The Rise of Nonbanks and the Quality of Financial Services: Evidence from Consumer Complaints[*]

Ahmet Degerli

Federal Reserve Board

ahmet.degerli@frb.gov

Jing Wang

University of Missouri

jingwang@missouri.edu

First draft: July 2021

This draft: May 2022

Abstract

We show that as nonbanks' market share increases in a local residential mortgage market, the quality of mortgage services in the market improves. Two instrumental variable analyses exploiting (1) stress tests conducted by the Federal Reserve, and (2) mortgage industry surety bonds required by each state confirm this finding. We find evidence that as nonbanks grow their market share, they develop a specialty in servicing lower-income borrowers and increase investment in technology, leading to improved service quality. This improvement in service quality is more salient in counties with a higher percentage of minority populations.

Keywords: Product quality, Mortgage lending, Banks, Nonbanks

JEL classification: G21, G28, L13, L15

1 Introduction

Nonbanks, including FinTech lenders, have been growing rapidly since the Global Financial Crisis. In particular, nonbanks have achieved a substantial presence in the U.S. residential mortgage market. For example, in 2018, they accounted for 47% of the mortgage origination market and 35% of the post-origination mortgage servicing market.[1] This substantial growth of nonbanks raises one important question: Does the expansion of nonbanks in the mortgage market improve or impair consumer welfare?

The existing literature examines this question by focusing on the origination stage of mortgages and investigating the effects of nonbanks on consumers' access to and the cost of mortgages. Specifically, the literature provides evidence that nonbanks increase credit access for riskier and less creditworthy borrowers, whereas the evidence regarding the effects on the cost of mortgages is mixed (e.g., Buchak et al. 2018; Jagtiani et al. 2021).

In this paper, we take a fresh look at this question by examining the quality of financial services associated with mortgages predominantly *after* mortgage origination. Our goal is to understand the evolution of service quality in a local residential mortgage market as nonbanks increase their presence in the market. Such evidence complements the findings of prior studies in two important dimensions. First, it extends our understanding of the impact of nonbanks' growth on consumer welfare beyond the origination stage of mortgages. Second, it sheds light on the interplay of the quantity and quality of financial services accompanying the rise of nonbanks. Such evidence should be especially relevant for policymakers and regulators, considering the ongoing discussions on tightening the regulation of nonbanks.

Ex ante, it is not obvious whether and in which direction the service quality of the mortgage industry would change as nonbanks increase their share in the mortgage market. If nonbanks' increased market share is purely a result of regulatory arbitrage, service quality facing consumers in the mortgage market could deteriorate due to the less regulatory over-

---

[1]These nonbanks' market shares are computed based on a sample of mortgage lenders that are included in both the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) and Mortgage-Backed Securities OnLine (eMBS) datasets.

sight of nonbanks compared to that of traditional banks (Fuster et al., 2021).[2] However, as their market share grows, if nonbanks learn to better serve their customers through, for example, developing a specialty in servicing certain types of customers or investing in advanced technology, then service quality facing consumers in the mortgage market could improve.

Our analysis relates the quality of financial services associated with mortgages in a county to the market share held by nonbanks in the county's residential mortgage market. Admittedly, measuring the quality of financial services is challenging and subjective. The specific angle we take in this paper follows recent literature that utilizes mortgage-related complaints filed with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) to measure the service quality in the mortgage market (e.g., Begley and Purnanandam 2021). These complaints capture an important and unique aspect of financial service quality in the residential mortgage market—the direct feedback from mortgage borrowers about their poor experiences with financial institutions. Typically, these complaints are the results of issues that customers could not obtain a resolution from financial institutions before CFPB intervenes. Based on these complaints, our measure of service quality is the complaint ratio, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed with the CFPB over the number of outstanding mortgages in the local market. We follow prior literature (e.g., Buchak et al. 2018) and define nonbanks as lenders other than traditional deposit-taking banks. Our measure of nonbanks' market share is based on the HMDA data and is calculated as the dollar amount of mortgages originated by nonbanks divided by the total dollar amount of mortgages originated in the county. We use nonbanks' market share in the origination market as a proxy for their overall market share in the mortgage industry (including both mortgage origination and servicing) because comprehensive data on mortgage servicing are not available and nonbanks' market share in the origination market and that in the post-origination servicing market are highly correlated.[3]

---

[2]Using data on Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB) supervision and enforcement, Fuster et al. (2021) find that tighter regulatory oversight improves servicing practices.

[3]Using different samples, we show that the correlation between nonbanks' market share in the origination market and that in the post-origination servicing market is over 90%. Although nonbanks mostly use

We find that as nonbanks' market share increases in a county, the mortgage-related complaint ratio in the county reduces. The effect is economically large—a one standard deviation increase in nonbanks' market share is associated with a 12% reduction in mortgage-related complaint ratio in the county. Importantly, we obtain this result with county and year fixed effects. County fixed effects absorb any time-invariant county characteristics. For instance, counties may have different levels of complaint ratio because they differ in their residents' willingness to file complaints. To the extent that the average willingness of a county's residents to file complaints is stable, county fixed effects absorb this potential heterogeneity. Year fixed effects are also instrumental if we consider the possibilities that more consumers have become familiar with CFPB and therefore file more complaints over time or that financial institutions become better at avoiding having complaints filed against them over time. Therefore, year fixed effects mitigate the concern that our results are due to the time trend of the complaint ratio.

Of course, nonbanks' choices to expand business in specific counties are not random. In particular, time-variant county characteristics or local economic dynamics may affect these choices. Therefore, the main identification challenge is that county-specific economic conditions may be correlated with both the market share of nonbanks and the complaint ratio in the county, resulting in biased estimates. We conduct two instrumental variable (IV) analyses to address this identification challenge. In both IV analyses, we focus on the within-county changes in nonbanks' market share and examine their effect on the within-county changes in complaint ratio.

The first IV analysis exploits the stress tests implemented by the Federal Reserve. Based on the requirement of the Dodd-Frank Act (DFA), the Federal Reserve conducts annual stress tests to assess if the selected group of large bank holding companies (i.e., BHCs) have sufficient capital to absorb losses if poor economic conditions were to occur. Previous lit-

---

the originate-to-distribute model of lending, they frequently remain the servicing entities after the sale of mortgages to various third parties. Even in situations where nonbanks sell mortgage servicing rights, they typically sell those rights to other nonbanks. Therefore, mortgages that are originated by nonbanks are likely serviced by nonbanks. Please see Section 3.2 for more discussions.

erature documents that regulations, such as capital requirements, imposed on traditional deposit-taking banks are partially responsible for the rise of nonbanks (Buchak et al. 2018; Irani et al. 2021; Chernenko et al. 2022). In particular, prior studies show that the increased regulatory burdens due to stress tests lead to a reduction in bank lending, including residential mortgages (Covas 2017; Cortés et al. 2020). This reduction in mortgage origination by stress-tested banks may facilitate the expansion of nonbanks in the local mortgage market. Therefore, nonbanks' market share is likely to increase more aggressively in counties with a higher ex ante exposure to stress-tested banks, *ceteris paribus*. For this IV analysis, we use counties' ex ante exposure to stress-tested banks as an instrument for the change in nonbanks' market share. We find that counties with a higher ex ante exposure to stress-tested banks experience higher growth in nonbank market share during our sample period, and consequently, these counties experience a larger reduction in mortgage-related complaint ratio.

The second IV analysis exploits the variation in mortgage industry surety bond requirements by each state. Mortgage industry surety bonds are imposed by states to protect mortgage borrowers against dishonest lending practices. When mortgage professionals, such as mortgage brokers, lenders, originators, and servicers, apply for licenses to conduct business in a state, they are required to post surety bonds as part of the licensing application. The amount of surety bond required in a state reflects the costs of conducting mortgage business in the state. Therefore, nonbanks are likely to expand more aggressively in states with a lower surety bond requirement, *ceteris paribus*. For this IV analysis, we use states' mortgage industry surety bond requirement as an instrument for the change in nonbanks' market share. We find that counties that reside in states with a lower amount of surety bond requirement experience higher growth in nonbanks' market share during our sample period, and subsequently, these counties experience a larger reduction in mortgage-related complaint ratio.

It is worth noting that stress tests and surety bonds may have a direct impact on service

quality. To meet the exclusion restriction, we carefully design our IV strategies to include two features. First, as we emphasized earlier, we focus on the within-county change in nonbanks' market share and examine its effect on the within-county change in complaint ratio. Second, we construct the two instruments using information that is years preceding our sample period and remains constant during our sample period. As a result, although the two IVs may directly influence the level of service quality, they are not expected to have a direct influence on the change in service quality during our sample period. In addition, we conduct robustness tests to strengthen our identification assumption.

To investigate the reasons for the reduced county-level complaint ratio, we first compare the complaint ratios between nonbanks and traditional banks. We find that the average complaint ratio for nonbanks is much higher than that for traditional banks. Therefore, the cross-sectional difference in the complaint ratios between nonbanks and traditional banks cannot explain the reduced county-level complaint ratio as nonbanks' market share increases.

Rather, we find that nonbanks' complaint ratio decreases as their market share in a county increases, contributing to the overall reduction in complaint ratio in the local mortgage market. Specifically, focusing on mortgage complaints against nonbanks exclusively, we find that a one standard deviation increase in nonbanks' market share is associated with an 18% reduction in complaint ratio against nonbanks. We confirm this finding using the two IV strategies.

We explore two potential mechanisms through which nonbanks may improve their service quality as they gain a greater market share. First, we investigate whether nonbanks are likely to develop a specialty in servicing certain types of borrowers as their market share increases. Specialization would allow nonbanks to develop a deeper understanding of their customers' needs and to be better equipped to solve their customers' issues, resulting in improved service quality. Supportive of this conjecture, we find that nonbanks become increasingly focused on lower-income borrowers as their market share increases. Specifically, as nonbanks' share increases in the local mortgage market, their average borrower income becomes lower and the

5

dispersion of their borrowers' incomes becomes smaller. Although previous literature documents that the average borrower income of nonbanks is lower than that of traditional banks (Buchak et al. 2018), our finding is novel by showing that as nonbanks increase their market share, their customers become even more concentrated among lower-income borrowers. Critical to this mechanism is whether nonbanks indeed become better at servicing lower-income borrowers. By examining detailed complaint issues, we find that complaints against nonbanks about issues related to difficulties in making mortgage payments—complaints that are likely filed by lower-income borrowers—are significantly reduced as nonbanks' market share increases. Taken together, the evidence is consistent with the idea that, as their market share increases, nonbanks develop a specialty in offering mortgage solutions to lower-income borrowers.[4]

Second, we investigate whether nonbanks are likely to invest in technology (such as technological upgrades) to improve their service quality as their market share increases (Fuster et al. 2019). We test this conjecture by first examining nonbanks' incentives to invest. Nonbanks may have more incentives to invest if their increased market share is concentrated within a few lenders, because these lenders are more likely to internalize the benefits of such investment (Petersen and Rajan 1995; Giannetti and Saidi 2019; Saidi and Streitz 2021). Alternatively, nonbanks may have more incentives if their market shares increase not only in the focal county but also in the entire nation, because the marginal cost of such investment is decreasing and their increased market shares in the nation would allow them to take advantage of the economies of scale. Using two-stage regression models, we find evidence that the increased market share of nonbanks is positively associated with both sources of investment incentives, resulting in a lower complaint ratio in the county. Lending support to this mechanism, we find that as nonbanks' market share increases in a county, nonbanks' use

---

[4]Our interpretation should not be severely biased by the lower financial literacy of lower-income borrowers. We have shown that borrowers of nonbanks are not less likely to complain than borrowers of traditional banks, although the average income of nonbanks' borrowers is lower than that of traditional banks' borrowers. Also, prior literature shows that there are more mortgage-related complaints in areas with a higher proportion of poor populations (Begley and Purnanandam 2021).

of technology (proxied by nonbanks' demand for employees with technology-related skills) indeed increases. Furthermore, we find that complaints against nonbanks about issues related to the payment process—complaints that are likely resolved by upgrading technologies employed in online payment platforms—are significantly reduced as nonbanks' market share increases. Collectively, the evidence suggests that nonbanks invest more in technology to improve their service quality as their market share increases.

Shifting away from nonbanks, we continue our investigation into the evolution of mortgage-related complaint ratio by examining traditional banks. We find that mortgage-related complaints against traditional banks also decrease as nonbanks' market share increases, contributing to the improved service quality in the local mortgage market. This result is potentially due to lender specialization following the rise of nonbanks. We find that traditional banks' average borrower income increases as nonbanks' market share increases in the county. Considering that higher-income borrowers are of higher credit quality and are more likely to receive better quality services (Begley and Purnanandam 2021), the evidence does not necessarily indicate an improvement in traditional banks' service quality; rather, it may be the case that as nonbanks' market share increases in a county, traditional banks in the county become increasingly focused on higher-income borrowers, resulting in a lower complaint ratio against traditional banks. The increased average income of traditional banks' borrowers and the decreased average income of nonbanks' borrowers together suggest that nonbanks and traditional banks specialize in different types of borrowers as nonbanks grow in size. Importantly, this lender specialization benefits lower-income borrowers without hurting higher-income ones, consistent with an improvement in consumer welfare.

Finally, we examine whether the improvement in service quality is more likely to benefit marginalized borrowers, such as minorities. Previous studies show that in the mortgage market, minorities are more likely to face discrimination in both accessing mortgage loans and receiving high-quality mortgage services (e.g., Munnell et al. 1996; Bartlett et al. 2022; Begley and Purnanandam 2021). We find that the effect of the increased market share

held by nonbanks on mortgage-related complaints is stronger for counties with a higher percentage of minority populations. This finding highlights the role of nonbanks in alleviating discrimination in the quality of services received by minorities in the mortgage market.

Taken together, our findings speak to the collection of recent studies on the consequences of the rise of nonbanks. This literature shows that the growth of nonbanks is important in substituting for bank lending when credit supply from banks contracts. In particular, the funding provided by nonbanks is critical for small business lending and homeownership by low-income households (e.g., Buchak et al. 2018; Gopal and Schnabl 2020; Gete and Reher 2021). The literature also shows that the growth of nonbanks may reduce the resilience of the credit market during market-wide stress because nonbanks lack access to insured liabilities (e.g., Irani et al. 2021; Drechsler et al. 2019). We complement this strand of literature by showing that the growth of the nonbank industry has a positive effect on the service quality in the mortgage market, leading to an improvement in consumer welfare; this channel of welfare improvement is particularly important for minority consumers.

Our findings also provide new evidence on the interplay between the quantity and quality of financial services using the nonbank industry as a laboratory. Closely related to our paper is Begley and Purnanandam (2021). Focusing on the Community Reinvestment Act (CRA), Begley and Purnanandam (2021) show that when banks increase the quantity of mortgage supply due to regulatory requirements, their service quality (proxied by consumer complaints) declines. Their finding suggests that banks trade off the quantity of credit supply for the quality of such services. In contrast, our evidence suggests that when the mortgage supply increases due to market forces, financial institutions are able to develop relevant expertise and upscale investment, resulting in improved service quality. This contrasting evidence together is policy-relevant because, at the time of writing, the Federal Reserve is considering overhauling the CRA to encompass nonbanks.[5]

---

[5]For example, please see https://www.wsj.com/articles/powell-highlights-slower-recovery-for-low-wage-and-minority-workers-11620065926.

2 Related Literature

Nonbanks, i.e., financial intermediaries that provide banking services but do not rely on deposits as a funding source, have experienced marked growth in the consumer lending market since the recovery from the Global Financial Crisis (GFC). The consequences of this expansion have been of great interest to regulators and policymakers. So far, the literature documents both positive and negative effects of a growing nonbank industry. Regarding the positive effects, the literature shows that nonbanks play an important role in supplying credit, especially when credit supply by traditional deposit-taking banks is constrained. For example, Buchak et al. (2018) and Irani et al. (2021) show that, in response to the increased regulatory burdens, such as higher capital requirements, banks are likely to reduce credit supply while nonbanks are likely to fill in the gaps. By examining small business loans, Gopal and Schnabl (2020) show that lending by nonbanks substitutes for the reduction in lending by banks after the GFC. The literature also shows that nonbanks provide credit access for borrowers with lower credit quality (Buchak et al. 2018; Gete and Reher 2021; Jagtiani et al. 2021). Regarding the negative effects, theory suggests that nonbanks may impose significant fragility on the financial system because they lack insured liabilities in their funding structure (e.g., Plantin 2015). Empirically, Irani et al. (2021) show that, during the GFC, loans originated by nonbanks with relatively liquid liabilities were less likely to be rolled over and those loans also experienced greater price volatility. Our study contributes to this strand of literature by exploring a different dimension—the quality of financial services received by mortgage borrowers—to assess the consequences of the nonbank industry's expansion.

To understand the consequences of nonbanks' presence, a collection of studies examine the extent to which nonbanks improve or impair the overall efficiency of the financial system (Philippon 2016). For example, focusing on the role of Fintech lenders in the Paycheck Protection Program (PPP) during the Covid-19 pandemic, the literature documents both positive and negative effects of Fintech lenders on allocating credit. On the one hand, Erel

and Liebersohn (2020) show that Fintech complements banks during the pandemic by expanding financial services to ZIP codes where traditional banks do not have a strong presence. On the other hand, Griffin et al. (2021) show that misreporting is higher among FinTech loans than other loans in the PPP program. Furthermore, in the mortgage market, Gete and Reher (2021) show that nonbanks increase ZIP code-level home ownership, suggesting that nonbanks complement traditional banks by serving low credit quality borrowers. Our findings suggest that one channel through which nonbanks could improve the efficiency in the mortgage market is to improve service quality by developing expertise in servicing high-risk borrowers. This evidence is consistent with the market trend of the mortgage servicing industry, which indicates that nonbanks have increasingly focused on acquiring specialty and delinquent servicing.[6]

Our empirical investigation benefits from the prior literature on the impact of market concentration on banks' lending behavior. Petersen and Rajan (1995) show that lenders are more likely to invest in building relationships with their borrowers if the credit market is concentrated, because it is easier for these lenders to internalize the benefits of lending relationships. Giannetti and Saidi (2019) show that lenders' credit concentration in an industry helps the industry receive more credit in distress because their lenders internalize negative spillovers when fire sales are likely to ensue (also see Saidi and Streitz 2021). Complementary to this literature, our study suggests that when nonbanks have a concentrated market share in a local residential mortgage market, they have more incentives to make investments to improve their service quality to customers because they are likely to internalize the benefits of future business.

Another strand of literature that provides important guidance to our research agenda and the interpretation of results is the literature on scale economies in the financial sector. The existing literature supports the notion that the banking industry significantly benefits from scale economies (Hughes and Mester 2013). The benefits have become even more salient

---

[6]Please see https://www.mba.org/2015-press-releases/june/mba-pwc-us-release-the-changing-dynamics-of-the-mortgage-servicing-landscape.

in recent years because of the high costs associated with adopting advanced technology in the banking industry, such as computing, telecommunication, automation, machine learning, and artificial intelligence (Mester 2010). In recent years, the U.S. banking industry has spent over \$100 billion annually on technology investment.[7] Fuster et al. (2019) show that advanced technology plays an important role in improving the operational efficiency of mortgage lenders. Our study provides evidence consistent with the notion that a large market share allows nonbanks to take advantage of scale economies in funding and utilizing advanced technology, reducing the likelihood of consumer complaints.

Our study is closely related to the recent literature that goes beyond the quantitative measure of financial services and focuses on the quality of financial services. Using the CFPB data, Sedunov (2020) shows that consumer satisfaction is higher in counties with more small banks; Begley and Purnanandam (2021) show that mortgage-related complaints are higher in areas with a higher proportion of poor and minority borrowers and in areas targeted by the CRA. Using fraud conducted by financial advisers, Gurun et al. (2018) show that trust plays a critical role in the investment advisory industry; Egan et al. (2019) show that misconduct among financial advisers is extensive in the United States and unsophisticated consumers are the targets. Focusing on an important trend in the consumer lending market—the rise of nonbanks, we provide evidence that the expansion of nonbanks' market share has a positive effect on the service quality received by consumers in the mortgage market.

Our study is also related to the literature on discrimination facing minorities in the financial markets. This literature shows that minorities are more likely to be denied access to mortgages (Munnell et al. 1996), more likely to receive inferior financial services (Begley and Purnanandam 2021), more likely to experience debt collection judgments (LaVoice and Vamossy 2019), and less likely to achieve financial restitution after disputing financial services (Haendler and Heimer 2021). Recent studies explore whether nonbank lenders can alleviate discrimination against minorities. By examining interest-rate decisions in the mort-

---

[7]Please see https://www.wsj.com/articles/technology-is-banks-new-battleground-11568114378.

gage market, Bartlett et al. (2022) show that Fintech lenders reduce, but do not eliminate, discrimination against Latinx/African-American borrowers, possibly because algorithms and big data enable Fintech lenders to extract rents. By examining approval rates in the mortgage market, Giacoletti et al. (2021) show that nonbanks are more likely to have equal treatment of White and Black mortgage applicants than traditional deposit-taking banks. Our findings add to this strand of literature by shedding light on the potential of nonbanks to alleviate discrimination in the quality of services facing minorities in the mortgage market.

3 Data and sample

3.1 Data

We obtain mortgage-related complaints from the CFPB. After the GFC, the DFA established the CFPB as a platform for consumers to file complaints against financial institutions with regard to a wide range of financial products, such as credit reports, debt collection, student loans, and mortgages. The CFPB has considerable authority to conduct investigations of the complaints. The resulting gathered facts are used to identify violations of federal consumer financial law and may be used in a public enforcement action. Since its inception until 2020, the CFPB has received over 1.5 million consumer complaints and provided over $13 billion in consumer relief. Among the complaints filed with the CFPB, 17% are related to mortgages. The majority of these complaints concern post-origination mortgage servicing (such as payment processing, loan modification, loan collection, and foreclosure) rather than mortgage origination.

For most complaints, the CFPB reports the five-digit ZIP code of the filing consumer. For some complaints, the CFPB also includes a brief narrative of the complaint; in these cases, the last two digits of the ZIP code are removed to protect the consumer's anonymity. We restrict our analysis to only complaints with five-digit ZIP codes reported in the CFPB, to accurately match complaints in a county with the market share of nonbanks in the county.

Our analysis, therefore, includes mortgage-related complaints that are associated with a five-digit ZIP code. We aggregate ZIP code-level complaints at the county level.

Information on mortgage loans comes from the HMDA dataset, which provides substantial coverage of the U.S. residential mortgage market.[8] The HMDA data contain detailed information on loan application and origination, including the application year, application outcome, loan amount, loan type, loan purpose, the location of the mortgaged property, the income and demographic information of applicants, and lender identity. We classify HMDA lenders into traditional deposit-taking banks and nonbanks by using the Avery file, following Jagtiani et al. (2021).

To construct our sample, following Loutskina and Strahan (2009), we keep only conventional home purchase loans originated for owner-occupied 1-to-4 family housings;[9] we drop loans with missing information on loan size, applicant income, or location. We also drop loans smaller than $10 thousand or larger than $10 million. We exclude mortgages insured by the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and mortgages guaranteed by the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). This empirical choice is due to two reasons. First, FHA and VA loans are different from other mortgages in that they are issued to lower credit quality borrowers with explicit guarantee/insurance provided by government agencies; these differences per se are likely to lead to different service outcomes for FHA and VA loans compared with those for other mortgages;[10] Second, nonbanks are the dominant mortgage originators for these loans during our sample period, reaching 80% by 2016 (Jagtiani et al., 2021); by comparison, in the conventional mortgage loan market, nonbanks originated 45% of the mortgages in 2016. Therefore, mixing the FHA and VA loan market with the conventional mortgage loan market in our analysis would complicate the interpretation of results

---

[8]Avery et al. (2007) estimate that the coverage is about 80% in 2006.

[9]If we include all mortgages (including refinancing loans, loans for houses that are non-owner occupied, and loans for multi-family housings) in the sample, our main results remain robust.

[10]Confirming this conjecture, we find that although FHA or VA loans comprise 25% of the overall mortgage market in 2016, there are only 12.6% of the complaints filed against FHA or VA loans in 2016 in the CFPB database.

about mortgage service quality.[11]

Regarding other data used in our analyses, we obtain county-level income per capita from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), county-level unemployment rates from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS), and county-level minority populations from the 2010 Census files.

3.2 Sample and main variables

Our sample includes 149,291 complaints filed between 2012 and 2018.[12] Table 1 shows the distribution of issues associated with these complaints. Besides examining the total number of complaints, we also differentiate between complaints about the post-origination mortgage servicing and complaints about the origination of mortgages. Complaints about the post-origination mortgage servicing include complaints with the following five issues: "Loan modification, collection, foreclosure," "Loan servicing, payments, escrow account," "Settlement process and costs," "Struggling to pay mortgage," and "Trouble during payment process." Complaints about the origination of mortgages include complaints with the following four issues: "Application, originator, mortgage broker," "Applying for a mortgage or refinancing an existing mortgage," "Credit decision / Underwriting," and "Closing on a mortgage." Four out of the top five issues in the sample are related to post-origination mortgage servicing. Less than 10% of the complaints are related to mortgage origination.

For a county to be included in our sample, we require the median number of complaints in the county during our sample period to be at least one. This requirement is to make sure that our analysis focuses on counties in which consumers' complaints about mortgage products are a valid concern. As a result, our sample for the county-level analyses includes 7,178 county-year observations.[13]

Our measure of service quality is the county-year complaint ratio, which is defined as the number of complaints scaled by the number of outstanding mortgages. The scaling variable

---

[11]If we include FHA and VA loans in the sample, our main results remain robust.

[12]Our sample period starts in 2012 because it is the first year with full-year coverage in the CFPB dataset.

[13]Our results are robust to including all counties with at least one complaint during the sample period. For details, please see the robustness tests discussed in Section 4.1.

is the number of outstanding loans in a year rather than the number of loans originated in that year because, as shown in Table 1, many complaints are associated with the servicing of mortgages that may be originated in previous years. We proxy a county's outstanding mortgages by the number of federal tax filings in the county with mortgage interest payments. For robustness, we alternatively use the total number of mortgages originated in that county during the last five years as a proxy for the county's outstanding mortgages.

Table 2 shows that an average county-year reports 19 complaints out of 29,304 outstanding mortgage loans, resulting in a complaint ratio of 0.05%. We observe a large cross-sectional variation in complaint ratio with an interquartile range from 0.02% to 0.07%.

Nonbanks' market share for a county-year is calculated as the dollar amount of mortgages originated in the county in year *t-1* by nonbanks over the dollar amount of mortgages originated in the county in year *t-1* by all lenders. For robustness, we compute an alternative measure of nonbanks' market share using the number of mortgages rather than the dollar amount of mortgages. Figure 1 shows that there is a secular increase in the market share of nonbanks in the mortgage market after the GFC. The average market share of nonbanks in our sample is 32% with an interquartile range from 20% to 43%.

It is important to note that our measure of nonbanks' market share is based on information about mortgage origination. In interpreting our results, we use nonbanks' market share in mortgage origination as a proxy for nonbanks' overall market share in the mortgage industry, including both origination and post-origination servicing. This empirical choice is due to two considerations. First, comprehensive data on mortgage services are not available, making it impossible to conduct empirical analysis using granular observations.

Second and more importantly, nonbanks' market share in the origination market and that in the post-origination servicing market are highly correlated, making the use of origination information appropriate in measuring nonbanks' overall presence in the mortgage market. For example, using the sample of mortgages sold to the Freddie Mac and still outstanding during our sample period (i.e., 2012–2018), the top left panel of Figure 2 shows the relation-

15

ship between nonbanks' nationwide market share in the origination market and that in the post-origination servicing market. The correlation between the two series is 0.99.[14],[15] The remaining panels of Figure 2 provide bin scatter plots, which show the relationship between nonbanks' market share in the origination market and that in the post-origination servicing market at more detailed geographical levels. Specifically, we group nonbanks' market share in the origination market into 10 bins for the state-level panel and 100 bins for the Metropolitan statistical areas (MSA) and ZIP-code level panels; we plot the average nonbank market share in the origination market and that in the post-origination servicing market for each bin. Across all three panels, we see a close alignment of nonbanks' market share in these two markets. Although nonbanks mostly use the originate-to-distribute model of lending, they remain the servicing entity for a sizable portion of the loans they sell. Within this sample of loans sold to the Freddie Mac, the servicing rights of 32% of the loans remain held by the originating nonbanks; for the loans that the servicing rights are not held by the originating nonbanks, 57% are sold to another nonbank for servicing. These statistics imply that, in this sample, 71% of the loans that are originated by nonbanks are still serviced by nonbanks.[16]

Furthermore, during our sample period, traditional banks reduce purchasing mortgage servicing rights from nonbanks due to Basel III capital requirements (Lux and Greene 2015). Therefore, in our sample, mortgages that are originated by nonbanks are likely serviced by nonbanks. Because the interpretation of our findings is based on the market share of all nonbanks in a county, rather than the market share of individual nonbanks in the county, the transfer of mortgage servicing rights between nonbanks should not impact our interpretation.

---

[14]This sample is from Freddie Mac Single Family Loan-Level Dataset. The dataset reports the sellers of mortgages and we assume these sellers as the originators of the mortgages.

[15]We also use a sample of mortgage lenders that are included in both the HMDA and eMBS datasets between 2016 and 2018, and we find similar results; the correlation between nonbanks' market share in the origination market and that in the post-origination servicing market nationwide is 0.99. We thank You Suk Kim for providing this matched sample.

[16]32% + 68% * 0.57 = 71%

4 Nonbanks' market share and mortgage service quality

The goal of our empirical analysis is to understand the effects of the nonbanks' market share in a county on the quality of financial services associated with mortgages in the county. In this section, we provide evidence that nonbanks' market share in a county is negatively associated with the mortgage-related complaint ratio in the county. We conduct two instrumental variable analyses to support a causal link between the increase in nonbanks' market share and the reduction in mortgage-related complaint ratio.

4.1 Ordinary least squares (OLS) regression

We start our analysis by estimating the following regression model as the baseline specification:

$$Complaint\ ratio_{c,t} = \beta Nonbank\ share_{c,t-1} + \gamma Controls_{c,t-1} + \delta_c + \eta_t + \epsilon_{c,t}, \tag{1}$$

where the dependent variable is the county-level complaint ratio, which is the total number of complaints in county c in year t scaled by the number of outstanding mortgage loans in the county in that year. $Nonbank\ share_{c,t-1}$ is the market share of nonbanks in the county's residential mortgage market in year t-1. $Controls_{c,t-1}$ includes county income per capita and unemployment rates to absorb time-varying differences across counties. δ_c indicates county fixed effects and controls for the unobserved time-invariant differences across counties. η_t indicates year fixed effects and controls for macro-level shocks that may affect the complaint ratio. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

Table 3 presents the baseline estimation results. Column (1) shows that as the market share of nonbanks in a county's mortgage market increases, the complaint ratio decreases. The economic meaning of the coefficient is that, following a one standard deviation increase

in the market share of nonbanks, the complaint ratio is reduced by 0.006 percentage points, which is a 12% reduction from the average county-level complaint ratio.[17] In columns (2) and (3), we classify complaints into complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing and those about the origination of mortgages, respectively. The results show that nonbanks' market share is negatively associated only with complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing, not with those about mortgage origination. This evidence confirms that our main finding is due to the reduction in complaints about the post-origination mortgage servicing rather than the origination of mortgages. This result may not be surprising since the majority of the mortgage-related complaints filed with the CFPB are about post-origination mortgage servicing. Nonetheless, this finding highlights an important distinction between our study and the existing studies on nonbanks in the mortgage market, as the existing studies exclusively focus on the origination stage of the mortgages.

We conduct five robustness tests. First, we use an alternative measure of complaint ratio, where a county's outstanding mortgages are proxied by the total number of mortgages originated in that county during the last five years. Second, we use an alternative measure of nonbanks' market share based on the number of mortgages rather than the dollar amount of mortgages. Third, to examine whether the results are driven by large nonbanks, we exclude Quicken Loans (i.e., the nonbank with the highest amount of loan origination in our sample) and the top 3 nonbanks. Fourth, we include all counties with at least one complaint during our sample period.[18] Fifth, we drop observations from 2012 to limit the impact of the 2008 financial crisis on the result. The negative association between complaint ratio and nonbanks' market share survive all the robustness tests. These results are reported in Tables A2 to A6.[19]

---

[17]0.1638*0.037=0.006 percentage points; 0.006/0.05=12%

[18]In our main sample, we require that the median number of complaints in the county during our sample period should be at least one.

[19]In additional robustness tests, we (1) include all mortgages (including refinancing loans, loans for houses that are non-owner occupied, and loans for multi-family housings) in calculating nonbank market share, and (2) include FHA and VA loans in the sample. Our main results remain robust. The results from these tests are not tabulated but available upon request.

4.2 Instrumental variable analysis

Thus far, we have documented a negative association between county-level complaint ratio and nonbanks' market share in the county. However, the presence of nonbanks in a county is not random. County characteristics or local economic dynamics may affect nonbanks' decisions to expand in specific counties. Therefore, the main identification challenge to argue causality is that contemporaneous changes in a county's economic conditions may be correlated with both the market share of nonbanks in the county and the complaint ratio of the county, resulting in biased estimates. In particular, in a scenario where we fail to control for relevant economic conditions, we may falsely attribute the changes in complaint ratio to the changes in nonbanks' market share, when the changes in complaint ratio are in fact due to the changes in the county's economic conditions. To address this identification challenge, we conduct two instrumental variable (IV) analyses.

4.2.1 Instrumental variable analysis: stress tests

The first IV analysis exploits the stress tests implemented by the Federal Reserve. The DFA requires Federal Reserve to conduct annual stress tests starting from 2009 to assess if large bank holding companies have sufficient capital to absorb losses under several stress scenarios. Covas (2017) shows that stress tests impose disproportionately high capital requirements on residential mortgages. Buchak et al. (2018) suggest that banks reduce mortgage lending in order to build capital buffers required by regulations, facilitating the expansion of nonbanks' market share. Therefore, nonbanks' market share is likely to increase more aggressively in counties with a higher ex ante exposure to stress-tested banks, *ceteris paribus*.

For this IV analysis, we use counties' ex ante exposure to stress-tested banks as an instrument for the change in nonbanks' market share in the local residential mortgage market. Specifically, we calculate the IV as the county's mortgage market share in 2008 (i.e., the year right before the inception of stress tests) held by banks that would be subject to stress tests

during our sample period. This IV analysis examines whether the instrumented within-county changes in nonbanks' market share between 2012 and 2018 affect the within-county changes in complaint ratio during the same period.

We recognize that stress tests may directly affect the service quality in the local mortgage market through two channels. First, stress tests may affect the service quality of tested banks because of the increased regulatory oversight. Second, stress tests may further affect the service quality of non-tested banks through peer effects or market competition. However, these considerations should not result in a violation of the exclusion restriction in our empirical setup for two reasons. First, our sample period starts in 2012, which is years after the inception of stress tests (i.e., 2009). Second, although the ex ante exposure to stress-tested banks may have a direct effect on the level of service quality in the local mortgage market soon after the inception of stress tests, it should not influence the within-county changes in service quality years after the inception of stress tests through channels other than its impact on the evolution of lender composition (i.e., banks versus nonbanks) in the county. In addition, we conduct two robustness tests of this IV strategy to ensure our interpretation is not contaminated by the direct impact of stress tests on service quality provided by banks and nonbanks. The details of these robustness tests are discussed at the end of this subsection.

We estimate the following regression model:

$$Complaint\ ratio_{c,\Delta(2018-2012)} = \beta Nonbank\ share_{c,\Delta(2017-2011)} + \gamma Controls_{c,\Delta(2017-2011)} + \epsilon_c, \tag{2}$$

where $c, \Delta(2017-2011)$ indicates the within-county changes in variables from 2011 to 2017, and $Nonbank\ share_{c,\Delta(2017-2011)}$ is instrumented by counties' ex ante exposure to banks subject to stress tests.

Table 4 presents the regression results. The result from the first-stage regression (column 1) shows that counties with a higher ex ante exposure to stress-tested banks indeed experience higher growth in nonbanks' market share. Consequently, the result from the second-stage

regression (column 2) shows that these counties witness a larger reduction in the mortgage-related complaint ratio. In column (3), we confirm that the results hold if we restrict complaints to only those related to post-origination mortgage servicing. Regarding the size of the coefficients, the IV estimates suggest a much larger effect of nonbanks' market share on complaint ratio than the OLS estimates.

To strengthen our identifying assumption, we conduct two robustness tests. First, we focus on more recent changes in complaint ratio (i.e., changes between 2014 and 2018) as the dependent variable. The inception of stress tests in 2009[20] might either directly influence the service quality of stress-tested banks, or indirectly influence that of other banks and nonbanks through competition. Considering any possible effects of stress tests on service quality may take time to appear, the changes in complaint ratio during the early years of the stress tests may be partially due to stress tests directly. However, this is less likely to be a concern if we focus on later years during our sample period. The results reported in 5 show that our findings remain robust when we focus on more recent changes in complaint ratio.

Second, we limit our sample to counties, whose ex ante exposure to stress-tested banks is not influenced by the inclusion of more banks in the stress tests in the later years of our sample period. Because the number of stress-tested banks increased significantly in 2014,[21] some counties' exposure to stress-tested banks experienced large changes during our sample period, which may affect the service quality in these counties and hence the within-county changes in complaint ratio that we focus on in our estimation. This should not be a concern if we drop counties with ex ante exposure to banks that have become a participant in stress tests after 2013. The results reported in 6 show that our findings remain robust when we use this subsample of counties.

---

[20]Prior to the passage of DFA in 2010, the Federal Reserve initiated the Supervisory Capital Assessment Program (SCAP) in 2009 to conduct stress tests on large U.S. bank holding companies.

[21]Pre-2014, stress tests on average include 19 BHCs; since 2014, stress tests on average include more than 30 BHCs.

4.2.2   Instrumental variable analysis: mortgage industry surety bonds

The second IV analysis exploits the variation in mortgage industry surety bond requirements by each state. These requirements are imposed in order to protect mortgage borrowers against dishonest lending practices. To conduct mortgage business in a state, mortgage professionals need to apply for licenses from the state and are required to abide by all state laws and regulations. In particular, as part of the licensing application, mortgage professionals (the principals) are required to post surety bonds. In case of noncompliance (such as predatory lending behavior), the bond ensures that the principal will pay for all costs and damages. Therefore, the amount of surety bond required in a state reflects the level of protection offered to mortgage borrowers, influencing the costs of conducting mortgage business in the state. As a result, nonbanks should expand more aggressively in states with lower surety bond requirements, *ceteris paribus* (the relevance condition).

We use states' mortgage industry surety bond requirements as an instrument for the change in nonbanks' market share in the local residential mortgage market. Same as the first IV strategy, this IV analysis examines whether the instrumented within-county changes in nonbanks' market share between 2012 and 2018 affect the within-county changes in complaint ratio during the same period. One might argue that the level of surety bond requirement of a state may reflect the overall toughness of the state's mortgage regulations, which might have a direct effect on the level of service quality in the mortgage industry of the state. However, surety bond requirements should not affect the within-county changes in service quality as long as there are no changes in these regulations over time (the exclusion condition). Therefore, for this IV analysis, we restrict our sample to states that have not experienced any changes in the amount of bond required since 2010.[22]

To create the instrumental variable, we focus on the minimum amount of surety bond imposed on mortgage brokers. This choice is due to three reasons. First, surety bonds

---

[22]To identify states with no changes in surety bond requirement for mortgage brokers during our sample period, we collect each state's mortgage broker surety bond requirement at the time of writing (i.e, September 2021) and compare it with the mortgage broker surety bond requirement as of 2010 available here.

imposed on mortgage brokers are the most prevalent across states compared to those imposed on other mortgage professionals; such information, therefore, provides a clear comparison of the costs of conducting mortgage business across states. Second, the amount of surety bond imposed on mortgage lenders is usually the same as that imposed on mortgage brokers. Third, historical information on bond requirements is available for mortgage brokers but not for other mortgage professionals; therefore, focusing on mortgage broker surety bonds allows us to identify states that do not experience any changes in bond requirements during our sample period.

We re-estimate Equation 2 but use the log amount of the mortgage broker surety bond required by each state to instrument for $Nonbank_{c,\Delta(2017-2011)}$. Table 7 presents the regression results. Column (1) reports the result from the first-stage regression. It shows that counties that reside in states with a lower amount of surety bond requirement experience higher growth in nonbanks' market share. These counties, as shown in the results from the second stage regression reported in column (2), witness a larger reduction in mortgage-related complaint ratio subsequently. Column (3) shows that the results hold if we restrict complaints to only those related to post-origination mortgage servicing.

5   Evaluate potential explanations for the improved service quality

In this section, we explore the explanations for the improved service quality accompanying the rise of nonbanks in the local residential mortgage market. We also investigate whether the effect of nonbanks' market share on service quality differs across counties based on the percentage of minority populations.

23

5.1 Mortgage service quality: nonbanks vs. traditional banks

One potential explanation for the decline in complaint ratio could be that on average nonbanks provide better services than traditional banks. If so, the increase in nonbanks' market share in a county would reduce the complaint ratio in the county. To examine whether this is the case, we conduct a univariate comparison of complaint ratios between nonbanks and traditional banks that are located in the same county. We find that the average complaint ratio for nonbanks (0.46%) is much higher than that for traditional banks (0.27%). This comparison suggests that the cross-sectional difference between the complaint ratios of nonbanks and that of traditional banks cannot explain the reduced county-level complaint ratio as nonbanks' market share increases.

We interpret this finding as consistent with the differences in borrower characteristics between nonbanks and traditional banks documented in prior literature. As shown in Buchak et al. (2018), nonbanks are more likely to serve riskier, less creditworthy, and lower-income borrowers. Considering that such borrowers are more likely to have difficulties in making mortgage payments, and therefore, more likely to file a complaint (Begley and Purnanandam 2021), it is not surprising that nonbanks have higher complaint ratios than traditional banks on average. These findings are also consistent with the differences in business models between nonbanks and traditional banks. It is typical for nonbanks to finance their entire origination through securitization and the originate-to-distribute model; whereas traditional banks still hold between 30% and 50% of their origination on their balance sheets (Buchak et al. 2018). As a result, traditional banks may be more concerned with loan performance, and consequently, more incentivized to provide good services.

Overall, the result indicates that the reduction in complaint ratio following an increase in nonbanks' market share is not due to the cross-sectional difference in the service quality between nonbanks and traditional banks.

5.2 Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints against nonbanks

5.2.1 OLS and IV analysis

In this section, we examine if the decrease in the county-level complaint ratio is due to the improvement in service quality by nonbanks as their market share increases. We start evaluating this explanation by studying the evolution of complaint ratios against nonbanks. Specifically, we exclude the complaints against traditional banks and calculate the county-level complaint ratio against nonbanks, which is the number of complaints against nonbanks divided by the number of outstanding loans originated by nonbanks in a county-year. Since the federal tax filings do not let us distinguish between mortgages granted by nonbanks and those granted by traditional banks, we proxy the denominator by the total number of mortgages originated by nonbanks in the county during the last five years.

We conduct both OLS and IV analyses. Table 8 reports the regression results. The OLS estimates reported in column (1) show that as nonbanks hold a larger market share in a county, complaints against them in the county decrease—a one standard deviation increase in nonbanks' market share is associated with a 0.083 percentage point reduction in mortgage complaint ratio against nonbanks. This magnitude of reduction is economically meaningful as it represents 18% of the average county-level complaint ratio for nonbanks.[23] Columns (2) and (3) report the results from the IV regressions using the two IV strategies discussed in Section 4.2. The results show that the instrumented change in nonbanks' market share is associated with a reduction in the complaint ratio against nonbanks. The results (reported in columns (4)-(6)) remain similar if we focus on only complaints about the post-origination mortgage servicing. Taken together, the results in Table 8 suggest that nonbanks indeed improve their service quality as they increase their market share in a county.

One might wonder if these results are due to the transfer of mortgage servicing rights

---

[23]The average county-level complaint ratio for nonbanks is 0.46%.

from nonbanks to traditional banks. Although the information on the transfer of mortgage servicing rights is not available to us, we do not believe that the transfer of mortgage servicing rights from nonbanks to traditional banks is driving our results. As discussed in 3.2, during our sample period, mortgages that are originated by nonbanks are likely serviced by nonbanks because traditional banks are not likely to buy mortgage servicing rights from nonbanks due to Basel III capital requirements (Lux and Greene 2015). By contrast, nonbanks, which do not face the same regulations, are more likely to purchase mortgage servicing rights from traditional banks, especially the mortgage servicing rights of lower-quality loans. Therefore, our results, if anything, may underestimate the extent to which nonbanks improve their service quality during our sample period.

5.2.2 The mechanisms through which nonbanks improve their service quality

We explore two mechanisms through which nonbanks may improve their service quality as they increase their market share. The first mechanism that we explore is product specialization. If nonbanks develop a specialty in servicing certain types of borrowers as their market share increases, such specialization may allow them to provide higher quality services to their borrowers. The second mechanism that we explore is nonbanks' investment in technology (Fuster et al. 2019). If nonbanks make such investments as their market share grows, their service quality may improve as a result.

Product Specialization

Regarding the first mechanism, we start by exploring the borrower profiles of nonbanks and estimate the following regression:

$$Outcome_{c,t} = \beta Nonbank\ share_{c,t-1} + \delta_c + \eta_t + \epsilon_{c,t}, \tag{3}$$

where $Outcome_{c,t}$ is either the average income of nonbanks' borrowers in a county-year or

the income dispersion for these borrowers (i.e., the interquartile range of borrower incomes scaled by the average income). $Nonbank_{c,t-1}$ is the lagged market share of nonbanks in the county's residential mortgage market. δ_c indicates county fixed effects and η_t indicates year fixed effects.

Column (1) of Table 9 reports the results for the average income. We find a negative and significant coefficient on $Nonbank\ share_{c,t-1}$, indicating that as nonbanks' market share increases in the local mortgage market, the average income of their borrower base decreases. Column (2) shows the result for the income dispersion. We find a lower income dispersion as nonbanks' market share increases. Taken together, the evidence suggests that nonbanks become increasingly focused on lower-income borrowers as nonbanks' market share grows. Previous literature documents that the average borrower income of nonbanks is lower than that of traditional banks (Buchak et al. 2018). Our evidence is different from this literature in that our evidence is not about the difference between the borrower income of nonbanks and those of banks. Instead, we show that nonbanks' customers become more concentrated among lower-income borrowers as nonbanks' market share increases.

Throughout our paper, we interpret the decreased complaint ratio as evidence of improved service quality. One might argue that lower-income borrowers may be of a lower level of financial literacy so they do not know that they can complain to the CFPB or how to do so. We do not believe that this possibility could bias our results and interpretation in a meaningful way because previous literature shows that there are more mortgage-related complaints in areas with a higher proportion of poor populations (Begley and Purnanandam 2021). Furthermore, the cross-sectional comparison of complaint ratio between nonbanks and banks in Section 5.1 implies that nonbanks' borrowers are not less likely to complain although their average income is lower than the borrowers of traditional banks.

Critical to this first mechanism is whether nonbanks indeed become better at servicing lower-income borrowers. To shed light on this question, we take a close look at the specific issues of the complaints. Specially, we examine complaints about "loan modification, collec-

tion, foreclosure" and "struggling to pay mortgage," both of which are related to situations in which borrowers may have financial difficulties in making mortgage payments. In particular, borrowers may not have the financial resources to make mortgage payments based on the original mortgage terms. If nonbanks become more experienced in providing mortgage services to lower-income borrowers, complaints regarding these two issues should be reduced. Column (1) in Table 10 reports evidence supportive of this mechanism. It shows that as nonbanks' market share increases, complaints that are more likely filed by borrowers who lack financial resources are significantly reduced.

Collectively, our findings are consistent with the notion that as nonbanks' market share increases, they develop a specialty in servicing lower-income borrowers, hence improving their service quality towards these borrowers.

Investment in technology

Regarding the second mechanism, we start by examining whether nonbanks' have enhanced incentives to making technology investment as their market share increases. We estimate the following two-stage regression:

$$Incentives_{Nonbanks,c,t} = \beta_0 Nonbank\ share_{c,t} + \gamma Controls_{c,t} + \delta_c + \eta_t + \epsilon_{c,t}\ (1^{st} stage)$$

$$Complaint\ ratio_{c,t} = \beta_1 \widehat{Incentives}_{Nonbanks,c,t-1} + \gamma Controls_{c,t-1} + \delta_c + \eta_t + \epsilon_{c,t}\ (2^{nd} stage).$$

$$(4)$$

$Incentives_{Nonbanks,c,t}$ indicates two potential sources of incentives for nonbanks to invest in technology. Regarding the first source of investment incentives, we propose that nonbanks may have heightened incentives to invest if the increased nonbank market share is concentrated within a few nonbanks, because these nonbanks are more likely to internalize the benefit of such investment (Petersen and Rajan 1995; Giannetti and Saidi 2019; Saidi and Streitz 2021). We measure this source of incentives using the market concentration within nonbanks. Specifically, we calculate the Herfindahl–Hirschman Index (HHI) of nonbanks

in the county.[24] This variable captures whether a small number of nonbanks dominate the increased market share held by nonbanks or a large number of nonbanks are competing with each other for the increased market share held by nonbanks.[25]

Regarding the second source of investment incentives, we propose that nonbanks may have heightened incentives to invest in technology if they can take advantage of the economies of scale, because the marginal costs of such investment are decreasing. We measure this source of incentives using the market share in the nation held by all the nonbanks that originate loans in the county. Nonbanks with a large market share in the national market can benefit from the economies of scale in making investments that could help improve their service quality. National market share is calculated as the dollar amount of mortgages originated by the nonbanks in year *t-1* scaled by the total dollar amount of mortgages originated in the nation in year *t-1*. This variable captures whether nonbanks increase their presence at the national level while increasing their market share in the focal county or they retract from other counties. $Controls_{c,t-1}$ includes county-year level income per capita and unemployment rate. δ_c indicates county fixed effects and η_t indicates year fixed effects.

Table 11 reports regression results for the first source of investment incentives. Column (1) reports the result for the first stage and indicates that the market share of nonbanks becomes more concentrated as nonbanks' overall market share increases in a county. This result indicates that the main driver of the increase in nonbanks' market share is the increased presence of a small number of nonbanks in the county rather than an increased number of nonbanks in the county. The second stage result in column (2) suggests that the increased market concentration within nonbanks, predicted by the higher market share of nonbanks in the county, is associated with a reduction in the complaint ratio of the county. Column (3) shows that the result holds for complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing.

---

[24]We calculate the summation of the squares of each nonbank's market share of all mortgages originated by nonbanks in the county.

[25]For instance, if there are traditional banks and only one nonbank in the county mortgage market, this measure would take the value of one because all the mortgages originated by nonbanks are originated by the only nonbank in the county. As the number of nonbanks increases, the measure approaches zero.

Table 12 reports regression results for the second source of investment incentives. Column (1) reports the results for the first stage and shows that as nonbanks' market share increases in a county, these nonbanks' market share in the nation increases as well. In other words, the increased presence of nonbanks in a county is not due to the shifting of resources from other counties. The second stage result in column (2) suggests that the increased market share in the nation, predicted by the higher market share of nonbanks in the county, is associated with a reduction in the complaint ratio of the county. Column (3) shows that the result holds for complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing.

Do nonbanks indeed increase their investment in technology as their market share increases? Using job posting data from Burning Glass Technologies (BGT) during our sample period, we find evidence supportive of this notion. BGT collects the near-universe online job postings. A particularly useful feature of this data is that it compiles the skill requirements in the job postings. If nonbanks increase investments in technology, their demand for employees with technology-related skills should also increase. To examine whether this is the case, we aggregate the total number of job postings that require technology-related skills by nonbanks in a county, and regress it on the market share of nonbanks in the county. We define technology-related skills as information technology (IT) skills and software skills tagged by BGT. Table 13 reports the results. With different specifications, we consistently observe a positive and significant association between nonbanks' market share and their demand for technology-related skills. In terms of economic significance, column (4) indicates that a one standard deviation increase in nonbanks' market share in a county is associated with an increase in the number of nonbanks' job postings that require technology-related skills by 13%. To assess whether the effect on skill requirements are due to a few large fintech lenders, In column (5), we exclude Quicken Loans and Guaranteed Rate Inc., two of the largest fintech nonbanks, and our result remains robust. This evidence suggests that nonbanks' use of technology increases as their market share increases, potentially helping

nonbanks provide higher-quality services to their mortgage customers.[26]

Finally, we examine the specific issues of the complaints against nonbanks. With respect to the mechanism of increased technology investment, we examine complaints about "Trouble during payment process." Among all the issues listed in Table 1, this one is most likely to benefit from investment in technology. For example, this issue is likely resolved by improvements in nonbanks' infrastructure, such as upgrades of the technologies employed in online payment platforms. Therefore, if increased investment in technology can at least partially explain our finding, complaints regarding this issue should be reduced as nonbanks increase their market share. Column (2) of Table 10 reports evidence supportive of this mechanism. It shows that as nonbanks' market share increases, complaints that are more likely due to technical issues in the payment process are significantly reduced.

In addition, columns (3) and (4) of Table 10 show that as nonbanks' market share increases, complaints regarding post-origination mortgage servicing that are not related to the two identified mechanisms do not experience significant reductions. The evidence, therefore, provides further support to the two mechanisms that we propose in the paper.

5.3 Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints against traditional banks

In this section, we study how the increased market share of nonbanks affects the complaint ratio of traditional banks. We are interested in understanding if the improved service quality of nonbanks comes at the price of a deterioration in the service quality of traditional banks. We regress the complaint ratio of traditional banks on nonbanks' market share. The complaint ratio of traditional banks is calculated as the number of mortgage complaints against traditional banks divided by the number of outstanding loans originated by these banks; the denominator is proxied by the total number of mortgages originated by banks in

---

[26]The positions advertised in these job postings are likely filled because the finance industry has one of the highest vacancy-employment conversion rates probably because wages in the finance industry are higher than those in the other industries (Abis and Veldkamp 2020).

that county during the last five years.

The results are reported in Table 14. In column (1), we find that complaint ratios against banks decrease as nonbanks account for a larger market share. Column (2) shows that this result holds using the stress test IV strategy described in Section 4.2. In column (3), we restrict our sample to only traditional banks that have never undertaken a stress test in the IV analysis and our finding remains robust. Column (4) shows that the result also holds when we use the surety bond IV strategy described in Section 4.2. Columns (5) to (8) repeat the above exercises using only complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing and the results are similar to those reported in the first four columns.

The results from Table 14 imply that the reduced complaint ratio against traditional banks also contributes to the reduced complaint ratio in the county. However, we are cautious to conclude that banks improve their service quality as nonbanks' market share increases. The reason is that the reduced complaint ratio against traditional banks might be due to the change in the composition of these banks' borrower base. Table 15 shows that as nonbanks' market share increases in the local mortgage market, the average income of traditional banks' borrowers increases albeit the income dispersion does not change. Begley and Purnanandam (2021) show that, on average, higher-income borrowers receive higher-quality mortgage services, hence are less likely to file complaints against their lenders. Therefore, the increased average income for banks' borrowers (reported in Table 15) and the decreased average income for nonbanks' borrowers (reported in Table 9) together suggest that nonbanks and banks specialize in different types of borrowers as nonbanks grow in size. Importantly, this lender specialization benefits lower-income borrowers without hurting higher-income ones, consistent with an improvement in consumer welfare.

5.4 Effects of nonbanks' market share conditional on minority populations

A highly relevant topic among studies on the mortgage market is the treatment of minority borrowers. Previous papers show that minorities are more likely to experience discrimination in the mortgage market in terms of pricing, access to credit, and the quality of mortgage services (e.g., Munnell et al. 1996; Bartlett et al. 2022; Begley and Purnanandam 2021). As a contribution to this strand of literature, we test whether the rise of nonbanks in the mortgage market has a disproportionately larger positive effect on the service quality received by minority borrowers.

For this analysis, we estimate the following regression model:

$$
\begin{aligned}
Complaint\,ratio_{c,t} = {} & \beta_0 Nonbank\,share_{c,t-1} + \beta_1 Nonbank_{c,t-1} \times Minority\,population_c \\
& + \gamma Controls_{c,t-1} + \delta_c + \eta_t + \epsilon_{c,t},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5}
$$

where the dependent variable is the county-level complaint ratio. $Nonbank\,share_{c,t-1}$ is the lagged market share of nonbanks in the county's residential mortgage market. $Minority\,population_c$ is the percentage of minority populations in the county from the 2010 Census. We measure the minority population in two ways: the Hispanic population and the Non-white population. All other variables are defined the same as in equation (1). The variable of interest is the interaction term, the coefficient on which implies whether the increased market share of nonbanks has a stronger effect on complaint ratio in counties with more minorities.

Table 16 reports the results. Across the four columns, the coefficients on the interaction term are all negative and significant at the 1% level, indicating that the effect of the increased market share held by nonbanks on mortgage-related complaints is more pronounced for counties with a higher percentage of minority populations. This finding supports the role of nonbanks in alleviating discrimination in the quality of services received by minorities in the mortgage market.

6   Conclusion

In this paper, we study the consequences of the rise of nonbanks on the service quality in the residential mortgage market. The specific aspect of service quality that we focus on is the mortgage-related complaints filed with the CFPB as a percentage of all outstanding mortgages (i.e., complaint ratio). We find that as nonbanks increase their market share in the local mortgage market, the complaint ratio of the county decreases. To verify that the relation between nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints is indeed causal, we conduct two IV analyses. We instrument the change in nonbanks' market share in the local mortgage market using (1) the county's ex ante exposure to banks subject to Federal Reserve's stress tests and (2) the amount of mortgage industry surety bond required by each state. We find that the instrumented increase in nonbanks' market share is associated with a reduction in mortgage-related complaint ratio.

Despite the fact that nonbanks on average have a higher complaint ratio than traditional banks, we find that nonbanks significantly improve their service quality as their market share increases, contributing to the reduction in complaint ratio at the county level. For this improvement in service quality, we provide evidence consistent with two explanations. First, as nonbanks increase their market share, they develop a specialty in servicing lower-income borrowers. Second, as nonbanks increase their market share, they make more investments in technology. Moreover, as nonbanks' market share grows, traditional banks increasingly focus on higher-income borrowers, and their service quality does not decrease. Therefore, the evidence together suggests an improvement in consumer welfare. We also find that the improvements in service quality are more likely to benefit marginalized borrowers, such as minorities, who are more likely to receive low-quality financial services.

As far as we are aware, our paper is the first to focus on the service quality of mortgages to understand the consequences of nonbanks' expansion on consumer welfare. Focusing on financial products other than mortgages, such as crypto currencies and credit cards,

existing studies show that nonbank financial companies, fintech companies in particular, may harm consumers (Calem 2022). We find that in the residential mortgage market, although nonbanks on average have a higher complaint ratio than traditional banks, their expansion reduces the complaints against them, leading to a reduction in the overall complaint ratio at the county level. Our findings suggest that future policies and regulations of nonbanks should consider the effect of market share on service quality. Our findings echo Philippon (2016) in that the non-traditional part of the financial sector has the potential to improve the efficiency of the financial system.

References

S. Abis and L. Veldkamp. The changing economics of knowledge production. *Available at SSRN 3570130*, 2020.

R. Avery, K. Brevoort, and G. Canner. Opportunities and issues in using hmda data. *Journal of Real Estate Research*, 29(4):351–380, 2007.

R. Bartlett, A. Morse, R. Stanton, and N. Wallace. Consumer-lending discrimination in the fintech era. Technical Report 1, 2022.

T. A. Begley and A. Purnanandam. Color and credit: Race, regulation, and the quality of financial services. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2021.

G. Buchak, G. Matvos, T. Piskorski, and A. Seru. Fintech, regulatory arbitrage, and the rise of shadow banks. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 130(3):453–483, 2018.

P. Calem. Lax supervision of fintechs harms consumers. *Available at https://bpi.com/lax-supervision-of-fintechs-harms-consumers/*, 2022.

S. Chernenko, I. Erel, and R. Prilmeier. Why do firms borrow directly from nonbanks? *The Review of Financial Studies forthcoming*, 2022.

K. R. Cortés, Y. Demyanyk, L. Li, E. Loutskina, and P. E. Strahan. Stress tests and small business lending. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 136(1):260–279, 2020.

F. Covas. The capital allocation inherent in the federal reserve's capital stress test. *Research Note, January*, 31, 2017.

I. Drechsler, A. Savov, and P. Schnabl. How monetary policy shaped the housing boom. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2019.

M. Egan, G. Matvos, and A. Seru. The market for financial adviser misconduct. *Journal of Political Economy*, 127(1):233–295, 2019.

I. Erel and J. Liebersohn. Does fintech substitute for banks? evidence from the paycheck protection program. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2020.

A. Fuster, M. Plosser, P. Schnabl, and J. Vickery. The role of technology in mortgage lending. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 32(5):1854–1899, 2019.

A. Fuster, M. C. Plosser, and J. I. Vickery. Does cfpb oversight crimp credit? 2021.

P. Gete and M. Reher. Mortgage securitization and shadow bank lending. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 34(5):2236–2274, 2021.

M. Giacoletti, R. Heimer, and E. G. Yu. Using high-frequency evaluations to estimate discrimination: Evidence from mortgage loan officers. *Available at SSRN 3795547*, 2021.

M. Giannetti and F. Saidi. Shock propagation and banking structure. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 32(7):2499–2540, 2019.

M. Gopal and P. Schnabl. The rise of finance companies and fintech lenders in small business lending. *Available at SSRN 3600068*, 2020.

J. M. Griffin, S. Kruger, and P. Mahajan. Did fintech lenders facilitate ppp fraud? *Available at SSRN 3906395*, 2021.

U. G. Gurun, N. Stoffman, and S. E. Yonker. Trust busting: The effect of fraud on investor behavior. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 31(4):1341–1376, 2018.

C. Haendler and R. Heimer. The financial restitution gap in consumer finance: Insights from complaints filed with the cfpb. *Available at SSRN 3766485*, 2021.

J. P. Hughes and L. J. Mester. Who said large banks don't experience scale economies? evidence from a risk-return-driven cost function. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 22 (4):559–585, 2013.

R. M. Irani, R. Iyer, R. R. Meisenzahl, and J.-L. Peydro. The rise of shadow banking: Evidence from capital regulation. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 34(5):2181–2235, 2021.

J. Jagtiani, L. Lambie-Hanson, and T. Lambie-Hanson. Fintech lending and mortgage credit access. *The Journal of FinTech*, 1(01):2050004, 2021.

J. LaVoice and D. F. Vamossy. Racial disparities in debt collection. *Available at SSRN 3465203*, 2019.

E. Loutskina and P. E. Strahan. Securitization and the declining impact of bank finance on loan supply: Evidence from mortgage originations. *The Journal of Finance*, 64(2): 861–889, 2009.

M. Lux and R. Greene. What's behind the non-bank mortgage boom? *M-RCBG Associate Working Paper*, (42), 2015.

L. J. Mester. Scale economies in banking and financial regulatory reform. *The Region*, 24: 10–13, 2010.

A. H. Munnell, G. M. Tootell, L. E. Browne, and J. McEneaney. Mortgage lending in boston: Interpreting hmda data. *The American Economic Review*, pages 25–53, 1996.

M. A. Petersen and R. G. Rajan. The effect of credit market competition on lending relationships. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 110(2):407–443, 1995.

T. Philippon. The fintech opportunity. Technical report, National Bureau of Economic Research, 2016.

G. Plantin. Shadow banking and bank capital regulation. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 28(1):146–175, 2015.

F. Saidi and D. Streitz. Bank concentration and product market competition. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 34(10):4999–5035, 2021.

J. Sedunov. Small banks and consumer satisfaction. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 60: 101517, 2020.

Figure 1: Nonbanks' market share

This figure plots the median and inter-quartile range of county-level nonbank market share between 2008 and 2018. Nonbanks' market share for a county-year is calculated as the dollar amount of mortgages originated in the county-year by nonbanks over the dollar amount of mortgages originated in the county year by all lenders.

Figure 2: Nonbanks' market share: Origination vs. post-origination servicing markets

This figure plots the relationship between nonbanks' market share in the origination market and that in the post-origination servicing market at different geographical levels, using the sample of mortgages sold to the Freddie Mac and still outstanding during our sample period (i.e., 2012–2018). The top left panel shows nonbanks' nationwide market share, the top right panel shows nonbanks' state-level market share, the bottom left panel shows nonbanks' MSA-level market share, and the bottom right panel shows nonbanks' 3-digit ZIP code-level market share. We group nonbanks' market share in the origination market into 10 bins for the state-level panel and 100 bins for the MSA and ZIP-code level panels, and plot the average nonbank market share in the origination market and that in the post-origination servicing market for each bin. The market shares are trimmed at the 5% level.

41

Table 1: Summary statistics: Complaints from the CFPB

This table reports the distribution of issues associated with the mortgage-related complaints filed with the CFPB.

Issue	Frequency	Percent (%)
Loan modification, collection, foreclosure	67,993	45.54
Loan servicing, payments, escrow account	40,985	27.45
Trouble during payment process	9,230	6.18
Application, originator, mortgage broker	8,486	5.68
Struggling to pay mortgage	8,328	5.58
Other	4,479	3.00
Settlement process and costs	4,044	2.71
Credit decision / Underwriting	2,674	1.79
Applying for a mortgage or refinancing an existing mortgage	1,596	1.07
Closing on a mortgage	974	0.65
Issues related to credit report	502	0.34
Total	149,291	

Table 2: Sample summary statistics

The main sample that we use in our analysis is a product of matching county-level complaint data set from CFPB with county-level mortgage market data from HMDA, supplemented with county characteristics from BEA, BLS, and 2010 Census. This table reports the county-year-level summary statistics.

	Mean	SD	25th perc.	Median	75th perc.
Complaint ratio (%)	0.05	0.06	0.02	0.04	0.07
# of complaints	19.47	65.27	1.00	4.00	13.00
# of outstanding mortgages	29,304	57,392	4,550	10,966	29,500
Nonbank market share (%)	32.17	16.38	19.67	30.67	43.39
Income per capita (tho. $)	44.05	13.78	36.15	40.98	48.00
Unemployment rate (%)	5.91	2.26	4.32	5.50	7.05
Mortgage market HHI	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.06	0.09
Hispanic ratio (%)	10.12	12.74	2.89	5.52	11.74
Non-white ratio (%)	17.09	14.51	6.64	12.06	23.22
Obs. (County × Year)	7,178				

Table 3: Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of county-level complaint ratio on nonbanks' market share in the county. The dependent variable is *Complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by the number of federal tax filings with mortgage interest payments in the county in the previous year. Column (1) includes all mortgage-related complaints; column (2) includes complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing; column (3) includes complaints about mortgage origination. *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

| | *Complaint ratio* | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
	All complaints	Complaints about servicing	Complaints about origination
Nonbank market share	-0.037**	-0.042**	0.005
	(0.017)	(0.016)	(0.005)
log(Income per capita)	-0.056***	-0.046**	-0.009*
	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.005)
Unemployment rate	0.284***	0.306***	-0.022
	(0.085)	(0.082)	(0.027)
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,178	7,178	7,178
R-squared	0.568	0.556	0.353

Table 4: IV analysis using stress tests

This table presents the results of a regression model in which we regress the change in county-level complaint ratio from 2012 to 2018 on the change in nonbanks' market share in the county from 2011 to 2017, which is instrumented by the county's ex ante exposure to banks subject to stress tests. The dependent variable in the first-stage regression is *the change in nonbank market share*. The dependent variable in the second-stage regressions is *the change in complaint ratio*; *complaint ratio* is calculated as the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by the number of federal tax filings with mortgage interest payments in the county in the previous year; in column (2), the dependent variable is calculated using all mortgage-related complaints; in column (3), the dependent variable is calculated using complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing. *Stress test exposure* is the share of the county's mortgage market that is served by banks subject to stress tests right before the inception of stress tests. *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$.

	First stage	Second stage	Second stage
	(1)	(2)	(3)
		All complaints	Complaints about servicing
Stress test exposure	0.228***		
	(0.028)		
Δ*Nonbank market share*		-0.457***	-0.433***
		(0.090)	(0.085)
Δ*log(Income per capita)*	-0.186***	-0.118***	-0.100**
	(0.058)	(0.042)	(0.040)
Δ*Unemployment rate*	-0.443**	0.115	0.151
	(0.214)	(0.169)	(0.161)
Observations	710	710	710
F-stat	63.80		

Table 5: IV analysis using stress tests: Changes in complaint ratio between 2014 and 2018

This table presents the results of a regression model in which we regress the change in county-level complaint ratio from 2014 to 2018 on the change in nonbanks' market share in the county from 2013 to 2017, which is instrumented by the county's ex ante exposure to banks subject to stress tests. The dependent variable in the first-stage regression is *the change in nonbank market share.* The dependent variable in the second-stage regressions is *the change in complaint ratio*; *complaint ratio* is calculated as the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by the number of federal tax filings with mortgage interest payments in the county in the previous year; in column (2), the dependent variable is calculated using all mortgage-related complaints; in column (3), the dependent variable is calculated using complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing. *Stress test exposure* is the share of the county's mortgage market that is served by banks subject to stress tests right before the inception of stress tests. *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$.

	First stage	Second stage	Second stage
	(1)	(2)	(3)
		All complaints	Complaints about servicing
Stress test exposure	0.126***		
	(0.021)		
Δ*Nonbank market share*		-0.457***	-0.433***
		(0.205)	(0.196)
Δ*log(Income per capita)*	-0.113**	-0.194***	-0.186***
	(0.054)	(0.064)	(0.061)
Δ*Unemployment rate*	-0.191	-0.155	-0.153
	(0.231)	(0.287)	(0.275)
Observations	770	770	770
F-stat	35.11		

Table 6: IV analysis using stress tests: Excluding counties with ex ante exposure to banks that have become a participant of stress tests after 2013

This table presents the results of a regression model in which we regress the change in county-level complaint ratio on the change in nonbanks' market share in the county from 2011 to 2017, which is instrumented by the county's ex ante exposure to banks subject to stress tests. The counties that have ex ante exposure to banks that are newly added to the stress test list since 2014 are excluded from the sample. The dependent variable in the first-stage regression is *the change in nonbank market share.* The dependent variable in the second-stage regressions is *the change in complaint ratio*; in columns (2) and (3), the change is computed during our entire sample period (i.e., between 2012 and 2018); in column (4), the change is computed for more recent years (i.e., between 2014 and 2018). *Complaint ratio* is calculated as the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by the number of federal tax filings with mortgage interest payments in the county in the previous year; in column (2), the dependent variable is calculated using all mortgage-related complaints; in columns (3) and (4), the dependent variable is calculated using complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing. *Stress test exposure* is the share of the county's mortgage market that is served by banks subject to stress tests right before the inception of stress tests. *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$.

	First stage	Second stage	Second stage	Second stage
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
		All complaints	Complaints about servicing	Complaints about servicing
Stress test exposure	0.268***			
	(0.043)			
Δ*Nonbank market share*		-0.379***	-0.356***	-0.630***
		(0.135)	(0.129)	(0.223)
Δ*log(Income per capita)*	0.166*	0.082	0.100	-0.005
	(0.095)	(0.086)	(0.081)	(0.089)
Δ*Unemployment rate*	-0.086	0.336	0.401	0.270
	(0.315)	(0.270)	(0.257)	(0.388)
Observations	283	283	283	324
F-stat	39.46			

47

Table 7: IV analysis using mortgage industry surety bond requirements

This table presents the results of a regression model in which we regress the change in county-level complaint ratio from 2012 to 2018 on the change in nonbanks' market share in the county from 2011 to 2017, which is instrumented by the log of the dollar amount of mortgage broker bond required at the state level. The dependent variable in the first-stage regression is *the change in nonbank market share.* The dependent variable in the second-stage regressions is *the change in complaint ratio*; *complaint ratio* is calculated as the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by the number of federal tax filings with mortgage interest payments in the county in the previous year; In column (2), the dependent variable is calculated using all mortgage-related complaints; in column (3), the dependent variable is calculated using complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing. *Surety bond requirement* is the average mortgage industry bond requirement in the state (dollars in thousands). *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$.

	First stage	Second stage	Second stage
	(1)	(2)	(3)
		All complaints	Complaints about servicing
Surety bond requirement	-0.012***		
	(0.003)		
Δ*Nonbank market share*		-0.528**	-0.545***
		(0.207)	(0.204)
Δ*log(Income per capita)*	-0.259***	-0.194**	-0.189**
	(0.066)	(0.076)	(0.074)
Δ*Unemployment rate*	-0.848***	-0.014	0.002
	(0.229)	(0.266)	(0.262)
Observations	536	536	536
F-stat	14.11		

Table 8: Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints against nonbanks

This table presents OLS (columns (1) and (4)) and the second-stage of IV estimates (columns (2)-(3) and (5)-(6)) from the regression of county-level complaint ratio against nonbanks on nonbanks' market share in the county. Columns (1)-(3) include all mortgage-related complaints; columns (4)-(6) include complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing. In the IV analyses, all variables are within-county changes during our sample period; the change in nonbanks' market share is instrumented by the county's ex ante exposure to banks subject to stress tests (columns (2) and (5)) and by the log of the dollar amount of mortgage broker surety bond required at the state level (columns (3) and (6)). The dependent variable in columns (1) and (4) is *complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed against nonbanks in a year scaled by all mortgages originated by nonbanks in the previous five years. The dependent variable in columns (2)-(3) and (5)-(6) is *the change in complaint ratio. Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	All complaints			Complaints about servicing		
	OLS	Stress Test IV	Surety Bond IV	OLS	Stress Test IV	Surety Bond IV
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Nonbank market share	-0.507**			-0.512**		
	(0.254)			(0.257)		
Δ*Nonbank market share*		-1.925***	-2.578**		-1.797***	-2.793**
		(0.557)	(1.173)		(0.542)	(1.186)
log(Income per capita)	-0.581			-0.383		
	(0.427)			(0.411)		
Δ*log(Income per capita)*		-0.318	-0.856*		-0.230	-0.857*
		(0.269)	(0.437)		(0.262)	(0.442)
Unemployment rate	2.823*			2.737*		
	(1.468)			(1.450)		
Δ*Unemployment rate*		0.019	-1.156		-0.183	-1.484
		(1.069)	(1.459)		(1.041)	(1.476)
Year FE	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
County FE	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Observations	7,178	725	550	7,178	725	550

Table 9: Borrower income of nonbanks

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of borrower income of nonbanks on nonbanks' market share in the county. The dependent variable in column (1) is *Average Income*, which is the average income of nonbanks' borrowers in the county; the dependent variable in column (2) is *Income dispersion*, which is the interquartile range for the incomes of nonbanks' borrowers in the county scaled by *Average Income*. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	Average income	*Income dispersion*
	(1)	(2)
Nonbank market share	-0.069*	-0.070**
	(0.041)	(0.030)
Year FE	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,185	7,178
R-squared	0.81	0.35

Table 10: Detailed complaint issues against nonbanks

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of county-level complaint ratio on nonbanks' market share in the county. The dependent variable is *Complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by all mortgages originated by nonbanks in the previous five years. Column (1)includes complaints about "trouble during payment process;" column (2) includes complaints about "loan modification, collection, foreclosure" and "struggling to pay mortgage;" column (3) includes complaints about "loan servicing, payments, escrow account;" column (4)includes complaints about "settlement process and costs." *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	Complaint ratio			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	Payment	Payment	Escrow	Settlement
	Difficulty	Processing	Account	Related
	Complaints	Complaints	Complaints	Complaints
Nonbank market share	-0.352*	-0.106**	-0.040	-0.013
	(0.212)	(0.046)	(0.124)	(0.029)
log(Income per capita)	-0.068	-0.188	-0.152	0.024
	(0.279)	(0.118)	(0.192)	(0.039)
Unemployment rate	1.958	-0.624**	1.161	0.242
	(1.215)	(0.246)	(0.710)	(0.218)
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,178	7,178	7,178	7,178
R-squared	0.398	0.403	0.370	0.301

Table 11: Nonbank concentration and mortgage-related complaints

This table presents the regression of complaint ratio on nonbank market concentration. The dependent variable in the first-stage regression is *Nonbank HHI* (i.e., the market concentration within nonbanks), which is the summation of the squares of the market share of each nonbank within the nonbank mortgage market in the county. The dependent variable in the second-stage regressions is *complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed against nonbanks in a year scaled by all mortgages originated by nonbanks in the previous five years. The dependent variable in column (2) is calculated using all mortgage-related complaints; the dependent variable in column (3) is calculated using complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	First stage	Second stage	Second stage
	(1)	(2)	(3)
		All complaints	Complaints about servicing
Nonbank market share	0.166***		
	(0.050)		
Nonbank HHI		-3.090*	-3.128*
		(1.814)	(1.841)
log(Income per capita)	0.124***	-0.171	0.031
	(0.042)	(0.436)	(0.438)
Unemployment rate	-0.237	2.246	2.152
	(0.206)	(1.570)	(1.535)
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,174	7,174	7,174
F-stat	11.20		

Table 12: Nonbanks' national market share and mortgage-related complaints

This table presents the regression of complaint ratio on the national market share of the nonbanks that originate loans in the county. The dependent variable in the first-stage regression is *National market share*, which is the summation of national market share of all nonbanks that originate loans in the county. Each nonbank's national market share is calculated as the amount of mortgages originated by the nonbank in the previous year scaled by the total amount of mortgages originated by all lenders in the nation in the previous year. The dependent variable in the second-stage regressions is *complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed against nonbanks in a year scaled by all mortgages originated by nonbanks in the previous five years. The dependent variable in column (2) is calculated using all mortgage-related complaints; the dependent variable in column (3) is calculated using complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	First stage	Second stage	Second stage
	(1)	(2)	(3)
		All complaints	Complaints about servicing
Nonbank market share	0.069***		
	(0.007)		
National market share		-7.381**	-7.463**
		(3.718)	(3.785)
log(Income per capita)	0.082***	0.026	0.230
	(0.016)	(0.459)	(0.467)
Unemployment rate	-0.278***	0.770	0.661
	(0.053)	(1.781)	(1.717)
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,178	7,178	7,178
F-stat	84.90		

Table 13: Nonbanks' demand for technology-related skills: Evidence from job posting data

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of the aggregate number of job postings that require technology-related skills by nonbanks in a county on nonbanks' market share in the county. The dependent variable is *log(1+number of job postings with technology-related skills)*, which is the log of the total number of job postings that require technology-related skills by nonbanks in a county-year. Column (5) excludes Quicken Loans and Guaranteed Rate Inc., two of the largest fintech nonbanks. *Income per capita* is from BEA. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	log(1+number of job postings with technology-related skills)				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
Nonbank market share	1.889***	1.513***	0.813**	0.907**	1.133***
	(0.251)	(0.294)	(0.400)	(0.398)	(0.387)
log(Income per capita)				1.284**	1.264**
				(0.505)	(0.504)
Year FE	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
County FE	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	3,227	3,227	3,227	3,227	3,183
R-squared	0.060	0.108	0.697	0.698	0.672

Table 14: Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints against traditional banks

This table presents OLS (columns (1) and (5)) and the second-stages of IV estimates (columns (2)-(4) and (6)-(8)) from the regression of county-level complaint ratio against traditional banks on nonbanks' market share in the county. Columns (1)-(4) include all mortgage-related complaints; columns (5)-(8) include complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing. In the IV analyses, all variables are within-county changes during our sample period; the change in nonbanks' market share is instrumented by the county's ex ante exposure to banks subject to stress tests (columns (2)-(3) and (6)-(7)) and by the log of the dollar amount of mortgage industry bond required at the state level (columns (4) and (8)). The dependent variable in columns (1) and (5) is *complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed against traditional banks in a year scaled by all mortgages originated by traditional banks in the previous five years. The dependent variable in columns (2)-(4) and (6)-(8) is *the change in complaint ratio*. The sample in columns (1), (2), (4), and (5), (6), (8) includes all banks; the sample in columns (3) and (7) includes banks that are never selected for stress tests. *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	All complaints				Complaints about servicing			
	OLS	Stress Test IV	Stress Test IV	Surety Bond IV	OLS	Stress Test IV	Stress Test IV	Surety Bond IV
	(1) All Banks	(2) All Banks	(3) Untested Banks	(4) All Banks	(5) All Banks	(6) All Banks	(7) Untested Banks	(8) All Banks
Nonbank market share	-0.269* (0.158)				-0.282* (0.150)			
Δ*Nonbank market share*		-1.985*** (0.410)	-0.479** (0.186)	-2.711*** (0.982)		-1.848*** (0.389)	-0.342** (0.157)	-2.591*** (0.924)
log(Income per capita)	-0.287** (0.134)				-0.240* (0.125)			
Δ*log(Income per capita)*		-0.789*** (0.198)	-0.219** (0.090)	-1.181*** (0.366)		-0.684*** (0.188)	-0.179** (0.076)	-1.079*** (0.344)
Unemployment rate	3.894*** (0.607)				3.891*** (0.579)			
Δ*Unemployment rate*		0.837 (0.787)	-0.424 (0.357)	-0.049 (1.223)		1.298* (0.746)	-0.289 (0.301)	0.559 (1.149)
Year FE	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
County FE	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No	No	No
Observations	7,178	725	725	550	7,178	725	725	550

Table 15: Borrower income of traditional banks

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of borrower income of traditional banks on nonbanks' market share in the county. The dependent variable in column (1) is *Average Income*, which is the mean value of incomes of traditional banks' borrowers in the county; the dependent variable in column (2) is *Income dispersion*, which is the interquartile range for the incomes of traditional banks' borrowers in the county by *Average Income*. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	Average income	*Income dispersion*
	(1)	(2)
Nonbank market share	0.089***	0.027
	(0.031)	(0.026)
Year FE	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,397	7,397
R-squared	0.93	0.40

Table 16: Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints conditional on minority populations

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of county-level complaint ratio on nonbanks' market share in the county conditional on the percentage of minority populations. The dependent variable is *Complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by the number of federal tax filings with mortgage interest payments in the county in the previous year. Columns (1)-(2) include all mortgage-related complaints; columns (3)-(4) include complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing. *Hispanic and non-white population* ratios are from the 2010 Census files; *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	Complaint ratio			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	All complaints		Complaints about servicing	
Nonbank market share	0.006	0.008	-0.007	0.004
	(0.020)	(0.018)	(0.019)	(0.017)
Nonbank market share × Hispanic population	-0.078***		-0.064***	
	(0.021)		(0.020)	
Nonbank market share × Non-white population		-0.090***		-0.090***
		(0.020)		(0.020)
log(Income per capita)	-0.055***	-0.069***	-0.046**	-0.060***
	(0.021)	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.020)
Unemployment rate	0.239***	0.250***	0.269***	0.272***
	(0.084)	(0.083)	(0.080)	(0.079)
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,178	7,178	7,178	7,178
R-squared	0.570	0.570	0.557	0.559

Appendix

Table A1: Variable descriptions

Variable name	Definition and source
Number of complaints	The number of mortgage-related complaints in a county filed with the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB).
Number of outstanding mortgages	(1) The number of federal tax filings with mortgage interest payments in a county in the previous year from the IRS, or (2) the total number of mortgages originated in a county during the last five years from the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (HMDA) dataset.
Complaint ratio	The number of complaints divided by the number of outstanding mortgages.
Nonbank	Lenders are classified into traditional and nonbanks by using the variable "FORE" in the Avery file. Lenders are defined as nonbanks if FORE is "IMB", and as traditional banks if FORE is one of the followings: FSB, SAL, SSB, CPB, BHC, NAT, NMB, SMB.
Nonbank share	The dollar amount of mortgages originated by nonbanks in a county in the previous year divided by the total dollar amount of mortgages originated by all lenders in the county in the previous year. All data used in this computation are from the HMDA dataset.
Income per capita	County-level average income per capita from the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA).
Unemployment rate	County-level unemployment rate from the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS).

Variable name	Definition and source
Stress test exposure	The exposure of a county to the banks that are subject to stress tests. $Stress\,test\,exposure_{c,t} =$ $$(\frac{\sum_{i\,\in\,stress\,test\,banks} mortgage_{i,c,t}}{\sum_{i\,\in\,all\,lenders} mortgage_{i,c,t}}) \quad (6)$$
Mortgage market HHI	The concentration of the mortgage market in a county. $$HHI_{c,t} = \sum_{i\,\in\,all\,lenders} w_{i,c,t}^2,$$ $$where\,w_{i,c,t} = (\frac{mortgage_{i,c,t}}{\sum_{i\,\in\,all\,lenders} mortgage_{i,c,t}}) \quad (7)$$
Nonbank HHI	The concentration of mortgage market among non-banks. $$HHI_{Nonbanks,c,t} = \sum_{i\,\in\,nonbanks} w_{i,c,t}^2,$$ $$where\,w_{i,c,t} = (\frac{mortgage_{i,c,t}}{\sum_{i\,\in\,nonbanks} mortgage_{i,c,t}}) \quad (8)$$
Lender national market share	The amount of mortgages originated by a nonbank in the previous year scaled by the total amount of mortgages originated in the nation in the previous year.

Variable name	Definition and source
Average income (Borrowers of nonbanks)	Borrowers' average income for nonbanks in a county. $Average\ income_{nonbanks,c,t} =$ $$(\frac{\sum_{b \in nonbank\ borrowers} income_{b,c,t}}{\#\ of\ nonbank\ borrowers\ in\ county\ c\ in\ year\ t})\quad(9)$$
Income dispersion (Borrowers of nonbanks)	The interquartile range of the income distribution for the nonbanks' borrowers divided by $Average\ income_{nonbanks,c,t}$.
Average income (Borrowers of traditional banks)	Borrowers' average income for traditional banks in a county. $Average\ income_{banks,c,t} =$ $$(\frac{\sum_{b \in bank\ borrowers} income_{b,c,t}}{\#\ of\ bank\ borrowers\ in\ county\ c\ in\ year\ t})\quad(10)$$
Income dispersion (Borrowers of traditional banks)	The interquartile range of the income distribution for the traditional banks' borrowers divided by $Average\ income_{banks,c,t}$.
Hispanic ratio	The ratio of the Hispanic population in a county from the 2010 Census files.
Non-white ratio	The ratio of the non-white population in a county from the 2010 Census files.

Table A2: Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints: Using an alternative measure of outstanding mortgages in computing complaint ratio

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of county-level complaint ratio on nonbanks' market share in the county. The dependent variable is *Complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by all mortgages originated in the previous five years. Column (1) includes all mortgage-related complaints; column (2) includes complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing; column (3) includes complaints about mortgage origination. *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	Complaint ratio		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	All complaints	Complaints about servicing	Complaints about origination
Nonbank market share	-0.295***	-0.309***	0.014
	(0.106)	(0.103)	(0.029)
log(Income per capita)	-0.348***	-0.291***	-0.058**
	(0.117)	(0.111)	(0.026)
Unemployment rate	3.035***	3.033***	0.002
	(0.522)	(0.512)	(0.117)
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,178	7,178	7,178
R-squared	0.638	0.623	0.390

Table A3: Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints: Using the number of loans instead of the dollar amount of loans in computing nonbanks' market share

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of county-level complaint ratio on nonbanks' market share in the county. The dependent variable is *Complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by the number of federal tax filings with mortgage interest payments in the county in the previous year. Column (1) includes all mortgage-related complaints; column (2) includes complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing; column (3) includes complaints about mortgage origination. *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	Complaint ratio		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	All complaints	Complaints about servicing	Complaints about origination
Nonbank market share	-0.051***	-0.054***	0.003
	(0.016)	(0.016)	(0.005)
log(Income per capita)	-0.053**	-0.043**	-0.010*
	(0.021)	(0.020)	(0.005)
Unemployment rate	0.282***	0.306***	-0.023
	(0.086)	(0.082)	(0.027)
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,178	7,178	7,178
R-squared	0.569	0.557	0.353

Table A4: Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints: Excluding Quicken Loans and Top 3 nonbanks

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of county-level complaint ratio on nonbanks' market share in the county. The dependent variable is *Complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by all mortgages originated in the previous five years. Columns (1)-(3) exclude complaints filed against Quicken Loans; columns (5)-(6) exclude complaints filed against the top 3 nonbanks (i.e., Quicken Loans, United Shore Financial Service, Guaranteed Rate Inc.). The main independent variable is *Nonbank market share*, which is the amount of mortgages originated by nonbanks in a county scaled by the total amount of mortgages originated by all lenders in the county in the previous five years, excluding loans originated by Quicken Loans (columns (1)-(3)) or excluding loans originated by the top 3 nonbanks (i.e., Quicken Loans, United Shore Financial Service, Guaranteed Rate Inc) (columns (5)-(6)). Columns (1) and (4) include all mortgage-related complaints; columns (2) and (5) include complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing; columns (3) and (6) include complaints about mortgage origination *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $* * * p < 0.01$, $* * p < 0.05$, and $* p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	Complaint ratio					
	Excluding Quicken			Excluding Top 3		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
	All	Servicing	Origination	All	Servicing	Origination
Nonbank market share	-0.272**	-0.279***	0.007	-0.281**	-0.285***	0.004
	(0.110)	(0.107)	(0.028)	(0.111)	(0.107)	(0.028)
log(Income per capita)	-0.346***	-0.289***	-0.057**	-0.357***	-0.298***	-0.059**
	(0.117)	(0.111)	(0.026)	(0.118)	(0.112)	(0.026)
Unemployment rate	3.003***	3.017***	-0.008	2.958***	2.979***	-0.015
	(0.524)	(0.515)	(0.116)	(0.522)	(0.514)	(0.117)
Year FE	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
County FE	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
Observations	7,169	7,169	7,169	7,167	7,167	7,167
R-squared	0.639	0.624	0.390	0.640	0.625	0.390

Table A5: Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints: Including all counties with at least one complaint

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of county-level complaint ratio on nonbanks' market share in the county. The dependent variable is *Complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by the number of federal tax filings with mortgage interest payments in the county in the previous year. Column (1) includes all mortgage-related complaints; column (2) includes complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing; column (3) includes complaints about mortgage origination. *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

| | *Complaint ratio* | | |
| | (1) | (2) | (3) |
	All complaints	Complaints about servicing	Complaints about origination
Nonbank market share	-0.045**	-0.041*	-0.004
	(0.022)	(0.022)	(0.007)
log(Income per capita)	-0.078***	-0.062***	-0.016*
	(0.023)	(0.021)	(0.010)
Unemployment rate	0.377**	0.402***	-0.025
	(0.146)	(0.145)	(0.026)
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	7,882	7,882	7,882
R-squared	0.513	0.508	0.290

Table A6: Nonbanks' market share and mortgage-related complaints: Post-2012

This table presents OLS estimates from the regression of county-level complaint ratio on nonbanks' market share in the county. The dependent variable is *Complaint ratio*, which is the number of mortgage-related complaints filed in a year scaled by the number of federal tax filings with mortgage interest payments in the county in the previous year. Column (1) includes all mortgage-related complaints; column (2) includes complaints about post-origination mortgage servicing; column (3) includes complaints about mortgage origination. *Income per capita* is from BEA; *Unemployment rate* is from BLS. All variables are defined in Table A1. $***p < 0.01$, $**p < 0.05$, and $*p < 0.1$. Standard errors are clustered at the county level.

	Complaint ratio		
	(1)	(2)	(3)
	All complaints	Complaints about servicing	Complaints about origination
Nonbank market share	-0.056***	-0.061***	0.006
	(0.020)	(0.020)	(0.007)
log(Income per capita)	-0.057**	-0.045*	-0.011
	(0.026)	(0.025)	(0.007)
Unemployment rate	0.337***	0.355***	-0.019
	(0.117)	(0.112)	(0.032)
Year FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
County FE	Yes	Yes	Yes
Observations	6,219	6,219	6,219
R-squared	0.569	0.557	0.369