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- Credit-asset prices nexus key area of post-crisis finance
- Affecting affordability through credit common policy objective

- Existing credit-prices evidence focuses on collateral constraints

- Payment size itself important dimension of credit, esp. for households
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Capitalization of supply shocks in the cross-section

- This paper: use disaggregated data on car loans and sales to identify mechanics of credit-supply shock *capitalization* and *incidence*

- Question: How do *individual* transaction prices impound *individual* credit terms?

  1. Identify borrower-specific exogenous changes in maturity (payment size)
  2. Marry individual maturity shocks to individual prices paid for equivalent cars
  3. Suggestive evidence that credit shocks affect bargaining intensity

- Spoiler: Significant capitalization effects of individualized credit supply shocks. Price adjustment offsets ~20% of monthly payment increase.
Isolating credit channel

Deregulation →
Credit Supply →
Shock →

- Lending standards down
- Interest rates down
- Local firms credit access improves
- Expectations improve
- Local aggregate demand increases
- Affordability improves
- Capital flows in
- ...

Prices increase
Focus on different dimension of credit supply

- Typical dimensions of credit supply:
  - interest rates (e.g. Bernanke and Gertler 1995)
  - credit limits (e.g. Gross and Souleles 2002)
  - lending standards (e.g. Keys et al. 2010)

- Maturity important for many credit contracts
  - corporate loans, car loans, equipment, personal loans, furniture, student loans, mortgages

- Maturity has large effects on installment-payment size

→ This paper: maturity policies important dimension of credit supply
Tie-in to debt + bargaining literature

- Highlights the usefulness of debt in the bargaining process

- Related corporate finance lit on debt and bargaining in
  - market for corporate control (Israel 1991, Muller and Panunzi 2004)
  - between firms and their suppliers (Hennessey and Livdan 2009)
  - firms and organized labor (Matsa 2010)
  - between hospitals and insurers (Towner 2018)

→ We show similar dynamic: limited financial flexibility influences the bargaining process

- Relevance: most secured debt involves bargained-over collateral
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Auto loans are ubiquitous, important

- $1.2 trillion outstanding (NY Fed, 2016)
- Fastest growing consumer debt category, 3rd largest
- 100m outstanding loans $\approx 0.8$ per U.S. household
- Vehicles 50%+ of low-wealth HHs total assets (Campbell, 2006)
Data source

- Data from a private software services company
- Originated by 372 lending institutions in all 50 states
- ~1 million used auto loans from 2005-2017
- Most are used-car loans originated by credit unions
  - CU market share of used car loans ~30%
- Observe price, make, model, model year, trim, origination date
- Drop loans intermediated by seller (indirect loans)
## Loan summary statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interest Rate</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maturity (months)</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase Price ($)</td>
<td>20,341</td>
<td>9,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Age (years)</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FICO Score</td>
<td>714.1</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan-to-Value Ratio</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>972,621</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Identification challenge

- **Goal**: Test for capitalization effects of financing terms in cross-section
- Can’t regress price on maturity
  - Better cars have higher prices and can support longer maturity
- Estimate lender-specific *maximum allowable maturity* policies

→ Isolate natural experiment in *offered* maturity affecting ~5% of sample
Average maturities decline with car age

- Collateral depreciates $\Rightarrow$ max offered maturity $= f(\text{car age})$
- Overall, smooth relationship between maturity and car age
- Fairly similar patterns for all car types
Average maturities decline with car age

- Collateral depreciates $\Rightarrow$ max offered maturity $= f($car age$)$
- Overall, smooth relationship between maturity and car age
- Fairly similar patterns for all car types
Lender-specific maturity policies

- Key insight: cars all age on Jan 1 (car age $\equiv$ calendar year - model year)
- Policies that limit max offered maturity based on car age cutoff will lead to January 1 discontinuities
- Important: Policies vary across lenders, search costly
Lender-specific maturity policies

- Key insight: cars all age on Jan 1 (car age \(\equiv\) calendar year - model year)
- Policies that limit max offered maturity based on car age cutoff will lead to January 1 discontinuities
- Important: Policies vary across lenders, search costly
Detecting exogenous maturity shocks

1. For each lender $\times$ car age, identify lender max maturity policy
   - E.g., lender offers max maturity of 72 months for cars 0-3 years old
   - Same lender offers max maturity of 60 months for cars 4-7 years old
   - Max offered maturity $\equiv p80$ within lender $\times$ car age $\times$ month
   - Maturity policy $\equiv$ stable max offered maturity for more than one year

2. Follow cars as they age
   - Maturity shock $\iff$ max maturity policy for a given vehicle changes from one month to the next
Capitalization of Consumer Financing

Discontinuous maturity policies

Sample lender maturity policy for 3-year-old cars

![Graph showing sample lender maturity policy for 3-year-old cars]
Example maturity shocks

2006 Honda Civic LX  (treatment)
2012 Honda Civic LX  (control)
60 63 66 69 72
Maturity policies
2006m1 2008m1 2010m1 2012m1 2014m1 2016m1 2018m1
3 year old cars 4 year old cars
Natural experiment

• **Summary**: isolated plausibly exogenous ~5% of transactions that should be affected by maturity shock

• **Treatment**: max offered maturity changes on Jan 1
  (for given lender \( \times \) model year)

• **Control**: lender’s max offered maturity does not change Jan 1

• **Post**: January through June

• **Pre**: July through December

• **Rich controls**: Same lender, same car in both treatment/control
First-stage specification

- Measure relevance for loan $i$, commuting zone $g$, lender $l$, month $t$

$$Maturity_{iglt} = \beta_1 Post_t + \beta_2 Treat_i + \beta_3 Treat_i \cdot Post_t + X'_{it}\gamma + \varphi_g + \psi_l + \varepsilon_{iglt}$$

- $\beta_3$ reports how maturity changed for treated cars post-Jan
- Identifying assumption: treatment and control loans would have had similar maturity trends but for age-based policies
- Crucial controls: Year-Make-Model-Trim $\times$ Month FEs $\delta_{YMMT(i),t}$
- Double cluster by commuting zone and month
Maturity parallel trends

Average Maturities Around New Year

Month: J A S O N D J F M A M J

Maturity (months):
0
1
-1
-2

Treated
Control
### First stage maturity regressions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maturity</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment × Post</td>
<td>-2.157***</td>
<td>-2.284***</td>
<td>-2.290***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.304)</td>
<td>(0.271)</td>
<td>(0.265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>-0.371</td>
<td>0.561**</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.365)</td>
<td>(0.282)</td>
<td>(0.263)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMMT × Month FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lender FE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>972,621</td>
<td>972,621</td>
<td>972,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>0.407</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ Chosen maturity decreases by ~2 months for treated borrowers (e.g., 1 in 4 borrowers receives the max, which decreases by 9 months)
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Use variation in loan terms to test for capitalization

- Reduced-form specification to look for discrete price changes
- For loan $i$, commuting zone $g$, lender $l$, month $t$ estimate

$$\log \text{Price}_{igt} = \beta_1 \text{Post}_t + \beta_2 \text{Treat}_i + \beta_3 \text{Treat}_i \cdot \text{Post}_t + \mathbf{X}'_{it} \gamma + \varphi_g + \psi_l + \varepsilon_{igt}$$

- Identifying assumption: parallel price trends for treatment/control
- Requires no differential unobserved changes in composition
  - Support with balance tests
- Double cluster by CZ and month
Unobserved heterogeneity

- Worry: Composition changed with $T \Leftrightarrow$ lower $P$ anyway
- Year-Make-Model-Trim (YMMT) fixed effects go very far
- Timing supportive: not a one-month shock but move to new stable $\bar{T}$
- Still important unobservables: mileage, accident history, sophistication, etc.
Unobserved heterogeneity

- Worry: Composition changed with $T \leftrightarrow$ lower $P$ anyway
- Year-Make-Model-Trim (YMMT) fixed effects go very far
- Timing supportive: not a one-month shock but move to new stable $\bar{T}$
- Still important unobservables: mileage, accident history, sophistication, etc.

1. Borrower characteristics balance checks
2. No detectable effect on vehicle mileage
3. Repeat-sales test
4. Maturity effects constant with car age
5. Oster (2017) unobserved selection test
Borrower composition balance: FICO

Average FICO Around New Year

- Treated
- Control
Borrower composition balance: DTI

Average DTI Around New Year

Month

Treated Control

Average DTI Around New Year

Month

Treated Control
Mileage differential stable around Jan 1

Average Odometer Around New Year for CA-emissions Sample

- Treated
- Control
Reduced form parallel trends
Capitalization effects

\[
\log Price_{igt} = \beta_1 Post_t + \beta_2 Treat_i + \beta_3 Treat_i \cdot Post_t + X'_{it} \gamma + \varphi_g + \psi_l + \varepsilon_{igt}
\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment × Post</td>
<td>-0.006**</td>
<td>-0.007***</td>
<td>-0.007***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMMT × Month FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lender FE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>972,621</td>
<td>972,621</td>
<td>972,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\rightarrow \text{Average prices drop } \sim 70 \text{ bp from average } \Delta T\]
Isolating maturity effects from interest-rate effects

- Treatment $\times$ Post affects both $T$ and $r$
- Estimate 2SLS system to estimate partial value of maturity
- Instrument set is Lender $\times$ Year $\times$ Age cell $k$ indicators $\times$ Post

$$\log Price_{igt} = \sum_k \alpha_k \mathbb{I}_{k(ilt)} + \eta^{mat} Maturity_i + \eta^{rate} Rate_i + X'_{igt} \mu + \varepsilon_{igt}$$
Isolating maturity effects from interest-rate effects

- Treatment × Post affects both \( T \) and \( r \)
- Estimate 2SLS system to estimate partial value of maturity
- Instrument set is Lender × Year × Age cell \( k \) indicators × Post

\[
\log \text{Price}_{igt} = \sum_k \alpha_k \mathbb{I}_{k(ilt)} + \eta_{\text{mat}} \text{Maturity}_i + \eta_{\text{rate}} \text{Rate}_i + X_{igt}' \mu + \varepsilon_{igt}
\]

\[
\text{Maturity}_{igt} = \sum_k \pi_{\text{mat}}^k \mathbb{I}_{k(ilt)} \cdot \text{Post}_t + \sum_k \varphi_{\text{mat}}^k \mathbb{I}_{k(ilt)} + X_{igt}' \gamma_{\text{mat}} + \nu_{\text{mat}}
\]

\[
\text{Rate}_{igt} = \sum_k \pi_{\text{rate}}^k \mathbb{I}_{k(ilt)} \cdot \text{Post}_t + \sum_k \varphi_{\text{rate}}^k \mathbb{I}_{k(ilt)} + X_{igt}' \gamma_{\text{rate}} + \nu_{\text{rate}}
\]
Isolating maturity effects from interest-rate effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maturity</td>
<td>0.0024***</td>
<td>0.0023***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0004)</td>
<td>(0.0004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rate</td>
<td>-0.863**</td>
<td>-0.900**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.330)</td>
<td>(0.330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMMT × Month FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lender FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>972,621</td>
<td>972,621</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

→ Implied elasticity of price w.r.t. payment size of -0.23
Interpreting magnitudes

- 2SLS LATE: value of one year of maturity is $12 \times 0.23\% = 2.8\%$
  - estimated used-car margins $\sim 5\text{–}20\%$
    (Gavazza et al. 2014, Huang et al. 2015, Larsen 2018)

- $2.8\% \times \$20k = \$560 \Delta P$ for $\Delta \bar{T} = 12$ months

- One year lower $\Delta \bar{T}$ has IRR of $\sim 8.9\%$

- Lower price offsets about 20% of the higher monthly payment
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Typical transaction timing

1. Loan application/Preliminary shopping for car
2. Loan approval
3. Finalize car transaction with financing terms

→ scope for prices to adjust because of search or bargaining
What is the transmission mechanism?

- Welfare interpretation affected by mechanism
- Search frictions most likely explanation for price dispersion, market clearing through bargaining (ANP, 2017)
- If lower prices result of treated borrowers searching more intensively, price effects may be washed out by incurred search costs
- On the other hand, bargaining intensity could have costs, too...
Suggestive evidence on mechanisms

1. **Search intensity**: length of time between application and sale does not change treatment $\times$ post

2. **Bargaining success**: prices fall from app $\rightarrow$ sale for treatment $\times$ post
## Search intensity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Days Between Application and Origination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment × Post</td>
<td>-1.184 -1.326 -2.112 -2.114 0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.025) (1.379) (1.606) (1.808) (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.117 1.312 0.301 0.951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.678) (1.065) (0.644) (1.121)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>-3.6917** -1.468 -4.1160** -1.941 -1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.728) (1.85) (1.661) (1.501) (1.346)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Borrower Controls**: Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
- **Lender FEs**: Yes Yes Yes
- **Car Age FEs**: Yes Yes Yes
- **CZ FEs**: Yes
- **Loan Month FEs**: Yes

- **Observations**: 54,929 54,929 54,929 54,929 54,929
- **R-squared**: 0.005 0.045 0.007 0.046 0.059
## Bargaining success

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Price at Origination - Price on Application</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment × Post</td>
<td>-189.759**          -213.858*** -263.175** -235.027*** -349.027***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(88.093)           (65.322) (102.492) (58.619) (87.498)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>222.816***         191.388*** 186.140** 188.804**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(80.763)           (70.628) (84.551) (76.183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>117.204            198.954*** 190.38 219.705*** 318.301***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(132.567)          (45.647) (148.856) (39.685) (61.279)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Controls</td>
<td>Yes               Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lender FEs</td>
<td>Yes               Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Age FEs</td>
<td>Yes               Yes Yes Yes Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ FEs</td>
<td>Yes               Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loan Month FEs</td>
<td>Yes               Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>54,929            54,929 54,929 54,929 54,929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.051             0.221 0.055 0.223 0.253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion: New lessons on credit markets

1. New evidence on the **locality** of credit shocks
   - Previous work: aggregate credit shock affects aggregate prices
   - This paper: Credit varies in the cross-section ⇒ prices vary in the cross-section
   - Prices adjust at a more granular level than we might have expected
   - Scope in most durables markets with secured credits
Conclusion: New lessons on credit markets

1. New evidence on the **locality** of credit shocks
   - Previous work: aggregate credit shock affects aggregate prices
   - This paper: Credit varies in the cross-section ⇒ prices vary in the cross-section
   - Prices adjust at a more granular level than we might have expected
   - Scope in most durables markets with secured credits

2. Illustrates new **mechanism of transmission** of credit to asset prices
   - \( \Delta \) demand operating through overlooked dimension of credit surface
   - Likely importance of bargaining in transmission
No significant change in price residuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>log(Price)</th>
<th>Initial-sale (1)</th>
<th>Second-sale (2)</th>
<th>Difference (1) - (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment × Post</td>
<td>-0.012 (0.010)</td>
<td>0.006 (0.007)</td>
<td>0.018* (0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>0.009 (0.010)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.004)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMMT × Month FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CZ FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>8,697</td>
<td>8,697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>0.0014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interest rates change little with max maturity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Rate</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment × Post</td>
<td>0.0006</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0009</td>
<td>0.0012*</td>
<td>0.0016***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0010)</td>
<td>(0.0011)</td>
<td>(0.0007)</td>
<td>(0.0007)</td>
<td>(0.0005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>-0.0002</td>
<td>-0.0030***</td>
<td>-0.0009</td>
<td>-0.0005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0014)</td>
<td>(0.0017)</td>
<td>(0.0008)</td>
<td>(0.0005)</td>
<td>(0.0004)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>0.0002</td>
<td>-0.0006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0007)</td>
<td>(0.0006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Borrower Controls: Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
Car Age FE: Yes
YMMT × Month FE: Yes Yes Yes
CZ FE: Yes Yes
Lender FE: Yes
Observations: 972,621 972,621 972,621 972,621 972,621
R-squared: 0.426 0.443 0.604 0.640 0.664

Interest rates don’t respond much to $\Delta \bar{T}$ policies, but perhaps some
### Robust to 50% hold-out training sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>log(Price)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Treatment × Post</td>
<td>-0.0003</td>
<td>-0.031**</td>
<td>-0.009*</td>
<td>-0.009**</td>
<td>-0.009***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.025)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment</td>
<td>-0.101***</td>
<td>-0.026**</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.006**</td>
<td>0.008***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.037)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post</td>
<td>-0.062***</td>
<td>0.055***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borrower Controls</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Age FE</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YMMT × Month FE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commuting Zone FE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lender FE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-squared</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.325</td>
<td>0.923</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Oster Unobserved Selection Bias

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>log(Price)</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Coefficient</td>
<td>-0.026</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omitted Variables</td>
<td>-0.068</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>-0.029</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bias-Adjusted</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Includes Zero?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Coefficient within Original Confidence Interval?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Car Age FE**
  - Yes

- **Age × MMT FE**
  - Yes

- **YMMT × Month FE**
  - Yes

- **Commuting Zone FE**
  - Yes

- **Lender FE**