup>
- *Intermediate funders* (IntF) include the rest of nonbank entities that provide credit to nonfinancial borrowers, and whose investment strategies vary at times between shorter- or longer-term. In this category we include the GSEs, agency- and GSE-backed mortgage pools, ABS issuers, finance companies, REITs, broker-dealers, holding companies, and funding corporations.

With this classification at hand, we examine the interconnections among nonbanks. That is, we measure credit between each pair of entity types (e.g., credit from long-term funders to short-term funders, from short-term funders to intermediate funders, and so on). We find that intermediate funders consistently received more than 90 percent of all the credit in the nonbank sector from 1980 onwards (Figure 5b). Interestingly, credit amongst intermediate funders doubled in the 1980s from 20 percent to 40 percent of all nonbank credit, and remained at that

---

<sup>22</sup> This classification broadly follows Gallin (2013). A notable exception is that Gallin (2013) defines short-term funders as activities rather than a type of entity.

<sup>23</sup> For the ensuing analysis it is useful to maintain money market funds separate from other intermediaries, as these institutions played a key role as transmitters of contagion during 2007–08 (cf., Baba et al. 2009, among others).



level until the GFC. Since then it has retrenched to account for just around one-fourth of nonbank credit.

The next natural question is whether it was possible to quantify somewhat the risks embedded in these interconnections. Admitting that the available data on financial linkages are deficient, we attempt a rough estimation of the credit and funding exposures faced by each subsector (Figure 6). We measure credit risk as the ratio of credit between two types of entities over the total financial assets of the lender.<sup>24</sup> Funding risk is approximated as the ratio of credit between two types of entities over the total liabilities of the borrower (cf., FSB 2012).

Given that *intermediate funders* were at the epicenter of the GFC (along with *short-term funders*, of course), we focus on this group to assess vulnerabilities in the financial system. Our measure of credit risk reveals the secular accumulation of credit exposures to *intermediate funders* by all subsectors of the financial system, including banks, between 1980 and 2006 (Figure 7).<sup>25,26</sup> Such growing exposure to a rather concentrated type of credit risk (i.e., the household sector as revealed by Figure 4b), in retrospect, should have raised concerns and thus elicited a closer monitoring, especially at a time when the financial system was becoming less regulated.<sup>27</sup>

As we now know, these elements—high and lightly supervised interconnections among financial entities (notably via securitizations) and the build-up of credit risks<sup>28</sup>)—set the stage

---

<sup>24</sup> This is an approximation. We cannot accurately measure credit risk without knowing whether the exposure between the two entities is insured and how much of that credit risk is transformed into counterparty risk through use of credit default swaps. In addition, as noted earlier, not all debt is of similar credit risk. Unfortunately, data limitations force us to rely on this approximation.

<sup>25</sup> As in Section 4.1, we recognize that the GSEs may be playing a unique role and may be behaving differently from other intermediate funders. To examine any potential divergent patterns, we re-do the exercise by separating intermediate funders into GSEs and other intermediate funders. The results are depicted in Figure A.1 in Appendix II, and suggest that the patterns we discuss in Section 4.2 are more prominently observed in the GSEs in the earlier years of the sample and in the non-GSE intermediate funders in the latter years. The main takeaway that the financial system became increasingly interconnected and exposed to intermediate funders remains unaltered. An interesting observation from the breakdown, however, is the role played by the GSEs during the crisis as manifested by the switch in the credit exposure of short-term funders from other intermediate funders to the GSEs.

<sup>26</sup> A curious observation is that the peak in credit exposures to intermediate funders happened sometime around 2003, or at least 4–5 years prior to the beginning of the GFC. While far from being definitive, it is interesting to also observe that the Federal Reserve started a monetary policy tightening cycle in June 2004 that lasted until June 2006. This perhaps may be one reason as to why credit exposures stopped increasing.

<sup>27</sup> With respect to Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, concerns arose around this time that resulted in the passage of the Federal Housing Enterprise Safety and Soundness Act in 1992. Unfortunately, the Act put in place an inadequate regulatory regime.

<sup>28</sup> Another factor worth mentioning was the unstable nature of a non-negligible fraction of the funding received by nonbanks. By focusing on specific instruments that are either *runnable*—such as money market fund shares— or subject to high *roll-over risk*—such as commercial paper and repo contracts—we derive a lower-bound estimate of the fraction of interconnections that are short-term and therefore more vulnerable to runs, and find that, on the

for the crisis dynamics that unraveled in 2007–08. After the fact, however, and from a macro-financial perspective, one could argue that a framework to monitor these financial linkages and measure their attendant risks, as proposed here, could be useful going forward.

## 5. POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND CONCLUDING REMARKS

We set out to improve our understanding of the macroeconomic relevance of credit and financial interconnections by tapping information in the Financial Accounts of the United States. While admitting the tentative nature of our exploration due to existing data limitations, our results have important implications for policy makers at two levels.

First, from a surveillance perspective, our analysis illustrates the relatively untapped potential of the FAs to conduct macro-financial stability assessments. This is a nascent field of inquiry that still suffers from a dearth of data and an underdeveloped toolkit for risk assessment. We have proposed some solutions to both shortcomings, but, of course, our approach can be combined with other recent research pursuing similar goals. For instance, Gallin (2013) offers an alternative way to use FA data to track the reliance of the nonfinancial sector on short-term funding markets, while Errico et al. (2014) show one way to combine the FAs with other data sources.

Second, from a policy perspective, our analysis offers several insights that should be explored more rigorously in future research. First, the different credit and business cycles may magnify the trade-offs of using interest rates to contain financial stability risks. A monetary policy of ‘leaning against the wind’ to curb credit growth could have substantial costs in terms of employment growth and inflation: by raising rates to dampen the upswing in the long credit cycle, central banks may be accelerating an output downturn that is, in fact, closer than they think. Second, the divergent behavior of intra-financial system credit cycles suggests that managing financial stability risks may require a carefully calibrated approach, and one that likely requires targeted policies for each subsegment of the financial system. A change in interest rates would affect each subsector differently, as they are in different cyclical phases, and could possibly lead to a re-routing of lending flows within the financial system. Hence, an apparent reduction in bank credit to other financial entities could simply mask a migration of credit to the less-monitored nonbank sector. Third, the procyclicality of credit cycles in the nonbank sector stresses the need to strengthen resilience in the cycle upswing. As argued by others (e.g., Borio, 2012), the procyclicality of credit underscores the need to build prudential buffers in good times. Our findings imply that this lesson gains relevance for nonbanks, which have been shown to be more procyclical than banks. Finally, our study seems to corroborate that changes in financial regulation (and especially their removal) often lead to the slow and protracted build-up of risks. As demonstrated in the discussion of the period between the S&L

---

eve of the GFC, around 36 percent of the funding among nonbanks was of short-term nature. Notably, the market volume of commercial paper and repos took off remarkably during the 1980s and 1990s, reaching a combined market size of 16 percent of GDP by 1990, same as the GSE securities market. Note, however, that by 2007Q4, short-term funding among nonbanks was not at a historical high (it hovered around 40 percent in the 1980s and around 25 percent in the 1970s). That said, it remained high enough to be a vulnerability were it to dissipate suddenly and needed to be replaced quickly, as was soon to be the case. Moreover, it was the combination of still relatively high short-term funding and large credit risks that proved problematic

crisis and the GFC, new regulations on financial institutions will no doubt cause migration of activities into new places and forms. By adopting a short-term view and focusing on recent incremental changes in risk metrics, financial stability practitioners may miss the secular accumulation of key vulnerabilities.

### **Acknowledgements**

We thank, without implicating, Ravi Balakrishnan, Tamim Bayoumi, Nigel Chalk, Stijn Claessens, Stephan Danninger, Giovanni Dell’Ariccia, John Duca, Marco Espinosa, Joshua Gallin, Phil de Imus, Etibar Jafarov, Srobona Mitra, Marcelo Pinheiro, seminar participants at the IMF and Banco de México, and two anonymous referees and the editor (Iftekhar Hasan) for comments and suggestions. Huy Nguyen provided excellent research assistance. Errors and omissions are ours. The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the IMF, its Executive Board, the U.S. Department of Treasury, the United States Government, or their policies.

### **Appendix I. Ten Recessions**

Since 1952—when flow of funds data began to be collected—there have been 10 recessions and two systemic banking crises (the S&L crisis in the 1980s and the global financial crisis of 2007–08) in the United States.

Given that we have a very limited number of observations, it is difficult to utilize the usual econometric methods. Hence, we opt for a case-by-case approach where we look at the developments around each business cycle peak and trough separately.

Below we provide some narrative about the main characteristics of these recessions and subsequent recoveries. In particular, we discuss the “main” cause and the severity of the recession, as well as the behavior of bank and nonbank credit in the build up to the recession and the posterior recovery.<sup>29</sup>

#### **1953 Recession**

As the Korean War ended in July 1953, defense spending fell sharply. During the war, increased inflationary pressures had prompted the Fed to tighten monetary policy, which raised pessimism about the economic outlook and decreased aggregate demand. The recession started right after the end of the war and lasted for 10 months, but unemployment did not reach its peak of 6.1 percent until September 1954, three months after the recession ended. Real GDP level was down 2.5 percent from peak to trough.

---

<sup>29</sup> Recessions, like other economic events, seldom have a single cause but are rather the result of a confluence of factors. There is typically, however, a trigger and/or a dominant force that drives the economy into recession and which we call the main cause of the recession.

Credit to the nonfinancial private sector was not a major factor in the run-up to the recession. Both bank and nonbank credit to households grew at a healthy pace in the six quarters before the peak but this reflected trend growth that had started earlier and continued during and after the recession.

The financial system had begun to become more interconnected prior to the recession as bank credit to nonbanks increased and, while strengthening of bank-to-nonbank linkages stalled during the recovery, nonbank credit to nonbanks continued to grow. Interestingly, bank-to-bank credit declined before the recession and this trend accelerated during the recovery.

### **1957 Recession**

Drop in external demand, a strong dollar, and contractionary monetary policy contributed to a widening of the trade deficit and sharp drop in domestic activity led by auto sales and housing construction. The recession lasted 8 months from August 1957 to April 1958. Although shorter than the recession of 1953, the recession of 1957 was deeper: real GDP dropped by 3.6 percent and unemployment reached a peak of 7.4 percent in 1958q2.

Again, credit was not a major factor and patterns before and after the recession reflected the broader deepening of the financial system rather than cyclical movements. Notably, however, bank-to-bank credit increased in the run-up to the recession and plummeted during the recovery. Instead, bank-to-nonbank credit strengthened during the recovery and nonbank-to-nonbank credit also remained strong. This likely was a factor in ensuring uninterrupted provision of credit to households, in addition to the governmental actions taken—lowering the discount rate and ending restrictions on no-down-payment mortgage loans.

### **1960 Recession**

As demand for autos shifted from large, domestic cars to compact and often foreign-made cars, the automotive industry drew down inventories. Starting in April 1960, the recession lasted 10 months and ended in February 1961. This was a relatively mild recession with real GDP falling by 1.3 percent and unemployment rising to 7.1 percent in May 1961. Stimulus spending helped get the economy back on track.

Credit developments continued to reflect broader secular trends. Bank-to-bank linkages weakened somewhat while bank-to-nonbank and nonbank-to-nonbank linkages continue to increase.

### **1970 Recession**

On the back of contractionary monetary and fiscal policies, another relatively mild recession started in December 1969, lasting 11 months. Real GDP dropped by 0.6 percent. Unemployment peaked at 6.1 percent in December 1970.

Credit to the private sector barely increased in the run-up to the recession and grew at a measured pace during the recovery. Linkages between financial institutions continued to evolve on a trend.

### **1973–75 Recession**

This recession lasted 16 months from November 1973 to March 1975. Quadrupling of oil prices by OPEC for a few months in 1973 arguably was the trigger but obviously higher oil prices alone cannot explain the depth of the recession. Several other factors also played a role. First was the fall of the Bretton Woods system as a result of the unilateral decision by the United States to suspend the convertibility of the dollar to gold. Second, for the first time since World War II, wage and price controls were instituted to combat inflation. The result was stagflation and a 3.1 percent drop in real GDP. Unemployment reached a peak of 9 percent in May 1975, two months after the recession technically ended.

Bank and nonbank credit to the nonfinancial business sector grew at a somewhat faster pace than the previous recession episodes in the run-up. Growth of credit to this segment was negative during the recovery. Credit to households grew but at a rather sluggish pace.

In terms of linkages between financial segments, bank-to-bank credit shrank in the run-up while bank-to-nonbank credit grew rapidly. During the recovery, bank-to-bank credit bounced back while bank-to-nonbank credit stalled.

### **1980 and 1981 Recessions**

Although commonly thought as a single, long recession, the years 1980–81 technically witnessed two recessions: the recession of 1980, which started in January and ended in July (lasting 6 months), and the recession of 1981, which started in July and ended in November next year (lasting 16 months). According to many, the Iranian oil embargo, which resulted in an increase in prices, was the original trigger. With inflation running in double digits (which has been in part carried over from the previous oil crisis), the Fed raised interest rates and slowed money supply growth, putting breaks on the economy and leading to a rise in unemployment. Real GDP fell by as much as 8.1 percent (annualized) in 1980q2 and by 6.7 percent (annualized) in 1982q1. Peak-to-trough drop was 2.2 percent in the 1980 recession and 2.6 percent in the 1981 recession. Unemployment rose to 10.8 percent in November 1982, the highest level of unemployment in any post-war recession to that date, and remained above 10 percent for 10 months. Ultimately, a combination of a boost to defense spending, tax cuts, and the lowering of interest rates slowly guided the economy to recovery.

Bank credit to households grew 1.2 percent (annualized) in the 6 quarters preceding the 1980 recession and contracted by -4.3 percent in the run-up to the 1981 recession. Bank credit to nonfinancial businesses grew at a rate of 3.4 percent and 0 percent in the 1980 and 1981 recessions, respectively. This pattern perhaps reflects the back-to-back nature of the two recessions, with credit to nonfinancial businesses remaining flat or declining during the short recovery period in between. Nonbank credit, especially to households, grew at a faster pace in the run-up to the first recession but also remained muted in the run-up to the second. The

recovery from the second recession shows a bounce-back both in bank and nonbank credit to the nonfinancial private sector.

The recession hit the banks at a delicate time. Following a wave of deregulation, banks had been taking more risks. A growing number of loans turned sour as the economy turned and bank failures reached post-Depression highs. Linkages of nonbanks to banks and other nonbanks continued to grow rapidly. These events are discussed in further detail in Section 4.

### **1990–91 Recession**

Triggered by another energy-related geopolitical event (invasion of Kuwait), this recession was eight months (July 1990 to March 1991). Yet, its origins can also be traced to the deregulation of the Savings and Loans industry and, hence, the dynamics of macroeconomic variables and credit aggregates resemble familiar boom-bust cycles and feedback mechanisms. The deregulation resulted in massive growth of mortgage credit, including a surge in securitizations, and eventually the Savings and Loan Crisis of 1988–89. Recession followed soon after. Peak-to-trough drop in real GDP was a modest 1.3 percent.

Bank credit to households shrank by an average of -0.4 percent (annualized) in the 6 quarters preceding the recession (as bank credit started to retrench already in 1989), although it had grown at an average of 4 percent in the previous 5 quarters. Bank credit to nonfinancial businesses dropped at a rate of -3.4 percent in the 4 quarters ahead of the recession. Meanwhile, nonbank credit remained strong: credit to households to nonfinancial businesses grew 12.1 percent and 7 percent (annualized) in the 6 quarters preceding the recession, respectively. During the recovery, retrenchment in bank credit continued while nonbank credit somewhat made up for that, especially for households. In terms of interconnections, credit to banks contracted but nonbank-to-nonbank credit continued to increase at a robust pace of 8 percent before the recession and 10.1 percent during the recovery.

### **2001 Recession**

This recession lasted eight months (March–November 2001). It was caused by the bust of the tech boom and exacerbated by the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Still, the economy contracted only mildly by a peak-to-trough decline of a mere -0.1 percent. Unemployment reached 5.7 percent during the recession.

Credit to the nonfinancial sector from both banks and nonbanks grew at a robust pace in the run-up to the crisis. During the recovery, however, credit to households grew at a fast pace while credit to nonfinancial businesses remained sluggish. Interbank linkages increased at an astounding pace both before the recession and during the recovery.

### **2008–09 Recession**

The recession followed the problems in subprime mortgage markets, which then led to a global financial crisis. The Great Recession was the worst since the Great Depression in the 1930s. The economy shrank in five quarters, including four quarters in a row. In two of these, the drop

in real GDP was more than 5 percent—the worst came in Q2 2008 when real GDP fell by an enormous 8.9 percent, more than any other recession since the Great Depression. The recession was also the longest seen since the Great Depression, lasting 18 months. The recession technically ended in Q3 2009, when real GDP growth turned positive. Aggressive monetary policy actions and stimulus spending were finally able to help the economy register positive growth rates, but the recovery was characterized by a sporadic pattern and lower-than-typical performance overall.

The astonishing speed of growth in interbank linkages continued in the run-up to the recession and during the recovery—in part reflecting the actions taken to clean up the damage from the crisis. Interestingly, nonbank-to-nonbank credit declined for the first time in this recovery.

**Appendix II. GSEs Role as Intermediate Funders**



**References**

- Adrian, T., Shin, H.S., 2010. The Changing Nature of Financial Intermediation and the Financial Crisis of 2007–2009. *Annual Review of Economics* 2, 603–618.
- Allen, F., Gale, D., 2007. *Understanding Financial Crises*, Clarendon Lectures in Finance, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Baba, N., McCauley, R.N., Srichander, R., 2009. U.S. dollar money market funds and non-U.S. banks. *BIS Quarterly Review* March, 65–81.
- Basel Committee on Banking Supervision (BCBS), 2013. *Margin requirements for non-centrally cleared derivatives* (Basel: Bank for International Settlements).
- Bernanke, B., Blinder, A., 1988. Credit, Money, and Aggregate Demand. *American Economic Review Papers and Proceedings* 78, 435–439.
- Bernanke, B., Gertler, M., 1989. Agency Costs, Net Worth, and Business Fluctuations. *American Economic Review* 79, 14–31.
- Bernanke, B., Blinder, A., 1992. The Federal Funds Rate and the Channels of Monetary Transmission. *American Economic Review* 82 (4), 901–921.
- Bhatia, A.V., Bayoumi, T., 2012. Leverage? What Leverage? A Deep Dive into the U.S. Flow of Funds in Search of Clues to the Global Crisis. IMF Working Paper 12/162.
- Borio, C., 2012. The financial cycle and macroeconomics: What have we learnt? BIS Working Papers No. 395.
- Bry, G., Boschan, C., 1971. Cyclical Analysis of Time Series: Selected Procedures and Computer Programs, National Bureau of Economic Research Technical Paper 20, Columbia University Press, New York, NY.
- Claessens, S., Kose, M.A., Terrones, M.E., 2011. Financial Cycles: What? How? When? in: Clarida, R., Giavazzi, F. (Eds.), NBER International Seminar on Macroeconomics, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL.
- Den Haan, W.J., Sterk, V., 2011. The Myth of Financial Innovation and the Great Moderation. *Economic Journal* 121 (553), 707–739.
- Drehmann, M., Borio, C., Tsatsaronis, K., 2012. Characterising the financial cycle: don't lose sight of the medium term! BIS Working Papers No. 380.
- Duca, J., 2014. How Capital Regulation and Other Factors Drive the Role of Shadow Banking in Funding Short-Term Business Credit. Unpublished manuscript, Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas.
- Errico, L., Harutyunyan, A., Loukoianova, E., Walton, R., Korniyenko, Y., Amidžić, G., Abu Shanab, H., Shin, H.S., 2014. Mapping the Shadow Banking System Through a Global Flow of Funds Analysis. IMF Working Paper 14/10.
- Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, 1997. *History of the Eighties: Lessons for the Future*, Volume 1: An Examination of the Banking Crises of the 1980s and Early 1990s, (Washington, DC: Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation).

- Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission, 2011. *The Financial Crisis Inquiry Report* (Washington, DC: Financial Crisis Inquiry Commission).
- Financial Stability Board, 2011. *Shadow Banking: Scoping the Issues* (Basel: Financial Stability Board).
- Financial Stability Board, 2012. *Global Shadow Banking Monitoring Report* (Basel: Financial Stability Board).
- Financial Stability Board, 2014. *Regulatory Framework for Haircuts on Non-Centrally Cleared Securities Financing Transactions* (Basel: Financial Stability Board).
- Gallin, J., 2013. Shadow Banking and the Funding of the Nonfinancial Sector. Finance and Economics Discussion Series 13-50.
- Hahm, J.H., Shin, H.S., Shin, K., 2013. Noncore Bank Liabilities and Financial Vulnerability. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 45 (s1), 3–36.
- Harding, D., Pagan, A., 2002. Dissecting the cycle: a methodological investigation. *Journal of Monetary Economics* 49 (2), 365–381.
- Harutyunyan, A., Massara, A., Ugazio, G., Amidžić, G., Walton, R., 2015. Shedding Light on Shadow Banking. IMF Working Paper 15/1.
- Koo, R.C., 2003. *Balance Sheet Recession: Japan's Struggle with Uncharted Economics and its Global Implications*, John Wiley & Sons, Singapore.
- Loutskina, E., 2011. The Role of Securitization in Bank Liquidity and Funding Management. *Journal of Financial Economics* 100, 663–684.
- Nelson, B., Pinter, G., Theodoridis, K., 2015. Do contractionary monetary policy shocks expand shadow banking? Bank of England Working Papers No. 521.
- Poszar, Z., Adrian, T., Ashcraft, A., Boesky, H., 2010. Shadow Banking. Federal Reserve Bank of New York, Staff Report No. 458.
- Rajan, R., 2010. *Fault Lines: How Hidden Fractures Still Threaten the World Economy*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ.
- Shin, H.S., Shin, K., 2010. Procyclicality and Monetary Aggregates” NBER Working Paper No. 16836.

**Figure 1. U.S. Flow of Funds: Agency- and GSE-Backed Securities****L.210 Agency- and GSE-Backed Securities (1)**



Billions of dollars; amounts outstanding end of period, not seasonally adjusted

	2010	2011	2012
<b>1 Total liabilities</b>	<b>7598.2</b>	<b>7577.4</b>	<b>7554.6</b>
2 Budget agencies	24.2	25.3	24.9
3 Government-sponsored enterprises	6434.5	6247.3	6092.7
4 Agency- and GSE-backed mortgage pools	1139.5	1304.8	1437.0
<b>5 Total assets</b>	<b>7598.2</b>	<b>7577.4</b>	<b>7554.6</b>
6 Household sector	332.7	303.9	163.7
7 Nonfinancial corporate business	16.0	14.3	13.1
8 Federal government	149.2	31.1	0.0
9 State and local governments	516.7	503.8	494.7
10 Monetary authority	1139.6	941.7	1003.4
11 U.S.-chartered depository institutions	1527.2	1634.1	1669.6
12 Foreign banking offices in U.S.	26.5	30.6	32.1
13 Banks in U.S.-affiliated areas	12.8	4.8	2.6
14 Credit unions	151.5	182.1	197.0
15 Property-casualty insurance companies	115.8	122.7	114.3
16 Life insurance companies	376.0	374.4	360.9
17 Private pension funds	184.0	188.2	210.4
18 Federal government retirement funds	5.8	6.5	8.1
19 State and local govt. retirement funds	169.6	182.0	202.9
20 Money market mutual funds	402.8	403.7	343.5
21 Mutual funds	681.3	787.1	875.9
22 Government-sponsored enterprises	377.0	358.9	310.6
23 ABS issuers	3.6	0.3	0.3
24 REITs	143.4	248.1	357.6
25 Brokers and dealers	149.8	147.7	169.6
26 Holding companies	21.1	33.1	22.9
27 Rest of the world	1095.8	1078.2	1001.2



Source: Financial Accounts of the United States.

**Figure 2. Credit Growth Around Business Cycle Peaks**  
(Median, mean, and 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile; Quarterly annualized growth)



*Credit to Households*





*Credit to Nonfinancial Businesses*



*Credit to Banks*



*Credit to Nonbanks*





Note: t corresponds to beginning of recession.



Source: Authors' calculations.

**Figure 3. Credit Growth Around Business Cycle Troughs**  
(Median, mean, and 25<sup>th</sup>-75<sup>th</sup> percentile; Quarterly annualized growth)



*Credit to Households*





*Credit to Nonfinancial Businesses*



*Credit to Banks*




*Credit to Nonbanks*



Note: t corresponds to end of recession.

Source: Authors' calculations.

Figure 4. Credit to the Nonfinancial Private Sector



Sources: Authors' calculations.




**Figure 5. Financial Interconnections**

Figure 6. Credit and Funding Risk Measures






**Figure 7. Evolution of Credit Exposures to Intermediate Funders**



Sources: Authors' calculations.

Figure A.1. Credit Exposure to Intermediate Funders



**Table 1. Cross-Check of Select Constructed Series**

	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Correlation	Comparison period
<b>Total bank credit</b>					
Financial Accounts	4416	711	9975		
Federal Reserve Board	4185	588	10907	0.9951	1973-2014
<b>Bank credit to households</b>					
Financial Accounts	4150	3306	4577		
Federal Reserve Board	2875	2078	3269	0.8282	2004-2014

Source: Authors' calculations

Table 2. Credit Cycle Length and Depth during 1952Q1 – 2014Q4

	1952-2014			1952-1979			1980-2014			Share of GDP in 2014
	Average duration (years)	cycle (in years)	Average cycle amplitude	Average duration (years)	cycle (in years)	Average cycle amplitude	Average duration (years)	cycle (in years)	Average cycle amplitude	
GDP	6.3		0.5	5.6		0.3	7.0		0.3	...
Bank credit to households	10.5		0.6	14.0		0.4	11.7		0.3	25.6
Bank credit to nonfinancial businesses	10.5		0.6	9.3		0.5	11.7		0.3	21.6
Bank credit to banks	3.2		1.6	3.1		0.8	3.2		1.1	0.4
Bank credit to nonbanks	6.3		1.0	9.3		0.6	5.0		0.6	17.1
Nonbank credit to households	21.0		1.1	14.0		0.3	35.0		0.6	42.3
Nonbank credit to nonfinancial businesses	7.9		0.7	28.0		0.4	5.0		0.4	25.8
Nonbank credit to banks	6.3		1.1	9.3		0.6	5.0		0.6	8.2
Nonbank credit to nonbanks	10.5		1.2	9.3		0.8	11.7		0.6	44.5
Total domestic credit to the nonfinancial sector	15.8		0.8	28.0		0.4	11.7		0.4	115.2
Total domestic credit to the financial sector	10.5		1.1	9.3		0.7	11.7		0.6	70.2
Total domestic bank credit	15.8		0.7	28.0		0.5	17.5		0.4	64.6
Total domestic nonbank credit	21.0		1.1	28.0		0.4	17.5		0.6	120.8

Note: The cycle amplitude refers to the coefficient of variation, which is calculated as the standard deviation divided by the mean of a series. Source: Authors' calculations

Table 3. Synchronization Ratios of Output and Credit Cycles

	Synchronization ratio				Output-upward synchronizatio n ratio	Output- downward synchronizatio n ratio
	Full sample		1952- 1979	1980- 2014		
<b>Output cycle and bank credit cycle</b>						
Domestic bank credit	0.77	a	0.82	0.74	0.88	0.40
Bank credit to households	0.71		0.84	0.61	0.77	0.60
Bank credit to nonfinancial businesses	0.72		0.79	0.66	0.82	0.35
Bank credit to banks	0.43		0.46	0.42	0.47	0.35
Bank credit to nonbanks	0.70		0.74	0.73	0.80	0.30
Bank credit to ROW	0.50		0.56	0.46	0.54	0.45
<b>Output cycle and nonbank credit cycle</b>						
Domestic nonbank credit	0.79	b	0.82	0.76	0.91	0.30
Nonbank credit to households	0.78		0.85	0.86	0.89	0.40
Nonbank credit to nonfinancial businesses	0.79		0.81	0.76	0.90	0.30
Nonbank credit to banks	0.68		0.76	0.62	0.78	0.30
Nonbank credit to nonbanks	0.75		0.73	0.76	0.87	0.20
Nonbank credit to ROW	0.69		0.70	0.69	0.78	0.30
<b>Output cycle and domestic credit cycle</b>						
Domestic credit to the nonfinancial sector	0.81		0.82	0.79	0.91	0.40
Domestic credit to the financial sector	0.69		0.60	0.76	0.79	0.30

<b>Bank credit cycle and nonbank credit cycle</b>								
Credit to households	0.76		0.90	e	0.57	f	...	...
Credit to nonfinancial businesses	0.81		0.93		0.72		...	...
Credit to banks	0.51		0.63		0.42		...	...
Credit to nonbanks	0.75		0.72		0.75		...	...
<b>Output cycle and ROW credit cycle</b>								
ROW credit to households	...		...		...		...	...
ROW credit to nonfinancial businesses	0.73		0.65	g	0.80	h	0.84	0.30
ROW credit to banks	0.61		0.59		0.64		0.70	0.20
ROW credit to nonbanks	0.66		0.61		0.83		0.73	0.55
ROW credit to ROW	0.63		0.64		0.64		0.73	0.25

Note: Synchronization ratio is the ratio of number of observations where GDP and credit are in the same phase divided by total observations. Output-upward (output-downward) ratio is the ratio of observations where GDP and credit are both booming (slumping) divided by number of periods when GDP was booming (slumping).

Source: Authors' calculations

**Table 4. Synchronization Ratios of Output, Bank Credit, and Nonbank Credit Cycles**

	Synchronization ratio				Output-upward synchronization ratio	Output-downward synchronization ratio
	Full sample	1952- 1979		1980- 2014		
<b>Output cycle, bank credit cycle, and nonbank credit cycle</b>						
Credit to households	0.65	0.81		0.55	0.73	0.40
Credit to nonfinancial businesses	0.69	0.78		0.61	0.79	0.30
Credit to banks	0.35	0.45		0.29	0.41	0.10
Credit to nonbanks	0.61	0.61		0.63	0.72	0.10
Credit to ROW	0.40	0.44		0.39	0.46	0.20

Note: Synchronization ratio is the ratio of number of observations where GDP and both types of credit are in the same phase divided by total observations. Output-upward (output-downward) ratio is the ratio of observations where GDP and both types of credit are both booming (slumping) divided by number of periods when GDP was booming (slumping). Source: Authors' calculations

**Table 5. Credit Growth before Business Cycle Peaks**

(Annualized growth; 6 quarters pre-peak)

	1953Q3	1957Q3	1960Q2	1969Q4	1973Q4	1980Q1	1981Q3	1990Q3	2001Q1	2007Q4
Bank credit to:										
Households	16.4	7.5	11.4	3.0	8.2	1.2	-4.3	-0.4	5.3	3.0
Nonfinancial Businesses	3.1	5.3	8.0	6.3	11.3	3.4	0.0	-2.6	7.8	9.5
Banks	-4.5	14.2	-15.2	-5.7	-7.2	2.9	-9.2	-23.2	22.1	23.6
Nonbanks	15.5	-3.8	14.8	13.0	19.0	4.6	4.6	0.0	2.7	0.6
Nonbank credit to:										
Households	16.8	7.4	9.1	1.4	2.1	15.2	2.9	12.1	6.2	6.7
Nonfinancial Businesses	9.8	4.3	3.3	3.3	5.8	4.0	1.9	7.0	4.8	5.2
Banks	1.2	3.1	3.4	5.1	12.5	19.5	21.2	-5.8	6.9	8.0
Nonbanks	35.7	11.6	24.9	5.0	15.0	13.1	19.6	8.0	12.7	8.1

Source: Authors' calculations.



**Table 6. Credit Growth after Business Cycle Troughs**

(Annualized growth; 6 quarters post-trough)

	1954Q2	1958Q2	1961Q1	1970Q4	1975Q1	1980Q3	1982Q4	1991Q1	2001Q4	2009Q2
Bank credit to:										
Households	15.1	11.4	9.4	9.8	6.6	-4.9	8.7	-3.5	10.9	-0.4
Nonfinancial Businesses	8.7	8.2	10.2	10.7	-1.4	3.3	11.8	-7.8	-1.4	-7.3
Banks	-16.0	-25.8	6.5	2.7	22.5	-9.2	10.1	-3.4	65.4	37.5
Nonbanks	8.6	17.8	21.8	15.5	0.0	5.5	9.0	5.3	14.4	0.0
Nonbank credit to:										
Households	17.9	8.0	4.9	5.7	4.1	5.3	11.7	10.7	10.3	-7.3
Nonfinancial Businesses	5.5	3.9	7.4	4.6	-0.2	2.6	7.0	1.2	1.6	2.6
Banks	2.2	5.4	10.9	9.2	7.4	23.3	5.7	-7.4	6.3	9.3
Nonbanks	18.8	20.3	4.9	20.0	14.0	21.1	22.5	10.1	5.2	-10.5

Source: Authors' calculations.