

# Assessing the Performance of Default Risk Models using Firm-specific and Systematic Factors



सिद्धिमूलं प्रबन्धनम्  
भा. प्र. सं. इन्दौर  
IIM INDORE

A Doctoral Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Fellow Programme in Management

Indian Institute of Management Indore

By  
Khushbu Agrawal

November 2013

Thesis Advisory Committee:

Prof. Yogesh Maheshwari  
(Chair)

Prof. Ganesh Kumar N.  
(Member)

Prof. Pradip Banerjee  
(Member)

## Abstract

The event of default signals a state of financial distress which needs to be identified accurately and timely. Although financial distress prediction has considerably evolved over a period of time, the existing default risk models primarily focus on firm-specific information to predict distress. There have been only limited attempts to include systematic factors (macroeconomic and industry) in the models. Moreover, the lack of an integrated approach to modelling the risk of default is the primary motivation for the present study. Given the internal risk factors and turbulences in the external environment, recent years have been characterized by increased instances of default. Thus, it further provides impetus for exploring alternative ways to model the risk of default.

The present study is an attempt to develop a comprehensive and integrated model for default prediction that incorporates firm-specific factors i.e. factors internal to the operations of a firm as well as systematic factors represented by the sensitivity of a firm to industry and macroeconomic variables. Specifically, it seeks to address three relevant research questions pertaining to the prediction of default. Firstly, it is assessed which among the three firm-specific models i.e. accounting based model, option based model and the hybrid model has the highest prediction accuracy. Secondly, it is assessed whether the addition of industry beta to the hybrid model improves the prediction accuracy. Thirdly, it is assessed whether the addition of macroeconomic variables further improves the prediction accuracy. The study employs two alternative prediction techniques, logistic regression and multiple discriminant analysis. It is found that among the models based on firm-specific information, the hybrid model, which is a combination of information from the financial statements and option theory based measure (distance-to-default) performs the best in terms of classification accuracy, both in-sample and out-of-sample. The addition of industry beta as well as macroeconomic betas sequentially improve the classification accuracy of the model, both in-sample and out-of-sample. Overall, the results suggest that firm-specific and systematic factors are complementary to each other in prediction of default.

The findings of the study have important implications for lending and investment decisions. The model serves as a predictive tool to lenders, particularly banks and financial institutions, and investors for managing their exposures efficiently through a broader understanding of the relevant risk factors that are likely to affect the debt servicing capacity of a firm. Furthermore, the complementary role of firm-specific information and systematic factors in predicting default emphasize the fact that information from the external environment also needs to be considered in making investment and lending decisions. Each firm is uniquely affected by the changes in the external environment. Hence, lenders and investors need to constantly monitor the sensitivity of a firm to these changes and understand its implications for default risk. Accurate assessment of default risk is also useful in determining the appropriate risk premium. The findings of the study also have important implications for managers and other stakeholders. The potential direct as well as indirect costs of financial distress can be avoided by timely and accurate assessment of default risk.

**Keywords:** Default risk, financial distress, option theory, firm-specific factors

# Table of Contents

<i>Abstract</i> .....	<i>i</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i> .....	<i>ii</i>
<i>List of Tables</i> .....	<i>v</i>
<i>List of Figures</i> .....	<i>vi</i>
<b>1. Introduction</b> .....	<b>1</b>
1.1 Meaning and definition of default.....	3
1.2 Trends in default rates.....	4
<b>2. Literature Review</b> .....	<b>10</b>
2.1 Accounting based models.....	10
2.2 Option based models.....	19
2.3 Hybrid models.....	24
2.4 Macroeconomic and industry factors.....	27
<b>3. Research Gap and Research Questions</b> .....	<b>30</b>
<b>4. Data and Methodology</b> .....	<b>34</b>
4.1 Sample selection and description.....	34
4.2 Statistical technique.....	38
4.3 Variable description.....	41
4.3.1 Accounting based model.....	41
4.3.2 Option based model.....	44
4.3.3 Macroeconomic and industry variables.....	48
<b>5. Results and Discussion</b> .....	<b>50</b>
5.1 Accounting based model.....	50
5.1.1 Results of Logistic Regression.....	51
5.1.2 Results of Multiple Discriminant Analysis.....	61
5.2 Option based model.....	65
5.2.1 Results of Logistic Regression.....	66
5.2.2 Results of Multiple Discriminant Analysis.....	68

5.3 Hybrid model.....	70
5.3.1 Results of Logistic Regression.....	70
5.3.2 Results of Multiple Discriminant Analysis.....	73
5.4 Model with Industry beta.....	76
5.4.1 Results of Logistic Regression.....	77
5.4.2 Results of Multiple Discriminant Analysis.....	80
5.5 Model with Macroeconomic Betas.....	83
5.5.1 Results of Logistic Regression.....	85
5.5.2 Results of Multiple Discriminant Analysis.....	89
5.6 Summary of Results.....	92
<b>6. Conclusion.....</b>	<b>94</b>
<b>7. Limitations and Future Research.....</b>	<b>96</b>
<b>Appendix A: Description of variables in the accounting based model.....</b>	<b>97</b>
<b>Appendix B: Constitution of accounting variables.....</b>	<b>98</b>
<b>Appendix C: Multicollinearity test: Accounting based model.....</b>	<b>99</b>
<b>Appendix D: Multicollinearity test: Hybrid model.....</b>	<b>100</b>
<b>Appendix E: Multicollinearity test: Model with Industry Beta.....</b>	<b>101</b>
<b>Appendix F: Multicollinearity test: Model with Macroeconomic Betas.....</b>	<b>102</b>
<b>Appendix G: Classification Plot: Accounting based model.....</b>	<b>103</b>
<b>Appendix H: Classification Plot: Option based model.....</b>	<b>104</b>
<b>Appendix I: Classification Plot: Hybrid model.....</b>	<b>105</b>
<b>Appendix J: Classification Plot: Model with Industry Beta.....</b>	<b>106</b>
<b>Appendix K: Classification Plot: Model with Macroeconomic Betas.....</b>	<b>107</b>
<b>References.....</b>	<b>108</b>

## List of Tables

Table 1.1 Definitions of default.....	4
Table 1.2 Industry-wise and chronological break-up of defaults over the last 24 years.....	8
Table 2.1 Summary: Accounting based models of default prediction.....	18
Table 2.2 Summary: Hybrid models of default prediction.....	26
Table 3.1 Summary of Research Gaps.....	32
Table 4.1 Year-wise & rating agency-wise distribution of defaulting firms.....	35
Table 4.2 Industry-wise distribution of defaulting firms.....	35
Table 4.3 Descriptive statistics and t-test for asset size.....	37
Table 5.1 Descriptive statistics and Univariate t-test for variables in accounting model.....	51
Table 5.2 Accounting based model: Logistic Regression (Stepwise iterations).....	53
Table 5.3 Accounting based model: Model if Term removed.....	54
Table 5.4 Accounting based model: Result of Logistic Regression.....	59
Table 5.5 Explanation for positive coefficient of WC/TA: Composition of Current Assets.....	59
Table 5.6 Explanation for positive coefficient of WC/TA: Replacing WC/TA.....	60
Table 5.7 Accounting based model: Logistic Regression Classification Matrix.....	61
Table 5.8 Accounting based model: Test of Equality of Group Means.....	62
Table 5.9 Accounting based model: Result of MDA.....	63
Table 5.10 Accounting based model: Functions at group centroids.....	64
Table 5.11 Accounting based model: MDA Classification Matrix.....	65
Table 5.12 Descriptive statistics and Univariate t-test for Distance-to-default.....	66
Table 5.13 Option based model: Result of Logistic Regression.....	67
Table 5.14 Option based model: Logistic Regression Classification Matrix.....	68
Table 5.15 Option based model: Test of Equality of Group Means.....	68
Table 5.16 Option based model: Result of MDA.....	69
Table 5.17 Option based model: Functions at group centroids.....	69
Table 5.18 Option based model: MDA Classification Matrix.....	70
Table 5.19 Hybrid model: Result of Logistic Regression.....	72
Table 5.20 Hybrid model: Logistic Regression Classification Matrix.....	73
Table 5.21 Hybrid model: Test of Equality of Group Means.....	74
Table 5.22 Hybrid model: Result of MDA.....	75
Table 5.23 Hybrid model: Functions at group centroids.....	75
Table 5.24 Hybrid model: MDA Classification Matrix.....	76
Table 5.25 Descriptive statistics and Univariate t-test for Industry Beta.....	76
Table 5.26 Model with Industry Beta: Result of Logistic Regression.....	78
Table 5.27 Model with Industry Beta: Logistic Regression Classification Matrix.....	80
Table 5.28 Model with Industry Beta: Test of Equality of Group Means.....	80
Table 5.29 Model with Industry Beta: Result of MDA.....	81
Table 5.30 Model with Industry Beta: Functions at group centroids.....	81
Table 5.31 Model with Industry Beta: MDA Classification Matrix.....	82
Table 5.32 Descriptive statistics and Univariate t-test for Macroeconomic Betas.....	84
Table 5.33 Model with Macroeconomic Betas: Result of Logistic Regression.....	87
Table 5.34 Model with Macroeconomic Betas: Logistic Regression Classification Matrix.....	89
Table 5.35 Model with Macroeconomic Betas: Test of Equality of Group Means.....	89

Table 5.37 Model with Macroeconomic Betas: Functions at group centroids.....	91
Table 5.38 Model with Macroeconomic Betas: MDA Classification Matrix.....	92
Table 5.39 Summary of Results: Model Accuracy.....	93
Table 5.40 Summary of Results: Key Statistics.....	93

## List of Figures

Figure 1.1 Annual Default Rates over last decade.....	5
Figure 1.2 Issuer-wise Rating Revisions since 2001-02.....	6
Figure 1.3 National Ratings Historical Rating Activity.....	6
Figure 1.4 Industry-wise break-up of Defaults in 2011-12.....	9
Figure 3.1 Model for Default Risk Prediction .....	33