The Impact of U.S. Monetary Policy on Foreign Firms*

Julian di Giovanni
Federal Reserve Bank of New York
CEPR

John Rogers
Fudan University

Prepared for the IMF 23rd Jacques Polak
Annual Research Conference Honoring Maurice Obstfeld

First Draft: July 29, 2022
This Draft: October 21, 2022

Abstract

This paper uses cross-country firm-level data to explore the impact of U.S. monetary policy shocks on firms' sales, investment, and employment. We estimate a sizeable impact of U.S. monetary policy on the average foreign firm, while controlling for other macroeconomic and financial variables like the VIX and exchange rate fluctuations that accompany U.S. monetary policy changes. We then quantify the role of international trade exposure and financial constraints in transmitting monetary policy shocks to firms, allowing for a better identification of the importance of external demand effects and the interest rate channel. We first exploit cross-country-sector intermediate and final goods' trade data to show that greater global production linkages amplify the impact of U.S. monetary policy at the firm level. We then show that the impact varies along the firm-level distribution of proxies for firms' financial constraints (e.g., size and net worth), with the impact being significantly attenuated for less constrained firms.

Keywords: U.S. monetary policy spillovers; foreign firms; international production linkages; financial constraints

JEL Codes: E52; F40

*We are grateful to Wenchuan Dong, Neel Lahiri, and Yijing Ren for excellent research assistance. The views expressed herein are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the Federal Reserve Banks of New York or any other person affiliated with the Federal Reserve System. E-mail (URL): juliandigiovanni@gmail.com (http://julian.digiovanni.ca), johnrogers@fudan.edu.cn (http://johnrogerseconomist.net).

1 Introduction

The impact of U.S. monetary policy on the real economy is a long-studied topic, and one that is of primary importance to understand today as the Fed and other central banks have entered a global tightening cycle. These policy actions are not taken in a vacuum, and some economists, such as Obstfeld (2022) and Wei (2022), have argued that there is risk of central banks dampening aggregate demand excessively. Indeed, spillovers of U.S. monetary policy may impact foreign economies via several channels independently of domestic policy actions.

This paper merges firm, sectoral and macroeconomic data for a large cross-section of countries to quantify how international trade exposure and the financial channel of interest rate changes affect transmission of U.S. monetary policy shocks to foreign firm activity. We study these two channels given that the recent confluence of escalating protectionism, Covid-19, disrupted supply chains, Brexit, OFAC sanctions, corporate delistings, and geopolitical tensions has raised questions about whether the decades-long trend toward globalization in trade and financial markets, as well as the rise of "megafirms" (Autor, Dorn, Katz, Patterson and van Reenen, 2020), is reversing. Such "end-of-globalization" considerations are important for global welfare depending on the degree to which – and channels through which – shocks such as monetary policy tightening are fundamentally transmitted. Focusing on the firm level is particularly salient given the role of "granular" firms in driving aggregate fluctuations (Gabaix, 2011). Firm heterogeneity further interacts with exposure to the world economy, particularly via international trade, to play a large role in aggregate international business cycle co-movement (di Giovanni, Levchenko and Mejean, 2014, 2018, 2022; Wei and Xie, 2020).

We begin by estimating the effect of U.S. monetary policy shocks on the change in the average foreign firm's investment-to-capital share, sales-to-capital share, and employment growth in a given country. Our methodology utilizes a panel regression model, which allows us to control for time-varying firm-level and macroeconomic variables, as well as a rich set of non-time varying fixed effects. The main results imply that the tightening of U.S. monetary policy has a statistically significant contractionary effect on the change of a firm's investment and sales ratios, while employment growth also falls, but not sufficiently to detect a statistically significant effect. Results are also economically meaningful. For example, a one percentage point contraction in U.S. monetary policy translates to a fall in the investment ratio equivalent to sixty-five percent of the median change in the investment ratio across over the sample period. We then ask how this spillover effect varies along multiple country dimensions. For example, we document significant differences between emerging market economies (EMEs) and advanced economies (Kalemli-Özcan, 2019). We also examine how financial account and trade openness at the aggregate levels affect the magnitude of U.S. monetary policy transmission to foreign firms.

We next turn to a more in-depth analysis of the impact of a firm's trade exposure, both to the world economy as well as with respect to the United States alone. To do so, we construct four export-oriented measures of trade using cross-country sector-level data on intermediate and final goods trade as well as sectoral output sourced from the World Input-Output Database (WIOD) from Timmer, Dietzenbacher, Los, Stehrer and de Vries (2015). Specifically, we construct a country-sector's (i) total exports-to-output ratio, (ii) final goods exports-to-output ratio, (iii) intermediate exports-to-output ratio, and (iv) export-based weighted outdegree. The latter measure captures how important a sector is as supplier of intermediates in the production of one unit of its country-sector export partners' output. We interact these variables with the monetary policy shock in the next set of regressions, focusing on the impact on firm-level investment. The approach allows us to identify how the variation in trade exposure impacts shock spillover to the average firm within a country-sector. Given that we exploit variation at the country×sector×year level, we are able to control for time-varying fixed effects at the country and/or sector level.

We document that total export exposure plays a significant role in the transmission of U.S. monetary policy shocks to firm investment. Movements along the distribution of country-sector export openness from low (bottom decile) to high (top decile) amplifies the impact of the shock by forty percent relative to the impact on the average firm. Interestingly, decomposing the total export-to-output ratio, we find that it is intermediate goods and services trade that drives the overall export exposure findings, both for trade with the whole world and bilaterally with the United States. Finally, the estimated coefficient on the weighted outdegree measure is also economically and statistically significant, indicating that it's not just the importance of overall intermediate exports in driving the transmission of U.S. monetary policy shocks to foreign firms, but also the amplification of demand shocks via global production linkages. The results of this external demand channel via international trade and production linkages is in line with recent findings in the literature using more aggregated data, such as Bräuning and Sheremirov (2021) and di Giovanni and Hale (2022).

To provide evidence on the role of differential financial constraints on the interest rate channel, we run panel regressions interacting proxies of financial constraints (size or net worth) with the U.S. monetary policy shock. This allows us to exploit time-varying firm-level variation in the interaction variable to identify this transmission mechanism, and thereby include an exhaustive set of time-varying fixed effects at the country×sector×year level along with non-time varying firm fixed effects. Results show that foreign firms with lower financial constraints are able to attenuate the impact of monetary policy shocks on their investment, consistent with recent micro studies of domestic firms by Cloyne, Ferreira, Froemel and Surico (2020) and Ottonello and Winberry (2020). The magnitude of this effect is large. For example, moving over the interquartile range of the firm-net worth distribution implies that less financially constrained firms are able to attenuate the impact of U.S. monetary policy shocks by roughly one-quarter of the impact on the mean firm.

The final set of heterogeneity regressions combines the trade exposure measures with the financial constraint proxies in order to estimate the joint impact of these channels. These regressions yield some interesting results. First, the magnitude and significance of the trade and financial interaction coefficients do not change dramatically when included together. Second, our quantification exercises imply that the dampening effect of looser financial constraints of larger firms dominates the amplification effect of greater trade exposure. While the trade measures are at the country-sector level, large firms tend to dominate the export market (Melitz, 2003; Freund and Pierola, 2015), so our overall results point to these "granular" foreign firms being impacted less on net by U.S. monetary policy shocks given the channels identified in our regressions.

Related Literature

The empirical literature on cross-border spillovers of monetary policy shocks is voluminous. Most of this research, including early papers on the Global Financial Cycle, relied on aggregate data. Pioneering research on the GFC includes Rey (2013), Rey (2016), Kalemli-Özcan (2019), Han and Wei (2018), and Miranda-Agrippino and Rey (2020). Early work on spillovers from U.S. monetary policy shocks includes Eichenbaum and Evans (1995), Rogers (1999), Kim and Roubini (2000), Faust and Rogers (2003), and Faust, Rogers, Swanson and Wright (2003), who focused on foreign interest rates and exchange rates in VARs. Rogers, Scotti and Wright (2014) examine the effects of unconventional monetary policy by the Fed, BOE, ECB, and BOJ on cross-border bond yields and stock prices, as well as exchange rates.[1] Bräuning and Sheremirov (2021) document that trade plays a key role in explaining cross-country heterogeneity in the effects of U.S. monetary shocks on aggregate output, interest rates, and trade flows in a large panel of countries. Degasperi, Hong and Ricco (2021) find that a U.S. monetary policy tightening has large contractionary effects on both advanced and emerging economies, with financial channels dominating over demand and exchange rate channels in the transmission to real variables.

On the micro side, Bräuning and Ivashina (2020) examine the role of U.S. monetary policy in affecting credit conditions of EME firms. They show that the spillover is stronger in higher-yielding and more financially open markets and for firms with a higher reliance on foreign bank credit. Morais, Peydró, Roldán-Peña and Ruiz-Ortega (2019) analyze the universe of corporate loans in Mexico, matched with firm and bank balance-sheet data, to identify the spillover effects of advanced economy monetary policy shocks. They find that a tightening of foreign monetary policy increases

[1] See also Georgiadis (2016), who finds that the magnitude of U.S. monetary policy spillovers depends on a host of receiving country characteristics, including trade and financial integration, exchange rate regime, and participation in global value chains; Dedola, Rivolta and Stracca (2017), who find that a surprise U.S. monetary policy tightening leads to a dollar appreciation, decline in foreign industrial production, real GDP, and inflation, and rise in unemployment in a panel of advanced and emerging economies; and Kearns, Schrimpf and Xia (2019), who measure monetary policy shocks for seven advanced economy central banks and spillovers to 47 advanced and emerging market economies. They find no evidence that spillovers are related to real linkages such as trade flows, but some importance for exchange rate regimes, with the key country characteristic being financial openness.

the supply of credit of foreign banks to Mexican firms and that this occurs via their respective (country's) banks. Di Giovanni and Hale (2022) examine spillovers of U.S. monetary policy shocks to sectoral stock returns. They derive a model in which firms in all countries are affected by a monetary shock, by an amount that is proportional to a firm's global production linkages, and find that the global production network plays the key role in transmitting U.S. monetary policy shocks to cross-border stock returns, even conditioning on financial channel variables.

In addition to our paper being related to the large literature on international spillovers of U.S. monetary policy, it is closely related to Claessens, Tong and Wei (2012) and Dao, Minoiu and Ostry (2021). Although neither of these papers examines U.S. monetary policy, Claessens et al. (2012) examine how the global financial crisis affected firms' profits, sales, and investment, the focus of our paper. They find that the crisis had a bigger negative effect on firms with greater sensitivity to business cycle and trade developments, particularly in countries more open to trade. Dao et al. (2021) examine the relationship between real exchange rate fluctuations and firm-level investment and growth. They show that real depreciation boost profits, investment, and asset growth of tradable sector firms that have higher labor shares and are relatively more financially constrained, interpreting this finding as evidence for an "internal financing channel."[2]

Our paper is also related to work on trade and transport costs in international trade and macro (Obstfeld and Rogoff, 2000; Anderson and van Wincoop, 2004). These authors present evidence that total trade costs in rich countries are large, with an estimated ad valorem tax equivalent of about 170 percent, while poor countries face even higher trade costs. More recent estimates indicate that global trade costs have declined by 15 per cent between 2000 and 2018 (http://tradecosts.wto.org/). Clearly, there is a lot of variation across time, countries, and goods, features of the data that we exploit. Our forensic investigation of the linkages from U.S. monetary policy shocks to cross-border firms' investment, sales, and employment uncovers a key role for trade networks, consistent with Bräuning and Sheremirov (2021) and di Giovanni and Hale (2022).

Finally, our paper is also related to the literature on the investment channel of monetary policy transmission in closed economies. This literature emphasizes the importance of firm heterogeneity for the transmission of monetary policy, with much attention paid to "balance sheet effects." The balance sheet channel broadly refers to feedback effects between the health of borrowers' balance sheets, as measured for example by net worth, and investment (e.g. or output, asset prices, etc.). In this framework, financially constrained firms borrow in order to undertake productive long-term projects. Firms finance projects by issuing claims to lenders. The cash flows associated with firms' projects are exposed to an aggregate shock that may generate fluctuations in net worth,

[2]While putting the finishing touches on the ARC version of this paper, we became aware of contemporaneous work in progress by Arbatli-Saxegaard, Firat, Furceri and Verrier (2022). These authors also examine the cross-border effects of U.S. monetary policy shocks in a large panel of firm-level data. Although we do much more analysis of trade network channels and use different measures of Fed monetary policy shocks and investment, the two papers have a similar focus.

which could in turn trigger liquidations of capital and affect investment, the price of capital, and aggregate output. Monetary policy shocks, for example, would give rise to such effects. Seminal papers include Bernanke and Gertler (1989) and Kiyotaki and Moore (1997) and more recent work by Cloyne et al. (2020), Ottonello and Winberry (2020), Caglio, Darst and Kalemli-Özcan (2021).

The rest of the paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 describes our empirical methodology. Section 3 describes the data and presents summary statistics. Section 4 provides regression results that focus on the role of country-level characteristics, while our analysis of firm-level trade and financial constraint heterogeneity is in Section 5. Section 6 concludes.

2 Methodology

We first estimate the unconditional impact of U.S. monetary policy shocks on foreign firms' annual change in investment, sales, and employment. Our regression analysis follows the approaches used in a closed-economy setting by running panel regressions, where we allow for the possibility of tracing out the dynamic impulse of endogeneous variables using local projections (Jordà, 2005). The baseline regression that estimates the average effect of monetary policy shocks on all firms is:

$$Y_{fsc,t+h} - Y_{fsc,t-1} = \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \beta MP^{US}_{t-1} + \mathbf{Z}_{fsc,t-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma'} + \mathbf{X}_{c,t-1}\boldsymbol{\delta'} + \varepsilon_{fsc,t+h}, \tag{1}$$

where f denotes a firm, s the sector and c the country. $Y_{fsc,t+h}$ is the firm-level outcome measured in year $t+h$, $h = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, T$. The firm-level outcomes are either (i) the investment-to-lagged fixed capital ratio (I_t/K_{t-1}), (ii) the sales-to-lagged fixed capital ratio (S_t/K_{t-1}), or (iii) log employment ($\ln E_t$). Given the use of annual data, our baseline is to estimate the model for $h = 0$ only. In this case, the left-hand side of (1) measures either the annual change in the investment or sales shares, or annual employment growth. MP^{US}_{t-1} is the U.S. monetary policy shock variable from Bu, Rogers and Wu (2021) (BRW) at $t-1$, thus accounting for the lagged impact of monetary policy on the real economy. As described below, the BRW shock is a measure of monetary surprises centered on each of the eight FOMC meetings per year. To match our annual firm-level real variables, we aggregate the eight shock observations throughout the calendar year, which is customary in the literature. This timing issue further motivates the use of a lagged monetary policy shock variable as opposed to a contemporaneous one.[3] If a monetary policy tightening (loosening), $MP^{US} > 0$ ($MP^{US} < 0$), depresses (stimulates) firms' activity, we would expect that $\beta < 0$.

We further control for other standard firm-level controls, $\mathbf{Z}$, which we lag one period. These variables include firm size (measured as the log of total assets), net worth, and change in the cash flow-to-asset ratio.[4] We also include the lag of macroeconomic controls, $\mathbf{X}$, which may vary at

[3] We experimented with additional lags, but this did not yield any additional insights.

[4] We also experiment by including firm age, Tobin's Q, and other measures of firms' financial health such as changes in its leverage ratio. Including these regressors did not impact our results but cut the sample size in several cases

the country or global levels. These include domestic real GDP growth, change in the log nominal exchange rate against the U.S. dollar, the change in short-term domestic interest rates, and log VIX. Given the panel setup, we are also able to include a set of non-time-varying fixed effects, $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, (e.g., at the country, sector, or firm-level). Finally, ε is the error term. Given that the monetary policy shock is repeated across all firms in a given year, we cluster standard errors at the annual level and further cluster at the firm level to control for potential autocorrelation in the errors.

Equation (1) is a useful baseline specification to estimate the impact of U.S. monetary policy on the average firm in a given country. We can then "unpack" the potential heterogeneous impacts of monetary policy by allowing for β to vary across multiple dimensions. To begin, we examine how the impact of U.S. monetary policy on foreign firms varies across countries via simple sample splits and interactions with country characteristics. For example, we examine whether β differs between emerging market economies (EMEs) and industrial countries. We also examine how financial account and trade openness at the aggregate levels impact the estimates of β.

Role of Trade Linkages

Changes in U.S. monetary policy may impact foreign firms' activity directly given the resulting contraction/expansion of U.S. demand. This channel might be expected to have an out-sized impact on firms or sectors depending on how involved they are in international trade. Further, given the expansion of global production networks over time, firms that are more integrated in global value chains may be even more impacted given spillovers across countries arising from the change in U.S. monetary policy. Given data limitations, we are forced to exploit trade heterogeneity at the country-sector level rather than firm level in our estimation.[5]

Thus, our first extended regression specification exploits heterogeneity across country-sectors within a year:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{fsc,t+h} - Y_{fsc,t-1} = \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \beta_1 MP^{US}_{t-1} + \beta_2 (Trade_{cs,t-1} \times MP^{US}_{t-1}) \\ + \theta Trade_{cs,t-1} + \mathbf{Z}_{fsc,t-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma'} + \mathbf{X}_{c,t-1}\boldsymbol{\delta'} + \varepsilon_{fsc,t+h}, \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where $Trade_{cs}$ is a measure of a country-sector's trade exposure. We construct several measures of a country-sector's exposure to demand shocks by exploiting heterogeneity in a country-sectors' links to either the world or U.S. only via exports along four possible dimensions: a country-sector's (i) total exports-to-output ratio, (ii) final goods exports-to-output ratio, (iii) intermediate exports-to-output ratio, and (iv) export-based weighted outdegree. As we describe in Section 3, the weighted outdegree measure captures how important a country-sector's output is for all other country-sectors'

(for example, Italian firms do not report the age variable in our dataset). Therefore, in order to maximize sample size we constrain the inclusion of firm-level controls in the final analysis.

[5]See di Giovanni et al. (2022) for evidence that sales growth of firms more exposed to trade are more sensitive to changes in world GDP.

production and thus captures the importance of a country-sector in the global value chain.[6] Note that we also explored related import-based measures, consistent with the idea that the general equilibrium impact of U.S. monetary policy shocks may also feed through to firms/sectors' costs via imports, but results based on import measures were never significant so we omit for brevity. Conditional on U.S. monetary policy having a greater impact on firms in sectors that have larger trade exposure measures, we would expect that $\beta_2 < 0$.

A notable difference between this and our baseline estimation is that the set of fixed effects ($\boldsymbol{\alpha}$) may now vary over time, allowing us to control for unobserved time-varying country- and/or sector-level characteristics (e.g., how a country's trade openness varies over time).[7] Regression (2) is similar to the regression with firm heterogeneity that we describe below, however here the time-varying fixed effects cannot be as granular because the trade variables only vary at the country$\times$ sector level within a year. However, by exploiting differences in trade patterns as well as the type of trade (intermediate vs. final goods), we are able to estimate micro-level responses that vary for a firm given its country-sectors' exposure to different trade channels, while also controlling for time-varying firm-level variables.

Role of Firm Financial Constraints

We also estimate the role of firm financial constraints in affecting the transmission of U.S. monetary policy shocks. We extend the baseline regression (1) to allow for heterogeneous effects at the firm level, conditioning on standard firm-level measures of financial constraints:

$$Y_{fsc,t+h} - Y_{fsc,t-1} = \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \beta_1 MP^{US}_{t-1} + \beta_2 (Z_{fcs,t-1} \times MP^{US}_{t-1}) + \mathbf{Z}_{fsc,t-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma'} + \mathbf{X}_{c,t-1}\boldsymbol{\delta'} + \varepsilon_{fsc,t+h}, \quad (3)$$

where we now allow for the impact of monetary policy to vary by firm characteristic Z through β_2. Given that firm characteristics may vary both within and across countries (e.g., the largest firm in Germany may be larger than the largest firm in Thailand), we normalize all firm-level interaction variables within a country-year as we describe below in the data section. Following the literature, two firm characteristics that we use to proxy for firm financial constraints are size and net worth. We use the log of total assets for our measure of size. While this may generate a natural correlation with the two endogenous variables that are deflated by the lag of fixed assets (investment and sales ratios), we have also estimated all regressions with log employment as a measure of size instead and obtained similar results.[8] The net worth variable is defined as the log of the difference in total assets

[6] See Carvalho (2014) for a more detailed discussion of the weighted outdegree and other possible production network sufficient statistics.

[7] Note that doing so eliminates the possibility of estimating the average impact of monetary policy, β_1. Therefore, we first run regressions without time effects in order to estimate the importance of firm heterogeneity relative to the average effect of monetary policy on all firms in an economy.

[8] As noted in the firm dynamics literature (Cloyne et al., 2020, and others), age also plays a role independently of size or net worth. We have also run regressions with age and results were qualitatively similar to using size or net worth, but reduced sample size quite substantially, so we omit these results.

and total liabilities and is one measure that proxies for the differences in firms' collateral/ability to borrow (see Gopinath, Kalemli-Özcan, Karabarbounis and Villegas-Sanchez (2017); di Giovanni, Kalemli-Özcan, Ulu and Baskaya (2021); Caglio et al. (2021)). If larger or high net worth firms are less impacted by U.S. monetary policy shocks because their financial constraints are less binding, we would expect that $\beta_2 > 0$.

The most stringent set of fixed effects may now vary at more granular levels along the time dimensions – specifically at the country×sector×year level – since identification of the interaction terms is exploiting variation at the firm×year level. Therefore, we are able to identify differential impacts of financial constraints within a year along the firm distribution while controlling for time-varying country×sector characteristics or shocks.

Given the literature that studies the balance sheet effect of external shocks (e.g., exchange rate changes), we extend the estimation of (3) along several dimensions. For example, we interact other macro variables, such as changes in the exchange rate or VIX, with monetary policy shocks, thus estimating several interaction coefficients. Further, we allow β_2 to vary across different cross-sections of the data, such as the country level. We consider such further "unpacking" of the interest rate channel (and trade channel) in robustness analysis.

Firm-Level and Country-Sector Trade Heterogeneity

Our final specification combines the insights from regressions (2) and (3) in order to estimate the relative importance of the interest rate and trade channels. Specifically, we estimate the following:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{fsc,t+h} - Y_{fsc,t-1} = \boldsymbol{\alpha} + \beta_1 MP^{US}_{t-1} + \beta_2 (Z_{fcs,t-1} \times MP^{US}_{t-1}) + \beta_3 (Trade_{cs,t-1} \times MP^{US}_{t-1}) \\ + \theta Trade_{cs,t-1} + \mathbf{Z}_{fsc,t-1}\boldsymbol{\gamma'} + \mathbf{X}_{c,t-1}\boldsymbol{\delta'} + \varepsilon_{fsc,t+h}, \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where variables are defined as above. Importantly, relative to the firm heterogeneity regressions of (3), we cannot exploit time-varying fixed effects at the country×sector×year level given the inclusion of the trade variables.

This regression specification allows us to quantify the relative importance of financial constraints and trade channels across the distribution of firms and country-sectors in our sample. We detail this quantification exercise when presenting results below. We further experimented with more granular specifications by interacting the firm-level Z and country-sector $Trade$ variables with the monetary policy shocks. Besides being difficult to interpret, the triple-interaction coefficients were statistically insignificant for the majority of specifications.

3 Data

3.1 Monetary Policy Shocks

As our baseline, we use the Bu et al. (2021) monetary policy shock series, which is plotted at the annual frequency in Figure 1. This series is derived from a two-step, partial-least squares estimation using daily interest rate data across a wide spectrum of maturities. The general idea behind construction of the measure is to use Fama and MacBeth (1973) two-step regressions to estimate the unobservable monetary policy shock. The method works initially through the sensitivity of outcome variables to FOMC announcements. In the first step, time-series regressions are run to estimate the sensitivity of interest rates at different maturities to FOMC announcements. This is equivalent to the asset beta in the original Fama-MacBeth method. In the second step, all outcome variables are regressed onto the corresponding estimated sensitivity index from step one, for each time t. In this way, the monetary policy shock is derived as the series of estimated coefficients from the Fama-MacBeth style second step regressions. Bu et al. (2021) scale the shock series such that it has a one-to-one contemporaneous effect on the 2-year Treasury Bill rate.[9]

The Bu et al. (2021) shock measure has three appealing features, which together distinguish it from other shock series in the literature. First, by using the full maturity spectrum of interest rates, this series stably bridges periods of conventional and unconventional monetary policy. Second, the shock is largely devoid of the central bank information effect, the notion that monetary policy announcements, in addition to providing a pure monetary surprise, also reveal information regarding the central bank's future macroeconomic outlook (Nakamura and Steinsson, 2018). And third, the Bu et al. (2021) shock series is largely unpredictable from available information, including Blue Chip forecasts, "big data" measures of economic activity, news releases and consumer sentiment.[10]

For robustness, we also examine two alternative U.S. monetary policy shock series. The first is the policy news shock of Nakamura and Steinsson (2018), which we depict in Figure A1. The authors construct their measure using changes in five interest rate futures: the Fed Funds future for current month and the month of the next FOMC meeting, and the 3-month Eurodollar futures at horizons of two, three, and four quarters. The policy news shock is the first principle component of the change in these five interest rate futures over a 30-minute window around scheduled FOMC announcements. Our second robustness check uses Swanson (2021)'s forward guidance shock, depicted in Figure A2.

[9]To provide further meaning, Bu et al. (2021) regress contemporaneous changes in interest rates of different maturities on the shock. The response coefficient reaches its maximum at the 2-year interest rate (normalized to be 1.0). The response of the 5-year interest rate is of comparable magnitude, also large and significant. Response coefficients for all other maturities (3-mo., 6-mo., 1-yr, 10-yr and 30-yr) are significant but smaller. Thus, both the short and long ends of the yield curve respond to the BRW shock by less than do the 2- and 5-yr rates. This is similar to the experiment in Gürkayanak, Sack and Swanson (2005), who show that the long rate responds relatively more to their estimated "path factor" while the short rate responds relatively more to the "target factor."

[10]See, for example, Ramey (2016), Miranda-Agrippino (2016), and Bauer and Swanson (2020) for critiques of earlier monetary policy shock series that exhibited predictability.

Figure 1. U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks



Notes: This figure plots the annual aggregate of the pure monetary policy shock constructed by Bu et al. (2021) (updated March 4, 2021).

A noticeable difference in both of these series relative to BRW is the large negative values in 2001, almost all of which occurred after the 9/11 terrorist attack.[11] Finally, we also examine the shock Bu et al. (2021) constructed for the ECB (Figure A3) to examine robustness to the precise source of the monetary policy impulse.

Given that we run regressions using annual firm-level data, we must aggregate the monetary policy to the annual level as well. This aggregation has the potential of netting out positive and negative monetary policy innovations within a year and thus may bias the estimated impact of monetary policy on investment towards zero. Therefore, for identification we will rely on the persistent nature of monetary policy action within a year as well as the lagged effect of monetary policy on the real economy.

[11]Note that the scales of the policy news shock and the forward guidance shock are also arbitrary. Nakamura and Steinsson (2018) rescale their series such that its effect on the 1-year nominal Treasury yield is equal to one. Swanson (2021) offers one natural way to interpret his forward guidance shock: a 25bp change in the expected federal funds rate one year ahead, which would be very large by historical standards, about 4.4 standard deviations. Applying that to his estimates suggests that a forward guidance surprise of this magnitude would raise the 2-Yr Treasury bill rate by around 20bp. Concerning values in 2001, Cochrane and Piasezzi (2002) argue that it is problematic to interpret movements in interest rates around September 11, 2001 as a shock versus an expected movement. Their measure, like ours, does not exhibit this feature.

3.2 Firm Data

We source firm-level data from Worldscope for a large cross-section of countries and sectors spanning the time period 1995-2019 at the annual level. These data are reported for publicly listed firms, so are skewed towards covering medium-size to large firms. This firm coverage is similar to the one in studies of the impact of monetary policy on firm outcomes in the United States that rely on Compustat data, and studies in an international setting such as Claessens et al. (2012). Our cleaned sample covers twenty countries, which we choose based on the availability of a sufficient number of firms over the whole time period (at least 5,000 firm-year observations per country) and an approximately equal split between emerging market economies (EMEs) and industrial countries.[12] We further constrain the final regression sample to firms with at least five years of data.

Table A1 presents summary statistics for the firm-level outcome variables, explanatory variables, and controls we experimented with and that are commonly used in the literature. The three outcome variables are: (i) the investment-to-(lagged) fixed capital ratios, where we follow Cloyne et al. (2020) and define fixed capital by *net property, plant and equipment*, sales-to-(lagged) fixed capital ratios, and employment growth. We winsorize the data at the 1% level to clean outliers.[13]

The summary statistics indicate substantial cross-sectional heterogeneity in the three outcome variables, with the medians approximately centered around zero. Turning to the firm-level explanatory variables, there is also a good deal of cross-sectional heterogeneity. We focus on two key firm-level variables both because they proxy for financial constraints and offer maximal coverage: size and net worth. Size is defined as the logarithm of total assets while net worth is the log of the difference between total assets and total liabilities. In looking at Table A1, we see that these variables are quite skewed, which is not surprising given the granular nature of many firm-level characteristics, such as the size distribution (Gabaix, 2011). This also holds true for other possible proxies for size such as employment and the age distribution. Furthermore, the absolute size of firms along the distribution differs across country size, such that there is a positive correlation between the largest firms within a country and country size (di Giovanni and Levchenko, 2012). We take this cross-country difference in distributions into account before running regressions by normalizing both firm size and net worth. Specifically, for each country-year we normalize each variable around its mean, so that the distribution is centered at zero. This normalization ensures that we do not confound estimates that vary across the firm distribution for country differences in our regressions below.[14]

[12] The country sample includes Australia, Brazil, Canada, China, France, Germany, India, Indonesia, Italy, Japan, South Korea, Malaysia, Poland, Russia, Sweden, Taiwan, Thailand, Turkey, United Kingdom, and Vietnam.

[13] One exception is the sales ratio, which we winsorize at the 5% level.

[14] The inclusion of country or country-sector fixed effects would also help assuage this concern. However, given that we run interaction regressions with firm characteristics and the monetary policy shock, it is best to first demean the firm variables.

3.3 Trade Data

We use the 2013 edition of the World Input-Output Database (WIOD) from Timmer et al. (2015) to construct trade exposure measures at the country-sector level. This database contains information on bilateral trade flows in final and intermediate goods and services for 40 countries and the rest of the world as well as 35 sectors.[15] The database also contains country-sector value added and gross output measures. The database begins in 1995 and ends in 2011. We opt for this database rather than the more recent version (which covers 2000-2014) given that there is interesting monetary policy variation in the late 1990s that we would like to include. The downside to this approach is that we are forced to fill in trade data for 2011 onward in order to exploit the additional eight years of monetary policy shocks and firm-level data we have. However, given that world trade has been stagnant since the Great Financial Crisis (Antràs, 2021) and the relative stability of the the world I-O matrix, we are not overly concerned about potential bias this extrapolation might create.

We construct four measures of trade exposure at the country-sector level. These are meant to capture exposure to demand shocks resulting from U.S. monetary policy shocks. The first is a country-sectors' total exports-to-output ratio. We next break this measure into (i) the final goods exports-to-output ratio, and (ii) the intermediate goods-to-output ratio.[16] Our final measure is an export-based *weighted outdegree*. This variable captures how important is a country-sector's output that it exports for all of its customers' (foreign country-sectors) production. More specifically for this fourth measure, let

$$\omega_{mi,nj} = \frac{Sales_{mi \to nj}}{Output_{nj}}$$

be country-sector mi sales to country-sector nj deflated by nj's output. Then the export-based weighted outdegree for country-sector pair mi is defined as:

$$\text{WtOutdeg}_{mi} = \sum_{n \neq m}^{N} \sum_{j=1}^{J} \omega_{mi,nj}.$$

Note that the weighted-outdegree measure only captures the *first-order* importance of a country-sector as a supplier in global production given that it does not measure the importance of country-sector mi's customers in supplying their intermediate goods further downstream in global production process. However, given the relative high level aggregation of the WIOD and the sparsity in international linkages, the cross-sectional heterogeneity of the first-order linkages are sufficient to capture the relative importance of a country-sector in the global production network. Indeed, the distribution of these weighted-outdegree measures is quite skewed and follows a power law (see di Giovanni and Hale, 2022, for example).

[15] We use the rest-of-the-world (ROW) variables for three countries that are missing data: Malaysia, Thailand and Vietnam. Given the sparse data for Asia, the ROW data cover many of the smaller Asian economies, so we view this approximation to be reasonable. If anything, this assumption will bias against our regressions finding any trade effects as we are killing some cross-sectional heterogeneity by imputing the same numbers for several country-sectors.

[16] Note that when we write "goods" these might be services depending on the export sector.

We construct all the trade measures with respect to world trade and bilateral U.S. trade only. With the trade flows measure, for example, the outdegree for each country m would only be summed over sectors in country n = United States. We consider both sets of measures in order to help tease out both direct and indirect trade channels that would impact foreign firms given both a U.S. response in demand but also U.S. monetary policy shocks that directly impact other countries' demand and which spill over to their import demand.[17] Tables A3 and A4 present summary statistics of these measures for the year 2000, where we calculate statistics across our country sample in a given sector, for world trade and U.S.-trade, respectively. There is considerable heterogeneity both across sectors (comparing the 'Mean' columns) and countries within a sector (comparing the 'St.Dev.' columns) according to all trade exposure measures.

3.4 Other Macro Controls

Table A6 presents summary statistics across countries and over time for the annual macroeconomic data we use: (i) the log of the CBOE Volatility Index (VIX), (ii) real GDP growth in domestic currency, (iii) the percentage change of the local currency-to-U.S. dollar nominal exchange rate, (iv) the change in the domestic short-term rate, (v) one minus the Fernández, Klein, Rebucci, Schindler and Uribe (2016) index of financial account repression ('Fin. Openness'), and (vi) the (exports plus imports)-to-GDP ratio ('Trade/GDP'). All financial series are calculated using the annual average of the underlying variable, while macroeconomic and trade data are end-of-year series.

4 Baseline Results: The Role of Aggregate Factors

We begin with a set of baseline regressions that provide an interesting first look at the data and point to potential channels through which U.S. monetary policy may have differing effects on foreign firms. We also show that results are robust to several checks including the split between emerging and developed economies and choice of monetary policy shock. In order to better identify potential channels and quantify their relative importance, we then move on to exploiting cross country-sector and/or firm-level heterogeneity in the following section.

4.1 Baseline Specification

We begin by estimating regression specification (1) for $h = 0$. Table 1 presents our baseline results for investment, sales, and employment. For each variable, regressions include either country×sector or firm fixed effects. The negative coefficient on the MP^{US} shock variable indicates that a surprise monetary policy tightening ($MP^{US} > 0$) is associated with fall in investment, as seen in columns (1)-(2), or sales (columns (3)-(4)) in the following year. These results are robust across both sets of

[17] See di Giovanni and Hale (2022) for a structural econometric analysis of this problem.

fixed effects and statistically significant at the one-percent level for the more stringent set of firm fixed effects. Turning to the employment growth regressions in columns (5)-(6), the coefficient on MP^{US} is also negative, but insignificant at standard confidence levels.

Quantitatively, the impact of a U.S. monetary policy shock is sizeable for both foreign firms' investment and sales. For example, in the regressions with firm fixed effects a one-percentage point tightening (which would be very large by historical standards) implies that the investment ratio falls by 0.13 percentage points in the following year. This is large relative to the median change in the investment ratio across all firms over the sample period, which is 0.2 percentage points (see Table A1). A similar calculation holds for sales, with the sales ratio falling by 1.1 percentage points following a one hundred basis point tightening. This is almost four times as large as the median sales ratio change across firms in the sample (0.3 percentage points).

The estimated coefficients on firm-level controls are consistent with those reported in the investment literature. As seen in Table 1, both cash flow and net worth enter positively, while size is negative. Dao et al. (2021) also find negative and significant effects of firm size (measured by employment) on investment in a panel of firms similar to ours.[18] Turning to the macro controls, the VIX is negatively correlated with firm activity, as are changes in the domestic interest rate (though not robustly). Domestic real GDP growth tends to be negatively correlated with next period's firm investment and sales changes when including firm-level fixed effects, but is positively correlated with employment growth. Meanwhile, changes in the nominal exchange rate are typically not statistically significant, only weakly so for the investment regression in column (2).

4.2 Cross-Country Heterogeneity and Robustness

Effects for Industrial versus Emerging Market Economies

Table 2 presents estimates of the baseline regression with firm fixed effects separately for industrial and EME country samples. Examining the coefficients on MP^{US}, we see that the results are very similar to the baseline regressions. Interestingly, and perhaps not surprisingly, the monetary policy shock coefficients (the only ones we report, to save space) are larger in absolute value for the emerging market economies. The coefficient differences across country samples are not statistically distinguishable given their overlapping confidence intervals, however.

Leave-One-Out Analysis

The large, expansionary U.S. monetary policy shock in 2009 (Figure 1) and resurgence of global investment coming out of the Great Recession motivates a sensitivity check of the baseline results

[18] The authors further control for size, leverage, Tobin's Q, and sales growth. We have also explored including these variables. While doing so cuts sample size substantially, our baseline result does not change. Gulen and Ion (2016), who examine political uncertainty and investment, control for Tobin's Q, cash flow, and sales growth in regressions for U.S. firm-level investment and find all of these controls to be positive and significant, consistent with our regressions.

Table 1. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Investment, Sales, and Employment: Baseline Estimates

	$\Delta(\text{Investment}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$		$\Delta(\text{Sales}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$		$\text{Employment Growth}_t$	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-0.134^b	-0.161^a	-1.119^a	-1.302^a	-0.020	-0.030
	(0.051)	(0.054)	(0.391)	(0.402)	(0.030)	(0.027)
$\Delta(\text{CF/TA})_{t-1}$	0.0005^b	0.001^a	0.001	2E-05	-3E-05	-8E-05
	(0.0002)	(0.0002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.0001)	(0.0001)
Size_{t-1}	-0.007^a	-0.081^a	-0.008	-0.362^a	-0.027^a	-0.103^a
	(0.002)	(0.010)	(0.021)	(0.060)	(0.002)	(0.008)
Net Worth_{t-1}	0.003	0.002	-0.062^a	-0.212^a	0.022^a	0.047^a
	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.018)	(0.032)	(0.002)	(0.003)
$\Delta \ln(\text{RGDP}^D)_{t-1}$	-0.0002	-0.004^b	-0.012	-0.039^a	0.003^b	0.002^c
	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.001)	(0.001)
$\ln(\text{VIX}_{t-1})$	-0.076^a	-0.104^a	-0.622^a	-0.819^a	-0.026	-0.024
	(0.024)	(0.018)	(0.203)	(0.177)	(0.017)	(0.017)
$\Delta \ln(\text{NXR})_{t-1}$	-0.051	-0.099^c	-0.478	-0.794	-0.029	-0.044
	(0.042)	(0.051)	(0.455)	(0.493)	(0.028)	(0.031)
$\Delta\text{IntRate}^D_{t-1}$	-0.375^b	-0.201	-3.456^c	-2.295	-0.082	-0.042
	(0.179)	(0.216)	(1.785)	(2.041)	(0.119)	(0.132)
Observations	374,864	374,360	374,687	374,179	256,108	254,414
R^2	0.005	0.057	0.009	0.106	0.022	0.176
Country×sector FE	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Firm FE	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (1) for the change in the investment-to-fixed capital ratio (columns 1 and 2), the change in the sales-to-fixed capital ratio (columns 3 and 4), and employment growth (columns 5 and 6). The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'CF/TA' is a firms' cash flow-to-total assets ratio, 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities), 'RGDP^D is a country's real GDP, 'NXR' is a country's nominal exchange rate against the U.S. dollar, 'VIX' is the CBOE Volatility Index, and 'IntRate^D' is a country's short-term interest rate (annual average). We include fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

for possible outliers. In Figure A4, we display the estimated β obtained by running regression (1) multiple times while omitting one year's observations at a time. As we see, every estimate is negative and significant. Leaving out financial crisis years (2009-11, which implies leaving out the 2008-10 shocks) weakens the negative effect of U.S. monetary policy on global investment, but none of the coefficients is significantly different from any of the others throughout the sample.

Alternative Measures of Monetary Policy Shocks

Table A7 shows how the baseline results are affected by using three alternative measures of

Table 2. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Investment, Sales, and Employment: Baseline Estimates for EMEs and Industrial Countries

	$\Delta(\text{Investment}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$		$\Delta(\text{Sales}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$		$\text{Employment Growth}_t$	
	Industrial	*Emerging*	*Industrial*	*Emerging*	*Industrial*	*Emerging*
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-0.143^{b}	-0.168^{a}	-0.978^{c}	-1.515^{a}	-0.007	-0.053
	(0.064)	(0.052)	(0.484)	(0.459)	(0.029)	(0.035)
Observations	207,263	167,097	207,155	167,024	152,789	101,625
R^2	0.061	0.053	0.101	0.114	0.199	0.151
Macro controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (1) for the sample split between emerging market economies and industrial countries for the change in the investment-to-fixed capital ratio (columns 1 and 2), the change in the sales-to-fixed capital ratio (columns 3 and 4), and employment growth (columns 5 and 6). The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and firm-level fixed effects. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

monetary policy shocks: the Nakamura and Steinsson (2018) and Swanson (2021) measures for the Fed and the Bu et al. (2021) shock for the ECB.[19] We also include lagged changes in either the 2-yr. or 5-yr. U.S. Treasury bill rate to control for the more general effects of U.S. interest rate changes on foreign firm investment. The first two columns indicate that the baseline results using the BRW shock are robust, with the coefficients on MP^{US} rising in all cases and even becoming statistically significant in the employment regressions. In columns (3)-(8) we replace the BRW shock with one of the alternatives. Results using the forward guidance shock are similar to the baseline findings: U.S. monetary policy tightenings significantly reduce foreign firm investment and sales growth. With the policy news shock, however, the coefficient estimates are insignificantly different from zero, likely reflecting the "central bank information effect" which is the subject of Nakamura and Steinsson (2018). The final two columns indicate that the ECB monetary policy shock is insignificantly different from zero. Notice that in all regressions the coefficients on lagged changes in U.S. T-bill rates are positive. This is consistent with higher U.S. aggregate demand, and thus interest rates, spilling over to increase investment, sales, and employment by foreign firms.

Dynamics

Although our primary objective is to exploit the rich cross-section of firms, sectors, and countries

[19] These were computed using the same method described above for the Fed.

in our annual data set, we also estimate dynamic effects of U.S. monetary policy shocks using Jordà (2005)'s local projections regressions. We re-estimate equation (1) for $h = 0, \ldots, 3$ and display the *cumulative* impulse responses of the investment share, sales share, and log employment in the three panels of Figure A5. The results indicate that U.S. monetary policy tightenings have fairly persistent negative effects on the levels of these variables, but that the initial response ($h = 0$) that we estimate in our static regression captures the largest impact. The results for employment are not statistically significant, however.

Country-Level Trade and Financial Openness

Before moving on to more micro identification, we run a set of regressions to examine how trade and financial openness at the *country level* affect the transmission of U.S. monetary policy shocks at the firm level. We estimate these regressions by interacting measures of a country's total trade to GDP and its financial openness, as described in Section 3, with the monetary policy shock variable. As Table A8 shows, the coefficient on the U.S. monetary policy shock is largely unaffected relative to the baseline estimation of regression (1). Focusing on the firm-level fixed effect regressions in columns (2), (4), and (6) a common theme emerges: the impact of U.S. monetary policy shocks is greater for countries that are more open to trade,[20] while being attenuated for more financially open countries. However, the coefficients on the interactions with the trade and financial openness variables are insignificant for investment and sales, but significant for employment. As we show below, the influence of openness is manifest not so much at the country level but by sector.

5 Firm Heterogeneity Results

To gauge the importance of the external demand and interest rate channels of U.S. monetary policy transmission abroad, we next focus on heterogeneity at a more granular level, with a particular focus on international trade exposure and proxies for firms financial constraints. We begin by extending the baseline specification to allow for heterogeneous effects of international trade linkages at the country-sector level, and report results for different specifications of regression (2). We then utilize proxies for firm-level financial constraints and report results for different specifications of regression (3). Finally, we combine the country-sector and firm-level data to examine the impact of trade and the interest rate channel jointly by reporting results for different specifications of regression (4). For the sake of brevity, we present tables for the investment regressions in the main text and relegate the sales and employment regressions to Appendix B.

[20] Note that results are similar if we use the exports-to-GDP ratio rather than the total trade-to-GDP ratio.

5.1 Trade Exposure

Table 3 reports OLS estimates for regression (2) for the change in the investment share. We leave out time-varying fixed effects in order to retain the main coefficient on MP^{US}, but do include firm fixed effects in all specifications. Columns (1)-(4) use the trade measures based on global trade, while columns (5)-(8) use only trade flows with the United States.

The coefficient on the non-interacted U.S. monetary policy shock variable remains negative and strongly significant in all specifications. Turning to the coefficient on the total exports-to-output ratio ('TotExp/Output'), we see that country-sectors that are more dependent on trade with both the world or the U.S. alone are relatively more affected by U.S. monetary policy shocks. We dissect this result further by examining whether the type of trade matters and find that it does. First, while the coefficients on the final goods exports-to-output ratio ('FinExp/Output') are negative, they are tiny and statistically insignificant. In contrast, when we turn to the intermediate goods exports-to-output ratio ('IntExp/Output') regressions, the coefficients are negative and significant for both global and U.S.-only trade. This indicates the key role of intermediate goods trade in transmitting monetary policy shocks to firm investment. Finally, the coefficient interaction with the export weighted outdegree ('WtOutdeg'), which captures the importance of a country-sector as a supplier to other country-sectors' production, is also negative and significant, both for global trade and U.S. bilateral trade only.

Table 4 extends the regressions to include time-varying fixed effects (thus eliminating the main effect of MP^{US}) by including country×year fixed effects. The advantage of including these fixed effects is that we are able to control for time-varying country-level characteristics and shocks, such as overall trade openness or unobserved aggregate shocks, which may be correlated with U.S. monetary policy shocks. Looking across columns (1)-(8), we see that the coefficients on the trade variables are similar to those reported in Table 3. If anything, the coefficients on the interaction terms are larger (in absolute terms) and tend to be more statistically significant.[21]

Before quantifying the importance of trade in transmitting monetary policy shocks to firms that are exposed differently, it is worth commenting on the regression results for sales and employment. Tables A9 and A10 present the results for the regressions without and with time-varying fixed effects, respectively. The coefficients on the trade interaction terms are generally insignificant in regressions for both variables, whether or not we include time-varying country fixed effects.

Quantifying the Trade Channel

We exploit the country-sector distribution of the (normalized) trade measures in order to quantify

[21] We also experimented with including sector×year fixed effects and obtained similar results as our baseline OLS regressions. Regressions including both country×year and sector×year fixed effects yield similar coefficients as our main regressions, though the majority of the coefficients are no longer significant. This finding is not surprising given that the inclusion of both country and sector time-varying fixed effects greatly reduces degrees of freedom.

Table 3. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Investment: The Importance of Trade Integration, Non-Time-Varying FE Estimates

	$\Delta(\text{Investment}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$							
	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-0.160^a	-0.161^a	-0.160^a	-0.161^a	-0.161^a	-0.161^a	-0.161^a	-0.161^a
	(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.054)	(0.054)
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.089^b				-0.291^c			
	(0.038)				(0.156)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		-0.008				-0.012		
		(0.054)				(0.148)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			-0.149^b				-0.462^c	
			(0.061)				(0.259)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \text{WtOutdeg}_{t-1}$				-0.025^b				-1.127^b
				(0.012)				(0.449)
Observations	374,360	374,360	374,360	374,360	374,360	374,360	374,360	374,360
R^2	0.058	0.057	0.058	0.058	0.058	0.057	0.058	0.058
Macro Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (2) for the change in the investment-to-fixed capital ratio, where we interact different measures of country-sectors' trade integration with the monetary policy shock. Columns (1)-(4) use trade measures based on country-sector exports with the world, while columns (5)-(8) use U.S.-only exports data. The country-sector's trade measure include (i) total trade-to-output ratio ('TotExp/Output'), (ii) final goods trade-to-output ratio ('FinExp/Output'), (iii) intermediate goods trade-to-output ratio ('IntExp/Output'), and (iv) the weighted outdegree ('WtOutdeg'). The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

their importance in transmitting U.S. monetary policy shocks to firm investment in Tables 3 and 4. First note that the normalized versions of these variables are constructed around a mean of zero in a given country and year. This implies that the distribution we exploit for the regressions is centered around zero (see Table A5). Therefore, the mean-firm's trade variables are equal to zero and the impact of the U.S. monetary policy shock on firm investment is simply equal to the non-interacted coefficient on MP^{US}. Indeed, this is confirmed by comparing the coefficients in the first row of Table 3 to those of the firm-level fixed effects in column (2) of Table 1.

We take two approaches to examining the relative importance of trade exposure on monetary policy transmission across firms. The first is to compute the impact of MP^{US} on firms across the

Table 4. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Investment: The Importance of Trade Integration, Time-Varying FE Estimates

	$\Delta(\text{Investment}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$							
	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.120^a				-0.387^b			
	(0.041)				(0.162)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		-0.011				-0.013		
		(0.054)				(0.150)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			-0.208^a				-0.820^b	
			(0.073)				(0.348)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \text{WtOutdeg}_{t-1}$				-0.031^b				-1.614^a
				(0.012)				(0.570)
Observations	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359
R^2	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.069
Country×year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (2), with time-varying fixed effects, for the change in the investment-to-fixed capital ratio, where we interact different measures of country-sectors' trade integration with the monetary policy shock. Columns (1)-(4) use trade measures based on country-sector exports with the world, while columns (5)-(8) use U.S.-only exports data. The country-sector's trade measure include (i) total trade-to-output ratio ('TotExp/Output'), (ii) final goods trade-to-output ratio ('FinExp/Output'), (iii) intermediate goods trade-to-output ratio ('IntExp/Output'), and (iv) the weighted outdegree ('WtOutdeg'). The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

interquartile range (IQR) of the country-sectors' trade exposure measures.[22] Second, given that the trade exposure measures are skewed, we also look at the differential impact between the top and bottom deciles of the distribution. To be clear, as we exploit differences across country-sector pairs, it is only possible to interpret the following exercises for a representative firm in a given country-sector, irrespective of its trading behavior or other firm-level characteristics.

Our calibration results in Table 5 are based on the coefficients in Table 4 in order to control for the more conservative set of fixed effects. Moving from the bottom quartile to the top quartile country-sector in the world total export-to-output ratio distribution shows that greater export exposure amplifies the spillover effects of U.S. monetary policy shocks. Specifically, the moving along the IQR implies that a one percentage point surprise contraction in U.S. monetary policy

[22]This is akin to looking at a standard deviation of the distribution, but given that the normalized variables are still somewhat skewed, we opt for the IQR.

Table 5. Quantification Exercise of the Heterogeneous Impacts on Investment of Trade Exposure to U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks

	Global Trade			*U.S. Trade*		
	Coef.	IQR	P90-P10	Coef.	IQR	P90-P10
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.120	-0.037	-0.066	-0.387	-0.018	-0.034
		[0.230]	[0.408]		[0.111]	[0.211]
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.011	-0.001	-0.002	-0.013	0.000	-0.001
		[0.006]	[0.015]		[0.001]	[0.004]
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.208	-0.038	-0.093	-0.82	-0.017	-0.038
		[0.234]	[0.581]		[0.108]	[0.237]
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \text{WtOutdeg}_{t-1}$	-0.031	-0.016	-0.035	-1.614	-0.013	-0.045
		[0.098]	[0.218]		[0.082]	[0.279]

Notes: This table presents quantification results based on firm-level panel regression results from the estimation of regression (2), with time-varying fixed effects as reported in Table 4 combined with information from Table A5. The 'Coef.' column reports the coefficients on the interacted variable, 'IQR'/'P90-P10' measure the coefficient's implied impact of a U.S. monetary policy shock when moving from the lower quartile/decile to top quartile/decile of the given trade exposure variable. Numbers in square brackets represent the share (in absolute values) of these impacts relative to the impact of a monetary policy shock on a mean firm. MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), and the trade exposure variables are (i) total trade-to-output ratio ('TotExp/Output'), (ii) final goods trade-to-output ratio ('FinExp/Output'), (iii) intermediate goods trade-to-output ratio ('IntExp/Output'), and (iv) the weighted outdegree ('WtOutdeg').

intensifies the decrease in the investment ratio by an additional 0.037 percentage points. This is equal to about one quarter of the average effect of the monetary policy shock, per the entries in square brackets. Performing a similar calculation using the difference between the top and bottom deciles implies that the same U.S. monetary policy contraction lowers the investment ratio by 0.066 percentage points when considering the world trade ratio, roughly equal to forty percent of the average effect of the shock. The calculations using the U.S.-only trade ratio yields about half of the effect relative to exposure to world trade (square brackets, top row).

Turning to intermediate exports, we also find an amplifying effect of trade exposure. Moving from the bottom quartile to the top quartile country-sector in the world intermediate trade-to-output ratio distribution implies that a one percentage point shock to U.S. monetary policy will have almost identical effects as moving over the IQR of the total exports ratio. However, a similar calculation using the difference between the top and bottom deciles of intermediate trade implies that the same U.S. monetary policy contraction will lower the investment ratio by an additional 0.093 percentage points when considering the world trade ratio, which is around sixty percent of the average effect of the monetary policy shock. The calculations using the U.S.-only intermediate trade ratio again yield about half of the effect relative to exposure to world trade.

Finally, we consider the network measure of international trade, the weighted outdegree. Performing the interquartile quantification implies that moving from the bottom quartile to the top quartile country-sector in the world weighted outdegree distribution implies that a one percentage point contraction in U.S. monetary policy leads to firm investment falling by 0.016 percentage points, or about ten percent of the average effect of the monetary policy shock. Considering the difference between deciles roughly doubles the effect relative to the IQR calculation. Interestingly, comparing the IQR of the U.S.-only weighted-outdegree distribution yields similar results as the world distribution, while moving between the deciles for the U.S.-only weighted outdegree implies a larger impact than moving along the world distribution. These facts capture the importance of the U.S. as customer country for our country-sector sample of suppliers, as well as the skewness of the weighted-outdegree distribution.

Overall, we show that there are important heterogeneous effects on firms conditional on their sector's exposure to demand shocks being transmitted via exporting behavior. The magnitude of the amplifying effect arising from the interaction between U.S. monetary policy shocks and intermediate good trade and global production linkages on firm-level investment is large.

5.2 Financial Constraints

We next examine the importance of financial constraints at the firm-level, conditioning on standard firm-level measures as in regression (3). Here we allow for transmission to vary by firm characteristic Z. The two characteristics we use to proxy for firm financial constraints are size and net worth.[23] As noted in Section 2, in this specification the set of fixed effects ($\boldsymbol{\alpha}$) may now vary over time, allowing us to control for unobserved time-varying country- and/or sector-level characteristics (e.g., how a country's trade openness varies over time).

Results are reported in Table 6. We display results for investment only, with sales and employment results in Appendix B. Moving from left to right, we begin by omitting time-varying fixed effects, then include country×year fixed effects, and finally include the most stringent set of fixed effects of country×sector×year. Looking at columns (1) and (4), which omit time-varying fixed effects and control for size and net worth respectively, we see that a contractionary U.S. monetary policy shock has a slightly larger negative effect on investment growth than in our baseline estimation. As indicated in rows two and three, where the coefficient on the interaction of either size or net worth and MP^{US} is positive, the contractionary effect is smaller for firms that are less financially constrained. This finding holds irrespective of the proxy for financial constraints and the set of fixed effects. Our interaction results echo those of Cloyne et al. (2020) and Ottonello and Winberry (2020), who analyze U.S. firm investment and also find a smaller impact of monetary

[23] Results are qualitatively similar if we instead use age or measure size by employment using a smaller subset of firms for which these data exist.

Table 6. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Investment: Firm-Level heterogeneity

	Δ(Investment$_t$/FixAssets$_{t-1}$)					
	Size			*Net Worth*		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-0.165^a			-0.164^a		
	(0.055)			(0.054)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$Size$_{t-1}$	0.018^a	0.020^a	0.021^a			
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$Net Worth$_{t-1}$				0.017^a	0.018^a	0.018^a
				(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Observations	374,360	374,359	373,241	374,360	374,359	373,241
R^2	0.058	0.069	0.096	0.058	0.069	0.096
Country×year FE	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Country×sector×year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Macro Controls	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Firm Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (3) for the change in the investment-to-fixed capital ratio, where we interact firm characteristics with the monetary policy shock. The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

policy shocks on the investment of firms with less binding financial constraints.[24]

Table A11 presents the size and net worth interaction results for sales and employments. The results for sales are qualitatively similar to those using investment shares in Panel A of the table. Turning to the employment regressions in Panel B, we see that there is no significant effect of MP^{US} on employment growth, as in the baseline regressions. However, the coefficients on the interactions with size or net worth are negative and significant when not including the most stringent set of time-varying fixed effects, indicating that larger/high net worth firms contract employment more than smaller/low net worth firms during periods of monetary tightening.

Quantifying the Financial Constraints Channel

We next utilize the firm-level distribution of firm characteristics to quantify the heterogeneous

[24]The firm size results also matches how small (U.S.) firms cut investment by more than large firms following a monetary contraction, the key result in early work by Gertler and Gilchrist (1994).

impact of firms' financial constraints on their investment reaction to monetary policy shocks. Similar to the trade exposure quantification exercise above, we examine the differential impact across the firm-size distribution, in this case focusing on size and net worth where each variable is normalized around mean zero (see Table A2). Notably, in contrast to trade exposure, the impact of U.S. monetary policy shocks on firms that are in the upper tail of the distribution is attenuated rather than amplified relative to those firms in the lower tail of the distribution.

Given the similarity in point estimates across the set of fixed effects in Table 6, we provide numbers based on the country×sector×year specifications of columns (3) and (6) in Table 7. Heterogeneity in the impact of monetary policy shocks across the firm distribution is large. First, moving across the IQR of the size distribution from smaller to larger firms implies an attenuation of the impact of U.S. monetary policy shocks of 0.052 percentage points, approximately one-third the impact on the mean firm (based on column (1) of Table 6: 0.165 p.p.). Moving from the lower to upper decile of the firm-size distribution implies a large attenuation arising from the loosening of financial constraints: 0.108 percentage points, or two-thirds the impact on the average firm. Second, the net worth measure of financial constraints yields similar results to what we find for size. Moving across the IQR of the net worth distribution from more financially constrained to less financially constrained firms implies an attenuation of 0.042 percentage points, which is approximately one quarter of the impact of the shock on the mean firm (based on column (4) of Table 6: 0.164 p.p.). Moving from the lower to upper decile of the firm-net worth distribution implies a large attenuation arising from the loosening of financial constraints: 0.086 percentage points, or over one half the impact on the average firm.

5.3 Trade Exposure and Financial Constraints

Our final set of core estimation results examines the heterogeneous impact of monetary policy shocks on foreign firms conditional on their trade exposure and financial constraints *jointly*. Table 8 presents results for the investment regressions using the size interaction, while we relegate the net worth regression to Table A14 since results are qualitatively similar.[25] All regressions are run with country×year fixed effects. Looking across coefficients for the size and trade variables in Table 8 and contrasting them with Tables 4 and 6 (country×year specifications), we see that the coefficients are remarkably similar even when controlling for trade exposure and financial constraint proxies jointly. A similar story holds for the net worth regressions as well as the employment and sales regressions presented in Appendix B.

We next move to quantification exercises. Although comparing the impact of heterogeneity in the trade exposure and financial constraint proxies' distributions is not perfect given that the trade variables are based on sector-level data, it is useful to remember that the largest firms in a

[25] For completeness, we also present the sales and employment regressions in Tables A15 and A16.

Table 7. Quantification Exercise of the Heterogeneous Impacts on Investment of Financial Constraints to U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks

	Coef. (1)	IQR (2)	P90-P10 (3)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$Size$_{t-1}$	0.021	0.052	0.108
		[0.314]	[0.658]
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$Net Worth$_{t-1}$	0.018	0.042	0.086
		[0.256]	[0.527]

Notes: This table presents quantification results based on firm-level panel regression results from the estimation of regression (3), with time-varying fixed effects as reported in Table 6 combined with information from Table A2. The 'Coef.' column reports the coefficients on the interacted variable, 'IQR'/'P90-P10' measure the coefficient's implied impact of a U.S. monetary policy shock when moving from the lower quartile/decile to top quartile/decile of the given firm constraint variable. Numbers in square brackets represent the share (in absolute values) of these impacts relative to the impact of a monetary policy shock on a mean firm. MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities).

given sector also dominate exports (Melitz, 2003; Freund and Pierola, 2015). Therefore, contrasting impacts of the trade and interest rate channels when looking at firms along the size distribution across sectors may indeed be a good approximation to having firm-level trade data to exploit.

We begin by asking how small firms compare to large ones when moving from low to high trade exposed sectors in Table 9. Focusing on intermediate goods trade exposure in the first two rows, we utilize coefficients from either columns (3) or (7) of Table 8. First, looking at the IQR for the size variable, the differential impact between a less financially constrained (larger) and a more constrained (smaller) firm from a one percentage point monetary policy tightening is 0.044 p.p., an attenuation of roughly one quarter relative to the total impact on the mean firm (0.161 p.p. contraction in investment). However, once we include the impact difference in the IQR of the intermediate world trade exposure and consider a movement from a less open to more open sector, this attenuation falls to 0.012 percentage points (i.e., $0.044 - 0.032 = 0.012$). Assuming that the distribution of intermediate trade openness within a sector is similar to that across sectors (e.g., the power law distributions of both trade exposures have the same slope), then this quantitative experiment would imply that, on net, the impact of large firms being less financially constrained while also being more exposed to world demand shocks via trade produces a slight attenuation of the effect of U.S. monetary policy shocks relative to the average firm. Put concretely, this indicates that **the exacerbation of the impact of U.S. monetary policy shocks due to increased trade exposure is dominated by the attenuation associated with being less financially constrained**. Further calculations yield the same qualitative results for firms' exposures to U.S. intermediate goods trade, as well as their exposure to world production networks as measured by

Table 8. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Investment: The Importance of Size and Trade Integration

	$\Delta(\text{Investment}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$							
	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{Size}_{t-1}$	0.019^a	0.020^a	0.018^a	0.019^a	0.019^a	0.020^a	0.018^a	0.019^a
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.095^b				-0.284^c			
	(0.038)				(0.155)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		0.026				0.083		
		(0.059)				(0.150)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			-0.178^b				-0.683^b	
			(0.069)				(0.329)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{WtOutdeg}_{t-1}$				-0.027^b				-1.426^b
				(0.012)				(0.536)
Observations	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359
R^2	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.069	0.069
Country×year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm Controls	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (4) for the change in the investment-to-fixed capital ratio, where we interact firm size in addition to different measures country-sectors' trade integration with the monetary policy shock. Columns (1)-(4) use trade measures based on country-sector exports with the world, while columns (5)-(8) use U.S.-only exports data. The country-sector's trade measure include (i) total trade-to-output ratio ('TotExp/Output'), (ii) final goods trade-to-output ratio ('FinExp/Output'), (iii) intermediate goods trade-to-output ratio ('IntExp/Output'), and (iv) the weighted outdegree ('WtOutdeg'). The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

weighted outdegree. There, however, the dampening effects of less binding financial constraints of larger firms are somewhat larger.

5.4 Heterogeneous Effects across Countries

We exploit the cross-country dimension of our dataset in order to ask whether there is any heterogeneity in the relative impact of either the trade exposure or financial constraint variables by estimating regressions (2) and (3) allowing for the coefficients on the trade exposure or financial constraint interaction terms (the β_2s) to vary across countries.[26] Figure A6 plots the cross-country distribution of twenty different estimated coefficients on the interaction of the monetary policy

[26] We also allow for heterogeneity in the non-interacted coefficients to avoid omitted variable bias.

Table 9. Quantification Exercise of the Heterogeneous Impacts on Investment of Trade Exposure and Financial Constraints to U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks

	Global Trade			*U.S. Trade*		
	Coef.	IQR	P90-P10	Coef.	IQR	P90-P10
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times \text{Size}_{t-1}$	0.018	0.044	0.093	0.018	0.044	0.093
		[0.276]	[0.575]		[0.276]	[0.575]
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.178	-0.032	-0.080	-0.683	-0.015	-0.032
		[0.200]	[0.497]		[0.090]	[0.197]
Total		0.012	0.013		0.030	0.061
		[0.076]	[0.078]		[0.186]	[0.377]
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times \text{Size}_{t-1}$	0.019	0.047	0.098	0.019	0.047	0.098
		[0.291]	[0.607]		[0.291]	[0.607]
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$ WtOutdeg_{t-1}	-0.027	-0.014	-0.031	-1.426	-0.012	-0.040
		[0.086]	[0.190]		[0.073]	[0.247]
Total		0.033	0.067		0.035	0.058
		[0.206]	[0.417]		[0.219]	[0.360]

Notes: This table presents quantification results based on firm-level panel regression results from the estimation of regression (4) as reported in Table 8 combined with information from Tables A2 and A5. The 'Coef.' column reports the coefficients on the interacted variable, 'IQR'/'P90-P10' measure the coefficient's implied impact of a U.S. monetary policy shock when moving from the lower quartile/decile to top quartile/decile of the given firm constraint variable. Numbers in square brackets represent the share (in absolute values) of these impacts relative to the impact of a monetary policy shock on a mean firm. MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities).

shock with the four world trade exposure measures. The estimates are based on regressions with country×year fixed effects and we include 95% confidence intervals in the figures. We reject homogeneity across the three coefficients that appear significant in Table 4 in panels (a), (c), and (d) – total exports, intermediate exports, and weighted outdegree, respectively. It clear from the figures that there is heterogeneity in the estimates, with some coefficients being positive rather than negative and others insignificant. However, given the unbalanced nature of the panel along with using country-sector variables rather than firm ones, it is hard to draw any concrete conclusions. We repeat this for the financial constraint interactions in Figure A7, which plots coefficients for the size and net worth interactions in panels (a) and (b), respectively. We reject homogeneity of coefficients, but all coefficients are positive and many statistically significant.

Further Robustness Checks We conduct additional robustness checks for the interaction regressions. In particular, we first replace both the country-sector trade and firm-level financial

constraint variables with beginning-of-period values rather than using time-varying values. Overall, results are robust and the coefficients on the interaction terms do not change dramatically, either quantitatively or in terms of statistical significance. Second, rather than using beginning-of-period values we use the interaction variables averaged over time. Again, our main findings are robust to this change of spsecification.

6 Conclusion

This paper documents two broad results. First, there are significant effects of Fed monetary policy shocks on foreign firms' investment, sales, and employment. This spillover effect varies between emerging market economies (EMEs) and advanced economies, but not according to country-level variation in measures such as the degree of financial account and trade openness. Second, drilling down to more granular levels of heterogeneity across sectors and firms, we find interesting patterns in the data that suggest potential channels for the amplification or attenuation in the spillovers of U.S. monetary policy shocks. Namely, greater exposure to intermediate goods trade and global production linkages contribute to amplifying the cross-country transmission of U.S. monetary policy shocks to firms. However, these effects are attenuated for larger firms and firms with greater net worth given less binding financial constraints, which dampen the interest rate channel of monetary policy. These findings highlight the importance of both external demand channel and interest rate channels for monetary policy spillovers to foreign activity.

References

Anderson, James E. and Eric van Wincoop, "Trade Costs," *Journal of Economic Literature*, 2004, *42* (3), 691–751.

Antràs, Pol, "De-Globalisation? Global Value Chains in the Post-COVID-19 Age," in "2021 ECB Forum: 'Central Banks in a Shifting World' Conference Proceedings" 2021.

Arbatli-Saxegaard, Elif, Melih Firat, Davide Furceri, and Jeanne Verrier, "U.S. Monetary Policy Shock Spillovers: Evidence from Firm-Level Data," 2022. IMF Working Paper 22/191.

Autor, David, David Dorn, Lawrence F. Katz, Christina Patterson, and John van Reenen, "The Fall of the Labor Share and the Rise of Superstar Firms," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2020, *135* (2), 645–709.

Bauer, Michael D. and Eric T. Swanson, "An Alternative Explanation for the 'Fed Information Effect'," 2020. NBER Working Paper 27013.

Bernanke, Ben S. and Mark Gertler, "Agency Costs, Net Worth, and Business Fluctuations," *American Economic Review*, 1989, *79* (1), 14–31.

Bräuning, Falk and Viacheslav Sheremirov, "The Transmission Mechanisms of International Business Cycles: Output Spillovers through Trade and Financial Linkages," 2021. Federal Reserve Bank of Boston Research Department Working Papers No. 21-13.

_ and Victoria Ivashina, "U.S. Monetary Policy and Emerging Market Credit Cycles," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2020, *112*, 57–76.

Bu, Chunya, John H. Rogers, and Wenbin Wu, "A unified measure of Fed monetary policy shocks," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2021, *118*, 331–349.

Caglio, Cecilia R, R. Matthew Darst, and Şebnem Kalemli-Özcan, "Risk-Taking and Monetary Policy Transmission: Evidence from Loans to SMEs and Large Firms," April 2021. NBER Working Paper 28685.

Carvalho, Vasco M., "From Micro to Macro via Production Networks," *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Fall 2014, *28* (4), 23–48.

Claessens, Stijn, Hui Tong, and Shang-Jin Wei, "From the Financial Crisis to the Real Economy: Using Firm-level Data to Identify Transmission Channels," *Journal of International Economics*, 2012, *88*.

Cloyne, James, Clodomiro Ferreira, Maren Froemel, and Paolo Surico, "Monetary Policy, Corporate Finance and Investment," 2020. Forthcoming, *Journal of the European Economic Association*.

Cochrane, John and Monika Piasezzi, "The Fed and Interest Rates: A High-Frequency Identification," *American Economic Review P&P*, 2002, *92* (2), 90–95.

Dao, Mai Chi, Camelia Minoiu, and Jonathan D. Ostry, "Corporate Investment and the Real Exchange Rate," *Journal of International Economics*, 2021, *131.*

Dedola, Luca, Giulia Rivolta, and Livio Stracca, "If the Fed sneezes, who catches a cold?," *Journal of International Economics*, 2017, *108*, S23–S41.

Degasperi, Riccardo, Seokki Simon Hong, and Giovanni Ricco, "The Global Transmission of US Monetary Policy," 2021. Mimeo, University of Warwick.

di Giovanni, Julian and Andrei A. Levchenko, "Country Size, International Trade and Aggregate Fluctuations in Granular Economies," *Journal of Political Economy*, 2012, *120* (6), 1083–1132.

_ and Galina Hale, "Stock Market Spillovers via the Global Production Network: Transmission of U.S. Monetary Policy," 2022. Forthcoming, *Journal of Finance*.

_ , Andrei A. Levchenko, and Isabelle Mejean, "Firms, Destinations, and Aggregate Fluctuations," *Econometrica*, 2014, *82* (4), 1303–1340.

_ , _ , and _ , "The Micro Origins of International Business Cycle Comovement," *American Economic Review*, 2018, *108* (1), 82–108.

_ , _ , and _ , "Foreign Shocks as Granular Fluctuations," 2022. NBER Working Paper 28123.

_ , Sebnem Kalemli-Özcan, Mehmet F. Ulu, and Yusef S. Baskaya, "International Spillovers and Local Credit Cycles," *Review of Economic Studies*, 2021, *89* (2), 733–773.

Eichenbaum, Martin and Charles Evans, "Some Empirical Evidence on the Effects of Shocks to Monetary Policy on Exchange Rates," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1995, *110* (4), 975–1009.

Fama, Eugene F. and James D. MacBeth, "Risk, Return, and Equilibrium: Empirical Tests," *Journal of Political Economy*, 1973, *81* (3), 607–636.

Faust, Jon and John H. Rogers, "Monetary Policy's Role in Exchange Rate Behavior," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2003, *50* (7), 1403–1424.

_ , _ , Eric T. Swanson, and Jonathan H. Wright, "Identifying the Effects of Monetary Policy Shocks on Exchange Rates Using High Frequency Data," *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 2003, *1* (5), 1031–1057.

Fernández, Andrés, Michael W. Klein, Alessandro Rebucci, Martin Schindler, and Martin Uribe, "Capital control measures: A new dataset," *IMF Economic Review*, 2016, *64* (3), 548–574.

Freund, Caroline and Martha Denisse Pierola, "Export Superstars," *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2015, *97* (5), 1023–1032.

Gabaix, Xavier, "The Granular Origins of Aggregate Fluctuations," *Econometrica*, 2011, *79* (3), 733–772.

Georgiadis, Georgios, "Determinants of Global Spillovers from US Monetary Policy," *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 2016, *67*, 41–61.

Gertler, Mark and Simon Gilchrist, "Monetary Policy, Business Cycles, and the Behavior of Small Manufacturing Firms," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 1994, *109* (2), 309–340.

Gopinath, Gita, Sebnem Kalemli-Özcan, Loukas Karabarbounis, and Carolina Villegas-Sanchez, "Capital Allocation and Productivity in South Europe," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2017, *132*, 1915–1967.

Gulen, Huseyin and Mihai Ion, "Policy Uncertainty and Corporate Investment," *Review of Financial Studies*, 2016, *29* (3), 523–564.

Gürkayanak, Refet S., Brian Sack, and Eric T. Swanson, "Do Actions Speak Louder Than Words? The Response of Asset Prices to Monetary Policy Actions and Statements," *International Journal of Central Banking*, 2005, *1* (1), 55–93.

Han, Xuehui and Shang-Jin Wei, "International Transmissions of Monetary Shocks: Between a Trilemma and a Dilemma," *Journal of International Economics*, 2018, *110*, 205–219.

Kalemli-Özcan, Sebnem, "U.S. Monetary Policy and International Risk Spillovers," 2019. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Jackson Hole Economic Policy Symposium.

Kearns, Jonathan, Andreas Schrimpf, and Fan Dora Xia, "Explaining Monetary Spillovers: The Matrix Reloaded," 2019. Mimeo, Reserve Bank of Australia.

Kim, Soyoung and Nouriel Roubini, "Exchange rate anomalies in the industrial countries: A solution with a structural VAR approach," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2000, *45* (3), 561–586.

Kiyotaki, Nobu and John Moore, "Credit Cycles," *Journal of Political Economy*, 1997, *105* (2).

Melitz, Marc J., "The Impact of Trade on Intra-Industry Reallocations and Aggregate Industry Productivity," *Econometrica*, 2003, *71* (6), 1695–1725.

Miranda-Agrippino, Silvia, "Unsurprising shocks: information, premia, and the monetary transmission," 2016. Bank of England Working Paper.

_ and Hélène Rey, "US monetary policy and the global financial cycle," *Review of Economic Studies*, 2020, *87* (6), 2754–2776.

Morais, Bernardo, José-Luis Peydró, Jessica Roldán-Peña, and Claudia Ruiz-Ortega, "The International Bank Lending Channel of Monetary Policy Rates and QE: Credit Supply, Reach-for-Yield, and Real Effects," *Journal of Finance*, 2019, *74* (1), 55–90.

Nakamura, Emi and Jòn Steinsson, "High-frequency identification of monetary non-neutrality: the information effect," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2018, *133* (3), 1283–1330.

Obstfeld, Maurice, "Uncoordinated Monetary Policies Risk a Historic Global Slowdown," 2022. Peterson Institute for International Economics, September 12, 2022.

_ and Kenneth Rogoff, "The Six Major Puzzles in International Macroeconomics: Is There a Common Cause?," *NBER Macroeconomics Annual*, 2000, *15*, 339–390.

Òscar Jordà, "Estimation and inference of impulse responses by local projections," *American Economic Review*, 2005, *95* (1), 161–182.

Ottonello, Pablo and Thomas Winberry, "Financial Heterogeneity and the Investment Channel of Monetary Policy," *Econometrica*, 2020, *88* (6), 2473–2502.

Ramey, Valerie A., "Macroeconomic shocks and their propagation," in "Handbook of Macroeconomics," Vol. 2, Elsevier, 2016, pp. 71–162.

Rey, Hélène, "Dilemma not trilemma: the global financial cycle and monetary policy independence," 2013. Federal Reserve Bank of Kansas City Jackson Hole Economic Policy Symposium.

_ , "International channels of transmission of monetary policy and the Mundellian trilemma," *IMF Economic Review*, 2016, *64* (1), 6–35.

Rogers, John H., "Monetary Shocks and Real Exchange Rates," *Journal of International Economics*, 1999, *48*, 269–88.

_ , Chiara Scotti, and Jonathan H. Wright, "Evaluating asset-market effects of unconventional monetary policy: a multi-country review," *Economic Policy*, 2014, *29*, 749–799.

Swanson, Eric T., "Measuring the effects of federal reserve forward guidance and asset purchases on financial markets," *Journal of Monetary Economics*, 2021, *118*, 32–53.

Timmer, Marcel P., Erik Dietzenbacher, Bart Los, Robert Stehrer, and Gaaitzen J. de Vries, "An Illustrated User Guide to the World Input–Output Database: the Case of Global Automotive Production," *Review of International Economics*, August 2015, *23* (3), 575–605.

Wei, Shang-Jin, "The Risk of Competitive Interest Rate Hikes," 2022. *Project Syndicate*, September 8, 2022.

_ and Yinxi Xie, "Monetary policy in an era of global supply chains," *Journal of International Economics*, 2020, *124* (2), 283–296.

Appendix A Additional Figures

Figure A1. Alternative U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks: Nakamura and Steinsson



Notes: This figure plots the annual aggregate of the policy news shock constructed by Nakamura and Steinsson (2018) (updated).

Figure A2. Alternative U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks: Swanson's Forward Guidance



Notes: This figure plots the annual aggregate of the Forward Guidance factor estimated by Swanson (2021).

Figure A3. European Monetary Policy Shocks



Notes: This figure plots the annual aggregate of the pure European monetary policy shock constructed by Bu et al. (2021).

Figure A4. Estimated Coefficient on U.S. Monetary Policy Shock Leaving Out One Year



Notes: This figure plots the estimated β obtained from estimating Equation (1) multiple times leaving out one year's worth of observations at a time. The left-out year is indicated on the horizontal axis.

Figure A5. Cumulative Impulse Responses for Investment, Sales, and Employment of a one Percentage Point Contraction in U.S. Monetary Policy



(a) Investment/Fixed Assets



(b) Sales/Fixed Assets



(c) ln(Employment)

Notes: This figure plots the cumulative impulse response function of a one percentage point contraction in U.S. monetary policy (Bu et al., 2021) for (a) investment ratio, (b) sales ratio, and (c) log employment (in millions). Estimation is based on local projection method (Jordà, 2005) of the baseline regression (1) with $h = 0, \ldots, 3$, controlling for firm-level fixed effects. 90% confidence intervals are plotted in dashed lines, and regressions are clustering at the firm and year levels.

Figure A6. Heterogeneous Impact of Trade Exposure on the Transmission of U.S. Monetary Policy shocks across Countries



(a) TotExp/Output

(b) FinExp/Output

(c) IntExp/Output

(d) WtOutdeg

Notes: This figure plots coefficients for the financial constraint interaction with the monetary policy shock from regression (2) (β_2) where we allow the coefficient to vary across countries. Panel (a) plots the coefficients for the 'TotExp/Out' variable interaction, panel (b) for the 'FinExp/Out' variable interaction, panel (c) for the 'IntExp/Out' variable interaction, and panel (d) for the 'WtOutdeg' variable interaction. All regressions were run with firm controls and country×year fixed effects, clustering at the firm and year levels. The blue standard error bounds are for the 95% level.

Figure A7. Heterogeneous Impact of Financial Constraints on the Transmission of U.S. Monetary Policy shocks across Countries



(a) Size



(b) Net Worth

Notes: This figure plots coefficients for the financial constraint interaction with the monetary policy shock from regression (3) (β_2) where we allow the coefficient to vary across countries. Panel (a) plots the coefficients for the 'Size' variable interaction, while panel (b) plots the coefficients for the 'Net Worth' variable interaction. All regressions were run with firm controls and country×sector×year fixed effects, clustering at the firm and year levels. The blue standard error bounds are for the 95% level.

Appendix B Additional Tables

Table A1. Firm-level Summary Statistics for Country Sample, 1995-2019

	Obs.	Mean	Median	St.Dev.	Min	Max
Δ(Investment/Assets)	438,300	-0.024	-0.002	0.533	-2	2
Δ(Sales/Assets)	438,039	0.064	0.003	3.774	-10	10
Employment growth	297,152	0.074	0.016	0.328	-1	2
log(Cash flow)	332,132	19.42	19.38	3.11	10.93	26.45
Sales growth	423,567	0.13	0.06	0.44	-1	2
log(Assets)	480,729	21.54	21.59	3.48	10.11	28.95
Age	387,649	28.51	21	23.89	0	211
log(Sales)	463,353	21.17	21.30	3.64	9.90	28.33
log(EBITDA)	375,453	19.77	19.71	3.02	11.94	26.67
Tobin's Q	143,779	2.08	1.28	4.19	0.42	80.80
Liquidity ratio	467,678	0.01	0.04	0.30	-4.23	0.40
Leverage	477,263	0.24	0.19	0.30	0	3.49
log(Debt)	411,667	20.06	20.24	3.70	9.74	27.84
log(Int. pay)	425,459	16.74	16.89	3.63	6.91	24.78
log(Collateral)	458,244	20.77	20.95	3.59	9.57	28.11
log(Dividends)	272,385	18.26	18.33	2.81	10.04	24.86
log(Equity)	439,239	21.13	21.40	3.26	12.93	28.09

Notes: This table presents firm-level summary statistics for all firms in with at least five years of data and that are in our baseline regression sample over 1995-2019. Summary statistics are based on the pooled sample of firms, where all variables have been winsorized at the 1% level, except for the change in sales-to-asset ratio which is winsorized at the 5% level. All measures are in nominal terms and in USD.

Table A2. Summary Statistics for Normalized Firm-Level Financial Constraint Proxy Measures across Firms

	Obs.	Mean	St.Dev.	p10	p25	p50	p75	p90
Size	438,300	0.000	2.120	-2.382	-1.338	-0.208	1.132	2.761
Net Worth	438,300	0.000	1.965	-2.258	-1.237	-0.148	1.106	2.540

Notes: This table presents firm-level summary statistics on the normalized size and net worth variables. Each variable is normalized across firms within a country-year. Summary statistics presented across all years.

Table A3. Summary Statistics Sector-Level Trade Measures for World Trade across Country Sample, 2000

Sector	Code	TotExp/Output Mean	TotExp/Output St.Dev.	FinExp/Output Mean	FinExp/Output St.Dev.	IntExp/Output Mean	IntExp/Output St.Dev.	WtOutdeg Mean	WtOutdeg St.Dev.
Agriculture	AtB	0.092	0.077	0.024	0.018	0.069	0.068	0.252	0.081
Air Transport	62	0.325	0.190	0.104	0.062	0.221	0.128	0.101	0.212
Automotive	50	0.014	0.029	0.005	0.013	0.009	0.017	0.003	0.035
Carbon/Nuclear Fuels	23	0.195	0.143	0.063	0.054	0.132	0.091	0.391	0.126
Chemicals	24	0.362	0.216	0.091	0.093	0.271	0.145	1.075	0.087
Construction	F	0.008	0.018	0.003	0.009	0.005	0.010	0.026	0.228
Education	M	0.004	0.006	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.004	0.007	0.151
Electrical Equipment	30t33	0.549	0.263	0.256	0.136	0.293	0.136	0.865	0.161
Financial Intermediation	J	0.045	0.047	0.007	0.006	0.037	0.041	0.126	0.197
Food	15t16	0.125	0.074	0.095	0.058	0.030	0.023	0.147	0.198
General Machinery	29	0.398	0.238	0.250	0.140	0.148	0.102	0.407	0.125
General Manufacturing	36t37	0.396	0.217	0.287	0.161	0.109	0.068	0.111	0.183
Health/Social Work	N	0.003	0.004	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.002	0.005	0.110
Hotels and Restaurants	H	0.065	0.073	0.023	0.025	0.042	0.050	0.090	0.153
Inland Transport	60	0.051	0.043	0.010	0.010	0.041	0.035	0.073	0.116
Leather	19	0.516	0.228	0.369	0.189	0.147	0.062	0.250	0.124
Metals	27t28	0.296	0.129	0.022	0.018	0.273	0.122	0.868	0.037
Mining	C	0.285	0.241	4E-04	0.028	0.284	0.225	1.606	0.011
Non-Metallic Minerals	26	0.171	0.095	0.022	0.016	0.149	0.091	0.126	0.040
Other Business Activities	71t74	0.098	0.081	0.013	0.015	0.086	0.070	0.499	0.072
Other Services	O	0.044	0.036	0.012	0.011	0.032	0.025	0.120	0.031
Other Transport	63	0.089	0.074	0.013	0.014	0.076	0.063	0.167	0.093
Paper	21t22	0.179	0.160	0.021	0.014	0.157	0.155	0.298	0.133
Post and Telecommunications	64	0.041	0.027	0.008	0.008	0.033	0.023	0.062	0.260
Public Administration	L	0.003	0.002	0.002	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.004	0.198
Real Estate	70	0.007	0.010	0.002	0.003	0.005	0.007	0.021	0.181
Retail Trade	52	0.029	0.043	0.020	0.037	0.009	0.014	0.020	0.081
Rubber and Plastics	25	0.276	0.177	0.056	0.046	0.220	0.139	0.326	0.123
Textiles	17t18	0.475	0.219	0.302	0.165	0.172	0.128	0.389	0.008
Transport Equipment	34t35	0.343	0.241	0.196	0.162	0.147	0.098	0.466	0.090
Utilities	E	0.021	0.029	0.005	0.006	0.016	0.023	0.044	0.007
Water Transport	61	0.415	0.367	0.098	0.101	0.317	0.283	0.082	0.014
Wholesale Trade	51	0.048	0.055	0.011	0.012	0.037	0.046	0.120	0.006
Wood	20	0.215	0.176	0.013	0.014	0.202	0.174	0.183	0.054

Notes: This table presents sector-level summary statistics on the (i) total exports-to-output ratio (TotExp/Output), (ii) final goods exports-to-output ratio (FinExp/Output), (iii) intermediate goods exports-to-output ratio (IntExp/Output), and (iv) export weighted outdegree (WtOutdeg) at the sector level for trade with the world. The 'Mean' variable is the average value of the ratio across countries within a sector, while 'St.Dev.' is the standard deviation of the ratio across countries within a sector. We calculate both the mean and standard deviation of these ratios across countries for the year 2000.

Table A4. Summary Statistics for Sector-Level Trade Measures for U.S. Trade across Country Sample, 2000

Sector	Code	TotExp/Output Mean	TotExp/Output St.Dev.	FinExp/Output Mean	FinExp/Output St.Dev.	IntExp/Output Mean	IntExp/Output St.Dev.	WtOutdeg Mean	WtOutdeg St.Dev.
Agriculture	AtB	0.015	0.022	0.004	0.005	0.011	0.016	0.004	0.007
Air Transport	62	0.104	0.076	0.033	0.025	0.071	0.052	0.002	0.001
Automotive	50	0.002	0.004	0.001	0.002	0.001	0.002	1E-05	1E-05
Carbon/Nuclear Fuels	23	0.037	0.048	0.012	0.014	0.025	0.034	0.004	0.006
Chemicals	24	0.072	0.093	0.020	0.022	0.052	0.078	0.011	0.014
Construction	F	0.001	0.001	7E-05	1E-04	5E-04	0.001	8E-05	1E-04
Education	M	0.001	0.001	2E-04	4E-04	5E-04	0.001	3E-05	6E-05
Electrical Equipment	30t33	0.148	0.168	0.087	0.100	6E-02	0.071	0.014	0.021
Financial Intermediation	J	0.004	0.006	0.001	0.001	0.003	0.005	0.001	0.001
Food	15t16	0.020	0.032	0.017	0.027	0.003	0.006	0.001	0.001
General Machinery	29	0.093	0.099	0.057	0.055	0.037	0.046	0.003	0.003
General Manufacturing	36t37	0.179	0.168	0.135	0.121	0.044	0.051	0.003	0.005
Health/Social Work	N	0.001	0.001	3E-04	4E-04	4E-04	0.001	4E-05	5E-05
Hotels and Restaurants	H	0.002	0.006	0.001	0.005	3E-04	0.001	3E-05	9E-05
Inland Transport	60	0.002	0.004	4E-04	0.001	0.002	0.004	0.001	0.002
Leather	19	0.176	0.085	0.129	0.063	0.048	0.022	0.009	0.011
Metals	27t28	0.059	0.084	0.008	0.015	0.051	0.069	0.009	0.010
Mining	C	0.039	0.070	0.001	0.003	0.038	0.068	0.036	0.085
Non-Metallic Minerals	26	0.048	0.070	0.007	0.007	0.041	0.071	0.002	0.002
Other Business Activities	71t74	0.042	0.046	0.006	0.010	0.036	0.040	0.008	0.012
Other Services	O	0.006	0.008	0.002	0.003	0.005	0.006	0.001	0.001
Other Transport	63	0.004	0.012	0.001	0.004	0.003	0.008	6E-05	1E-04
Paper	21t22	0.038	0.075	0.008	0.008	0.030	0.070	0.003	0.007
Post and Telecommunications	64	0.001	0.002	2E-04	2E-04	0.001	0.001	1E-04	3E-04
Public Administration	L	4E-05	6E-05	2E-05	3E-05	2E-05	3E-05	1E-06	1E-06
Real Estate	70	4E-04	0.002	9E-05	3E-04	3E-04	0.001	4E-05	1E-04
Retail Trade	52	0.003	0.005	0.002	0.003	0.001	0.003	2E-04	4E-04
Rubber and Plastics	25	0.058	0.131	0.019	0.045	0.039	0.086	0.002	0.004
Textiles	17t18	0.122	0.135	0.110	0.122	0.012	0.023	0.002	0.002
Transport Equipment	34t35	0.095	0.170	0.064	0.131	0.031	0.042	0.006	0.010
Utilities	E	0.006	0.015	0.001	0.003	0.004	0.011	5E-04	0.001
Water Transport	61	0.004	0.005	0.001	0.001	0.003	0.004	5E-05	7E-05
Wholesale Trade	51	0.002	0.004	0.001	0.001	0.002	0.003	0.001	0.003
Wood	20	0.050	0.109	0.004	0.004	0.046	0.109	0.004	0.010

Notes: This table presents sector-level summary statistics on the (i) total exports-to-output ratio (TotExp/Output), (ii) final goods exports-to-output ratio (FinExp/Output), (iii) intermediate goods exports-to-output ratio (IntExp/Output), and (iv) export weighted outdegree (WtOutdeg) at the sector level for trade with the U.S. only. The 'Mean' variable is the average value of the ratio across countries within a sector, while 'St.Dev.' is the standard deviation of the ratio across countries within a sector. We calculate both the mean and standard deviation of these ratios across countries for the year 2000.

Table A5. Summary Statistics for Normalized Sector-Level Trade Measures across Firms

	Obs.	Mean	St. Dev.	p10	p25	p50	p75	p90
TotExp/Output	438,300	0.000	0.223	-0.239	-0.131	-0.055	0.177	0.309
FinExp/Output	438,300	0.000	0.102	-0.086	-0.056	-0.034	0.032	0.136
IntExp/Output	438,300	0.000	0.169	-0.182	-0.086	-0.034	0.094	0.267
WtOutdeg	438,300	0.000	0.720	-0.678	-0.299	-0.096	0.211	0.455
TotExp/Output, U.S.	438,300	0.000	0.060	-0.035	-0.022	-0.009	0.024	0.053
FinExp/Output, U.S.	438,300	0.000	0.036	-0.021	-0.014	-0.008	0.003	0.029
IntExp/Output, U.S.	438,300	0.000	0.043	-0.019	-0.011	-0.004	0.010	0.027
WtOutdeg, U.S.	438,300	0.000	0.020	-0.014	-0.006	-0.001	0.003	0.014

Notes: This table presents sector-level summary statistics on the normalized (i) total exports-to-output ratio (TotExp/Output), (ii) final goods exports-to-output ratio (FinExp/Output), (iii) intermediate goods exports-to-output ratio (IntExp/Output), and (iv) export weighted outdegree (WtOutdeg) at the sector level for trade with the world and U.S. only. Each variable is normalized across firms within a country-year. Summary statistics presented across all years.

Table A6. Summary Statistics for Macroeconomic Variables

	Obs.	Mean	Median	St.Dev.	Min	Max
ln(VIX)	25	2.932	2.864	0.305	2.406	3.487
$\Delta \ln(\text{RGDP}^D)$	487	3.654	3.303	3.464	-12.90	19.90
$\Delta \ln(\text{NXR})$	492	0.041	0.010	0.184	-0.216	2.442
$\Delta\text{IntRate}^D$	490	-0.105	-0.0003	2.156	-47.71	0.350
Fin. Openness	468	0.559	0.604	0.358	0	1
Trade/GDP	449	0.646	0.551	0.364	0.156	2.204

Notes: This table presents summary statistic for annual macroeconomic data for the following series: (i) the log of the CBOE Volatility Index ('ln(VIX)'), (ii) real GDP growth in domestic currency ('$\Delta \ln(\text{RDGP}^D)$'), (iii) the percentage change of the local currency-to-U.S. dollar nominal exchange rate ('$\Delta \ln(\text{NXR})$'), (iv) the change in the domestic short-term rate ('$\Delta\text{IntRate}^D$)'), (v) one minus the Ito-Chinn index of financial account repression ('Fin. Openness'), and (vi) the exports plus imports-to-GDP ratio ('Trade/GDP'). All financial series are calculated using the annual average of the underlying variable while macroeconomic and trade data are based on end-of-year series.

Table A7. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firm Investment, Sales, and Employment: Robustness to Including U.S. Rates and to Using Alternative Measures of Monetary Policy Shocks

	Panel A. Δ(Investment$_t$/FixAssets$_{t-1}$)							
	BRW-US		*Nakamura-Steinsson*		*Forward Guidance*		*BRW-ECB*	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
MP_{t-1}	-0.164^a	-0.176^a	0.047	0.077	-0.009^a	-0.007^c	-0.240	-0.227
	(0.048)	(0.043)	(0.085)	(0.067)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.147)	(0.148)
Δ(2-year USTR)$_{t-1}$	0.017^b		0.010		0.028^b		0.023	
	(0.007)		(0.013)		(0.012)		(0.014)	
Δ(5-year USTR)$_{t-1}$		0.025^b		0.008		0.027		0.027
		(0.011)		(0.013)		(0.018)		(0.018)
Observations	374,360	374,360	374,360	374,360	374,360	374,360	315,155	315,155
R^2	0.058	0.058	0.056	0.056	0.057	0.057	0.064	0.064
	Panel B. Δ(Sales$_t$/FixAssets$_{t-1}$)							
	BRW-US		*Nakamura-Steinsson*		*Forward Guidance*		*BRW-ECB*	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
MP_{t-1}	-1.327^a	-1.421^a	0.853	0.942	-0.077^b	-0.060^c	-1.177	-1.058
	(0.332)	(0.293)	(0.799)	(0.640)	(0.028)	(0.031)	(1.105)	(1.106)
Δ(2-year USTR)$_{t-1}$	0.139^c		0.031		0.232^b		0.201^a	
	(0.067)		(0.116)		(0.108)		(0.113)	
Δ(5-year USTR)$_{t-1}$		0.206^b		0.024		0.224		0.233
		(0.095)		(0.126)		(0.156)		(0.148)
Observations	374,179	374,179	374,179	374,179	374,179	374,179	315,028	315,028
R^2	0.106	0.106	0.105	0.105	0.105	0.105	0.116	0.116
	Panel C. Employment Growth$_t$							
	BRW-US		*Nakamura-Steinsson*		*Forward Guidance*		*BRW-ECB*	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
MP_{t-1}	-0.033^c	-0.039^b	0.135^b	0.128^a	0.004	0.004^c	0.022	0.028
	(0.019)	(0.016)	(0.064)	(0.042)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.091)	(0.092)
Δ(2-year USTR)$_{t-1}$	0.017^b		0.001		0.011		0.014	
	(0.008)		(0.012)		(0.010)		(0.012)	
Δ(5-year USTR)$_{t-1}$		0.022^c		0.003		0.013		0.015
		(0.012)		(0.014)		(0.013)		(0.017)
Observations	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	205,212	205,212
R^2	0.177	0.177	0.178	0.178	0.177	0.177	0.193	0.193

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (1) for the change in the investment-to-fixed capital ratio, sales-to-fixed capital ratio, and employment growth. The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP is the U.S. monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021) in columns (1)-(2), Nakamura and Steinsson (2018) in columns (3)-(4), Swanson (2021)'s measure of forward guidance in columns (5)-(6), and the European monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021) in columns (7)-(8). '2-year and 5-year USTR' are the annual average of U.S. 2-year or 5-year Treasury bills. We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

Table A8. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firm Investment, Sales, and Employment: Impact of Country-Level Trade and Financial Openness

	Δ(Investment$_t$/FixAssets$_{t-1}$)		Δ(Sales$_t$/FixAssets$_{t-1}$)		Employment Growth$_t$	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-0.089	-0.141^{b}	-0.956^{b}	-1.309^{a}	-0.084	-0.092
	(0.065)	(0.065)	(0.363)	(0.390)	(0.065)	(0.068)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$ TrOpen$_{t-1}$	-0.046	-0.038	-0.390	-0.310	-0.047^{c}	-0.059^{b}
	(0.036)	(0.041)	(0.299)	(0.307)	(0.025)	(0.028)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$ FinOpen$_{t-1}$	-0.027	0.001	0.174	0.365	0.131^{b}	0.135^{b}
	(0.043)	(0.044)	(0.357)	(0.379)	(0.057)	(0.058)
TrOpen$_{t-1}$	-0.021	-0.013	-0.163	-0.196	-0.002	0.015
	(0.018)	(0.025)	(0.184)	(0.200)	(0.035)	(0.031)
FinOpen$_{t-1}$	0.001	0.097^{a}	0.291	1.028^{a}	0.058^{c}	0.099^{a}
	(0.031)	(0.034)	(0.273)	(0.265)	(0.030)	(0.033)
Observations	340,930	340,441	340,766	340,273	239,666	238,168
R^2	0.005	0.059	0.008	0.107	0.024	0.180
Country×sector FE	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Firm FE	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (1) along with interactions of the shock with country-level measures of trade openness ('TrOpen') and financial openness ('FinOpen'). Regressions are run for the change in the investment-to-fixed capital ratio, sales-to-fixed capital ratio, and employment growth. The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

Table A9. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Sales and Employment: The Importance of Trade Integration, Non-Time-Varying FE Estimates

Panel A. $\Delta(\text{Sales}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$

	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-1.297^a	-1.302^a	-1.297^a	-1.300^a	-1.300^a	-1.303^a	-1.298^a	-1.298^a
	(0.400)	(0.402)	(0.400)	(0.400)	(0.401)	(0.402)	(0.401)	(0.399)
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.025				0.870			
	(0.317)				(0.879)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		-0.500				-1.706		
		(0.379)				(1.293)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			0.126				3.608^b	
			(0.459)				(1.633)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \text{WtOutdeg}_{t-1}$				-0.078				3.433
				(0.054)				(2.035)
Observations	374,179	374,179	374,179	374,179	374,179	374,179	374,179	374,179
R^2	0.106	0.106	0.106	0.106	0.106	0.106	0.106	0.106

Panel B. $\text{Employment Growth}_t$

	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-0.030	-0.030	-0.029	-0.029	-0.029	-0.030	-0.029	-0.029
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.011				0.097			
	(0.030)				(0.132)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		-0.048				0.092		
		(0.052)				(0.211)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			0.002				0.180	
			(0.047)				(0.208)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \text{WtOutdeg}_{t-1}$				0.004				0.380
				(0.010)				(0.423)
Observations	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414
R^2	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (2) for the change in the sales-to-fixed capital ratio and employment growth, where we interact different measures of country-sectors' trade integration with the monetary policy shock. Columns (1)-(4) use trade measures based on country-sector exports with the world, while columns (5)-(8) use U.S.-only exports data. The country-sector's trade measure include (i) total trade-to-output ratio ('TotExp/Output'), (ii) final goods trade-to-output ratio ('FinExp/Output'), (iii) intermediate goods trade-to-output ratio ('IntExp/Output'), and (iv) the weighted outdegree ('WtOutdeg'). The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

Table A10. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Sales and Employment: The Importance of Trade Integration, Time-Varying FE Estimates

Panel A. $\Delta(\text{Sales}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$

	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.209				0.293			
	(0.334)				(0.981)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		-0.502				-1.660		
		(0.400)				(1.279)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			-0.230				1.416	
			(0.489)				(1.415)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \text{WtOutdeg}_{t-1}$				-0.115[c]				0.287
				(0.058)				(1.823)
Observations	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178
R^2	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118

Panel B. $\text{Employment Growth}_t$

	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-0.030	-0.030	-0.029	-0.029	-0.029	-0.030	-0.029	-0.029
	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)	(0.027)
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.011				0.097			
	(0.030)				(0.132)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		-0.048				0.092		
		(0.052)				(0.211)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			0.002				0.180	
			(0.047)				(0.208)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1} \times \text{WtOutdeg}_{t-1}$				0.004				0.380
				(0.010)				(0.423)
Observations	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414	254,414
R^2	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176	0.176
Country×year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (2), with time-varying fixed effects, for the change in the sales-to-fixed capital ratio and employment growth, where we interact different measures of country-sectors' trade integration with the monetary policy shock. Columns (1)-(4) use trade measures based on country-sector exports with the world, while columns (5)-(8) use U.S.-only exports data. The country-sector's trade measure include (i) total trade-to-output ratio ('TotExp/Output'), (ii) final goods trade-to-output ratio ('FinExp/Output'), (iii) intermediate goods trade-to-output ratio ('IntExp/Output'), and (iv) the weighted outdegree ('WtOutdeg'). The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where [a] indicates significance at the 1% level, [b] at the 5% level, and [c] at the 10% level.

Table A11. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Sales and Employment: Firm-Level heterogeneity

	Panel A. $\Delta(\text{Sales}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$					
	Size			*Net Worth*		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-1.320^a			-1.315^a		
	(0.402)			(0.402)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{Size}_{t-1}$	0.089^b	0.100^b	0.114^b			
	(0.035)	(0.041)	(0.049)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{Net Worth}_{t-1}$				0.096^a	0.104^b	0.109^b
				(0.033)	(0.039)	(0.042)
Observations	374,179	374,178	373,060	374,179	374,178	373,060
R^2	0.106	0.118	0.149	0.106	0.118	0.149
	Panel B. $\text{Employment Growth}_t$					
	Size			*Net Worth*		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-0.024			-0.025		
	(0.028)			(0.028)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{Size}_{t-1}$	-0.015^b	-0.010^c	-0.009			
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{Net Worth}_{t-1}$				-0.014^b	-0.009^c	-0.008
				(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)
Observations	254,414	254,412	252,777	254,414	254,412	252,777
R^2	0.176	0.200	0.243	0.176	0.200	0.243
Country×year FE	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Country×sector×year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (3) for the change in the sales-to-fixed capital ratio and employment growth, where we interact firm characteristics with the monetary policy shock. The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

Table A12. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Sales and Employment: Firm-Level Heterogeneity Robustness

	Panel A. $\Delta(\text{Sales}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$						**Panel B.** Employment Growth$_t$					
	Size			*Net Worth*			*Size*			*Net Worth*		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(8)	(10)	(11)	(12)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-1.310^a			-1.309^a			-0.024			-0.025		
	(0.401)			(0.401)			(0.028)			(0.028)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{Size}_{t-1}$	0.033	0.042	0.067^c				-0.011^b	-0.006	-0.005			
	(0.029)	(0.033)	(0.039)				(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{Net Worth}_{t-1}$				0.052^c	0.060^c	0.070^c				-0.010^b	-0.006	-0.004
				(0.028)	(0.031)	(0.035)				(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.006)
$\ln(\text{VIX}_{t-1})\times\text{Size}_{t-1}$	-0.021	-0.027^c	-0.016				0.007^a	0.005	0.005^c			
	(0.014)	(0.015)	(0.016)				(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)			
$\ln(\text{VIX}_{t-1})\times\text{Net Worth}_{t-1}$				-0.022	-0.026^c	-0.025				0.009^a	0.005	0.005^c
				(0.013)	(0.013)	(0.015)				(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)
$\Delta\ln(\text{NXR}_{t-1})\times\text{Size}_{t-1}$	-0.100	-0.048	-0.051				-0.024^a	-0.009	-0.006			
	(0.060)	(0.062)	(0.054)				(0.008)	(0.006)	(0.007)			
$\Delta\ln(\text{NXR}_{t-1})\times\text{Net Worth}_{t-1}$				-0.062	-0.029	-0.034				-0.026^a	-0.012^b	-0.008
				(0.055)	(0.058)	(0.049)				(0.007)	(0.005)	(0.006)
$\Delta\text{IntRate}_{t-1}\times\text{Size}_{t-1}$	0.854^a	0.946^a	0.863^b				0.011	-0.017	-0.005			
	(0.289)	(0.285)	(0.335)				(0.026)	(0.030)	(0.036)			
$\Delta\text{IntRate}_{t-1}\times\text{Net Worth}_{t-1}$				0.580^b	0.607^b	0.466				0.040	0.010	0.0004
				(0.237)	(0.244)	(0.273)				(0.025)	(0.025)	(0.030)
Observations	374,179	374,178	373,060	374,179	374,178	373,060	254,414	254,412	252,777	254,414	254,412	252,777
R^2	0.106	0.118	0.149	0.106	0.118	0.149	0.177	0.200	0.243	0.177	0.200	0.243
Country×year FE	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Country×sector×year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (3) for the change in the sales-to-fixed capital ratio and employment growth, where we interact firm characteristics with the monetary policy shock, VIX, nominal exchange rate change, and change in the domestic interest rate. The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

Table A13. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Investment: Firm-Level Heterogeneity Robustness

	Size			*Net Worth*		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
MP^{US}_{t-1}	-0.166^a			-0.164^a		
	(0.055)			(0.055)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$Size$_{t-1}$	0.020^a	0.024^a	0.024^a			
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$ Net Worth$_{t-1}$				0.019^a	0.021^a	0.021^a
				(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.005)
ln(VIX$_{t-1}$)$\times$Size$_{t-1}$	0.004	0.005	0.005			
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)			
ln(VIX$_{t-1}$)$\times$Net Worth$_{t-1}$				0.004	0.004	0.003
				(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)
Δ ln(NXR)$_{t-1}\times$Size$_{t-1}$	-0.002	0.002	0.004			
	(0.007)	(0.008)	(0.009)			
Δ ln(NXR)$_{t-1}\times$Net Worth$_{t-1}$				-0.003	-0.0003	0.002
				(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.008)
ΔIntRate$_{t-1}\times$Size$_{t-1}$	0.032	0.034	0.024			
	(0.045)	(0.047)	(0.047)			
ΔIntRate$_{t-1}\times$Net Worth$_{t-1}$				0.029	0.029	0.014
				(0.041)	(0.040)	(0.041)
Observations	374,360	374,359	373,241	374,360	374,359	373,241
R^2	0.058	0.069	0.096	0.058	0.069	0.096
Country$\times$year FE	No	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
Country$\times$sector$\times$year FE	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (3) for the change in the investment-to-fixed capital ratio, where we interact firm characteristics with the monetary policy shock, VIX, nominal exchange rate change, and change in the domestic interest rate. The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

Table A14. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Investment: The Importance of Net Worth and Trade Integration

	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$ Net Worth$_{t-1}$	0.017^{a}	0.018^{a}	0.017^{a}	0.018^{a}	0.017^{a}	0.018^{a}	0.017^{a}	0.017^{a}
	(0.005)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.106^{b}				-0.319^{c}			
	(0.040)				(0.158)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		0.013				0.057		
		(0.057)				(0.150)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			-0.192^{b}				-0.733^{b}	
			(0.071)				(0.336)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$ WtOutdeg$_{t-1}$				-0.029^{b}				-1.502^{b}
				(0.012)				(0.549)
Observations	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359	374,359
R^2	0.0688	0.0687	0.0688	0.0688	0.0688	0.0687	0.0688	0.0688
Country×year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (4) for the change in the investment-to-fixed capital ratio, where we interact firm net worth in addition to different measures country-sectors' trade integration with the monetary policy shock. Columns (1)-(4) use trade measures based on country-sector exports with the world, while columns (5)-(8) use U.S.-only exports data. The country-sector's trade measure include (i) total trade-to-output ratio ('TotExp/Output'), (ii) final goods trade-to-output ratio ('FinExp/Output'), (iii) intermediate goods trade-to-output ratio ('IntExp/Output'), and (iv) the weighted outdegree ('WtOutdeg'). The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

Table A15. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Sales and Employment: The Importance of Size and Trade Integration

Panel A. $\Delta(\text{Sales}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$

	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{Size}_{t-1}$	0.100^b	0.099^b	0.102^b	0.098^b	0.105^b	0.099^b	0.109^b	0.102^b
	(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.041)	(0.042)	(0.041)	(0.043)	(0.041)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.075				0.858			
	(0.325)				(0.972)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		-0.320				-1.191		
		(0.397)				(1.225)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			-0.063				2.224	
			(0.475)				(1.441)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{WtOutdeg}_{t-1}$				-0.096^c				1.317
				(0.053)				(1.673)
Observations	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178
R^2	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118

Panel B. $\text{Employment Growth}_t$

	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{Size}_{t-1}$	-0.011^b	-0.010^b	-0.010^b	-0.010^b	-0.010^b	-0.010^b	-0.010^b	-0.010^b
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.047				-0.122			
	(0.028)				(0.124)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		-0.094^c				-0.059		
		(0.053)				(0.202)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			-0.045				-0.228	
			(0.049)				(0.297)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\text{WtOutdeg}_{t-1}$				-0.005				-0.117
				(0.010)				(0.490)
Observations	254,412	254,412	254,412	254,412	254,412	254,412	254,412	254,412
R^2	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200
Country×year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (4) for the change in the sales-to-fixed capital ratio and employment growth, where we interact firm size in addition to different measures country-sectors' trade integration with the monetary policy shock. Columns (1)-(4) use trade measures based on country-sector exports with the world, while columns (5)-(8) use U.S.-only exports data. The country-sector's trade measure include (i) total trade-to-output ratio ('TotExp/Output'), (ii) final goods trade-to-output ratio ('FinExp/Output'), (iii) intermediate goods trade-to-output ratio ('IntExp/Output'), and (iv) the weighted outdegree ('WtOutdeg'). The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.

Table A16. Effect of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Firms' Sales and Employment: The Importance of Net Worth and Trade Integration

Panel A. $\Delta(\text{Sales}_t/\text{FixAssets}_{t-1})$

	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$Net Worth$_{t-1}$	0.104^b	0.103^b	0.105^b	0.103^b	0.107^b	0.103^b	0.110^b	0.105^b
	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.039)	(0.040)	(0.039)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.122				0.714			
	(0.330)				(0.972)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		-0.366				-1.269		
		(0.399)				(1.233)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			-0.129				1.983	
			(0.483)				(1.424)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$ WtOutdeg$_{t-1}$				-0.105^c				0.975
				(0.056)				(1.742)
Observations	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178	374,178
R^2	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118	0.118

Panel B. Employment Growth$_t$

	Global Trade				*U.S. Trade*			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$Net Worth$_{t-1}$	-0.010^c	-0.010^c	-0.010^c	-0.009^c	-0.010^c	-0.009^c	-0.010^c	-0.009^c
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.005)
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{TotExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$	-0.041				-0.101			
	(0.029)				(0.127)			
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{FinExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$		-0.086				-0.037		
		(0.053)				(0.205)		
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times\left(\frac{\text{IntExp}}{\text{Output}}\right)_{t-1}$			-0.037				-0.196	
			(0.049)				(0.300)	
$MP^{US}_{t-1}\times$ WtOutdeg$_{t-1}$				-0.004				-0.074
				(0.010)				(0.498)
Observations	254,412	254,412	254,412	254,412	254,412	254,412	254,412	254,412
R^2	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200	0.200
Country×year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Firm FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

Notes: This table presents firm-level panel regression results based on the estimation of regression (4) for the change in the sales-to-fixed capital ratio and employment growth, where we interact firm net worth in addition to different measures country-sectors' trade integration with the monetary policy shock. Columns (1)-(4) use trade measures based on country-sector exports with the world, while columns (5)-(8) use U.S.-only exports data. The country-sector's trade measure include (i) total trade-to-output ratio ('TotExp/Output'), (ii) final goods trade-to-output ratio ('FinExp/Output'), (iii) intermediate goods trade-to-output ratio ('IntExp/Output'), and (iv) the weighted outdegree ('WtOutdeg'). The sample uses firms with at least five years of observations over 1995-2019. All regressors are lagged one period, where MP^{US} is the monetary policy shock from Bu et al. (2021), 'Size' is the within country-year measure of a firm's size based on the log of total assets, and 'Net worth' is the within country-year measure of a firm's net worth based on the log of net worth (assets minus liabilities). We include lagged firm and macroeconomic variables as in the baseline estimation in Table 1, and fixed effects at various levels of disaggregation. Standard errors are double clustered at the firm and year level, where ^{a} indicates significance at the 1% level, ^{b} at the 5% level, and ^{c} at the 10% level.