

Market power and stability of CEE banks

Ivan Huljak Croatian National Bank – Financial Stability Department 19th Dubrovnik Economic conference 14/6/2013

Contents

- □ Motivation
- Stylized facts standard banking data vs. empirical indicators
- □ Testing the competition stability and related hypothesis
- Conclusion and discussion

Motivation

- Competition fragility view –banks with market power have higher opportunity cost of defaulting – they protect their franchise value so they are more stable
- Competition stability view –banks with market power have higher prices leading to increased risk in clients` balance sheet which shifts into banks` balance sheet – risk shifting paradigm
- So which one is it? Theory allows both, empirical studies confirm both
- □ CEE countries Swiss franc loans as a memory of the period of increased competition (*Others are doing it...*)

Failing to reach an agreement...

- **Researchers started asking philosophical questions:**
- Is the relationship linear?
- Is it necessarily intuitive?
- Is it case dependent?

. . .

- Is it to complex to understand?

- While in the same time not having any doubt in Z-score or Lerner index as indicators.
- Beck (2011): Raises the question of spurious relationship between some indicators and concludes that bank level research on this matter offers most inconsistent findings

Stylized facts – standard banking data vs. empirical indicators

Standard banking data – does not offer all the answers



Figure 1: Z-score and its` components for medial CEE bank

Source: Own calculation based on Bankscope data

Figure 2: Other standard banking indicators for medial CEE bank



Banking sector stability – high between 2001 and 2008:

- □ Solid and stable earnings.
- Decreasing capital / assets.
- Profitability driven by solid loan performance and increasing share of loans in assets.
- Decreasing net interest margin often commented as a result of increasing competition.
- After 2008 value adjustment cost increased rapidly

Lerner index

- Bank specific market power indicator derived from the microeconomic theory.
- **Gradient Formula:** $L = \frac{P MC}{P}$
- Popular, intuitive, easy to calculate providing we know marginal cost.
- However, one has to keep in mind its specificity.
- □ What does it really show?
- □ It shows market power for a bank that uses market power to increase prices!!!
- □ It is closely related to profitability and could result in mechanical rather than economical relationship with Z-score, net-interest margin, implicit loan rates.

Competition efficiency frontier (CEF)

- Bolt and Humphrey (2010) to investigate competition in non-loan activities
- Kraft and Huljak (2011) to investigate competition on different segments of the same market
- Advantage not calculated from the prices, allows the possibility of non-pricing strategy of a bank with market power
- However, it is a relative indicator and it shows the power compared with the weakest bank on the market
- Technically, it is an efficiency measure (efficiency of the competition to restrain the revenue) – Distribution free approach to dismantle error (in-efficiency and random term) – random term will average out in 5 or 6 years

$$\ln(Y_i) = \theta_0 + \sum_{i=1}^{5} \theta_i \ln X_i + 1/2 \sum_{i=1}^{5} \sum_{i=1}^{5} \theta_{ij} \ln X_i \ln x_j + \sum_{i=1}^{5} \sum_{k=1}^{2} \lambda_k \ln X_i \ln P_k + \sum_{k=1}^{2} \pi_k P_k + 1/2 \sum_{k=1}^{2} \sum_{m=1}^{2} \pi_{km} \ln P_k \ln P_m$$

 $\ln(rev/oc) = R(\ln X_i, \ln X_j, \ln P_k) + \ln e + \ln u$

 $CE_i = \exp(\ln \overline{u}_i - \ln \overline{u}_{\min}) - 1 = (\overline{u}_i / \overline{u}_{\min}) - 1$

Other data – x-efficiency and franchise value

- X-efficiency (Berger and Hannan, 1998) to measure managerial cost efficiency
 - Combines alocative and technical efficiency in unknown (X) ratio.
 - □ Not driven by economies of scale.
- □ Calculated from translog function, DFA
- Franchise value approximating market value by discounting net income with average cost of capital

$$FV_{ij} = \frac{MVA_{ij}}{BVA_{ij}}, MVAL_{ij} = \frac{OP_{ij}}{WACC_{ij}}, BVA_{ij} = EQ_{ij},$$

with FV - franchise value, MVA - market value, BVA - book value, OP - operating profit, WACC - weighted average cost of capital, EQ - balance sheet equity.

Additional data – the big picture

Figure 3: Empirical banking indicators for medial bank, 5 year moving averages



- Bank competition in CEE increasing since 2002 (but from relatively low level)
- Franchise value started to decrease after 2008 (just like Z-score)
- After 2006 bank cost x-efficiency decreasing – it appears banks did not increase their efficiency after the crisis started.

Testing the competition – stability and related hypothesis

Empirical strategy

- Bankscope (Fitch) data
- Starting with 3555 bank-year obs (15 countries, 16 years, unbalanced)
- On average we cover 80% of national banking sector assets
- After dealing with outliers and missing data we end up with 1421 obs (in Lerner spec.) and 579 (in CEF spec.)
- Strategy at this point: Panel OLS and country fixed effects
- □ Control: 2sls, bank fixed effects, lagged dependent var.
- □ Chow test to confirm it makes sense to break up the sample
- Hausman test to confirm fixed effects
- Running the regressions on sub samples and using separately two indicators of market power
- Also, decomposing the Z-score:

$$Z = \frac{ROAA + E / A}{ST _ DEV _ ROAA} = POR _ STA + LEV _ STA$$

Quick test – franchise value Variables: De Jonghe and Vennet (2007)

Table 1: Franchise value elasticity test

	Lerner index				CEF				
	OLS	Country f.e.			OLS	Country f.e.			
Dep Franchize value									
market power	0,550	***	0,524	***	0,912	***	0,841	***	
x_efficiency	-0,257	**	-0,117		0,019		0,009		
nt interest mar	0,081	***	0,110	***	0,129	***	0,134	***	
market share	1,188	***	1,103	***	1,322	***	1,061	***	
interbank	0,000		0,000		0,000		0,000		
equity to asset	-0,060	***	-0,059	***	-0,069	***	-0,065	***	
regulation	-1,836	***	-1,540	***	-2,487	***	-2,274	***	
_cons	2,771	***	2,287	***	2,250	***	2,061	***	
N	728		728		307		307		
r2	0,44		0,51		0,51		0,58		

Note: *, ** and *** - significant at 10%, 5% and 1%

Source: Own calculation based on Bankscope data

Competition – fragility test Variables: Beck and others (2011)

Table 2: Competition – fragility test with Z-score and its components

	Le			Competition efficiency frontier				
	Pre-crisis period		Crisis period		Pre-crisis period		Crisis period	
	OLS	Country f.e.	OLS C	Country f.e.	OLS	Country f.e.	OLS C	ountry f.e.
	Pre-crisis period		Crisi period		Pre-crisis period		Crisi pe	eriod
Dep: Z-score								
market power	0.0664	0.0003	1.3452 ***	1.2758 ***	0.5300	-0.3664	0.3948	-0.0904
x_efficiency	0.5239	1.4428	-0.1427	0.3875 ***	1.2314 *	2.4917 ***	-0.7326 *	0.0992
liquidity	-0.0010	0.0000	-0.0004	0.0008	-0.0024	-0.0020	0.0003	0.0067
credit growth	-0.0016	-0.0002	0.0018	0.0022 **	0.0031	0.0011	0.0146 ***	0.0130 ***
loan to deposit	-0.0027	0.0142 **	0.0065 **	0.0049 ***	0.0639	0.1067	-0.0363	0.0104
market share	0.5174	1	1977	1.0262 ***	0.6606	2.4113 ***	0.6204	1.9749 *
growth	0.0079	.0142	***	-0.0141	-0.0133	0.1785 *	-0.0590 ***	-0.0173
_cons	3.0604 *	2.5610 ***		2.7080 ***	2.5994 ***	0.1427	3.9791 ***	3.2444 ***
		7						
N of obs	36	362		877	144	144	416	416
R-sq.	0.0	0.15	0	0.23	0.07	0.24	0.15	0.33
Dep: Portfolio stability								
market power	0.3358	0.1358	0.9	0.9914 ***	1.0914 *	0.5764	0.8790 **	0.6329 **
x_efficiency	0.9226 **	1.7096	-0.9	-0.2917 *	1.4520 *	2.8724 ***	-1.2379 **	-0.4574
liquidity	-0.0022	-0.0011	-0.	0.0005	-0.0075	-0.0060	0.0009	0.0042 **
credit growth	-0.0001	0.0008	0	0.0036 **	0.0012	-0.0001	0.0130 ***	0.0134 ***
loan to deposit	-0.0706	-0.0441 *	**	0.0035 **	0.2561	0.2635	-0.0427	-0.0085
market share	1.9167 ***	2.7897 ***	.4 ***	3.5118 ***	2.4634 ***	4.1865 ***	3.3898 ***	4.6903 ***
growth	0.0058	-0.0047	172	0.0094 ***	-0.0218	-0.1926	-0.0070	0.0057
cons	0 4933 *	-0 1604	4421 ***	0.6547	-0 0774	-2 8986 **	1 3575 ***	0 7780
_00.00	0.1000	0.1001		0.0011	0.0111	2.0000		
N of obs	334	334	699	699	133	133	333	333
R-so	0.14	0.25	0.09	0.20	0.22	0.33	0.14	0.26
ivoq.	0.14	0.23	0.03	0.20	0.22	0.00	0.14	0.20
Den: Leverage	tability							
market nower	0 0047	-0.0673	1 0939 ***	1 0213 ***	0 4545	-0.4215	0.3622	-0 1446
x efficiency	0.4123	1 3242 ***	-0.2584	0.2102	1.0956 *	2 3489 ***	-0.8031 *	-0.1091
liquidity	-0.0008	0.0001	-0.0001	0.0010	-0.0023	-0.0018	0.0004	0.0053
credit growth	-0.0015	-0.000	0.0015	0.0018	0.0020	0.0012	0.0125 ***	0.0112 ***
loan to denosit	-0.0013	0.00	0.0066 ***	0.0052 **	0.0628	0.0936	-0.0275	0.0150
market chare	0.2930	1.1	0.0172	0.6061	0.4383	2 1085 **	0.0275	1 4450
arouth	0.2550	0.01	0.0172	0.0046	0.4303	0.1635 *	0.0000	0.0007
growth	0.0007	-0.01/	-0.0450	-0.0040	-0.0144	0.1035	-0.0401	-0.0037
_cons	3.0044	2.0400	3.4141	2.1302	2.0035	0.2020	3.9400	3.3011
N of obo	260	262	070	070	144	144	416	416
N OF ODS	302	0.15	0/0	0/0	144	0.22	410	410
rx-sq.	0.02	0.15	U.11	U.ZZ	0.05	0.23	0.15	0.01

Note: *,** and *** - significant at 10%, 5% and 1%

Competition – cost of funding test

Table 3: Bank competition and cost of funding

Lerner index					Competition efficiency frontier				
	Pre-crisi:	s period	Crisis	Crisis period		Pre-crisis period		Crisis period	
	OLS	Country f.e.	OLS	Country f.e.	OLS	Country f.e.	OLS	Country f.e.	
Dep: Net interest i	nargin								
market power	2.2239 **	1.3012 *	1.5765 ***	1.5656 ***	0.0525	0.0363	-1.3778 **	0.1294	
x_efficiency	0.3747	0.7871	-1.0261 *	-0.7513 *	-0.0879	2.3918 *	-0.0766	0.8159	
market share	1.8962 *	2.4341 **	-1.5430	-1.1254	0.9736	2.2734	-0.6137	0.5344	
loan to deposit	-0.8480 ***	-0.9761 ***	-0.0072 *	-0.0043	-0.5954	-0.0912	-0.3152	-0.6885 ***	
loan to assets	3.7004 ***	3.7358	2.5523	2.6791 ***	4.0839 *	0.0052	1.8314	3.9902	
equity to assets	0.2749	0.2675	0.1015	0.0449	0.2455	0.2241	0.1420	0.0267	
non-Interest revenue	0.5058	0.5917 ***	1.1715	0.7602	0.7173	0.3721	0.0572	0.3340 *	
credit growth	0.0062	0.0023	0.0060	-0.0020	0.0040	0.0076	0.0135	0.0042	
growth	-0.0591	-0.0451	-0.0217	-0.0152	-0.0742	-0.2277	-0.0394	-0.0222	
npir	0.0253	0.0249	0.0312	0.0124	0.0419	0.0255	0.0040	0.0043	
coverage	1.0997	1.4620	0.0076	0.0040	0.0014	1.2516	0.0052	0.0065	
_cons	-	1.4	-0.1955	2.7 103	-0.6792	1.3510	1.1452	2.0102	
N of obs		17	695	695	82	82	363	363	
P cq	0	0 7	0.34	0.69	0.62	0.75	0.29	0.67	
resq.	0.1	0.7	0.34	0.05	0.02	0.75	0.25	0.07	
Den: Implicit Ioan	rate								
market power	11 2760	10 7: 2 ***	5 2260 ***	5 3028 ***	-4 2742 *	-5 2876 *	-4 1945 ***	-2 3798 **	
x efficiency	-1.0541	-4.5 39 **	-0.5076	-1.6072 *	-4 0620	-3.9235	-0.4982	-1.0851	
market share	-1.2856	-6 / 93 ***	-9 1552 ***	-9 6176 ***	-5 2144 *	-10 6039 **	-7 0715 **	-4 6611 *	
loan to deposit	2 4374 *	1 867 ***	-0.0045	0.0054	1 0832	1 8326	0 2248	-0 7428	
loan to assets	-8.4088 **	0160 ***	-3.3835 ***	-3.2349 ***	-11.9288 *	-17.8896 **	-8.6398 ***	-5.0073 **	
equity to assets	0.2408 ***	2086 ***	0.0000	-0.0748 ***	0.1776	0.0802	0.1070 **	-0.0522	
non-interest revenue	1.4280 **	2978 *	1.8564 ***	1.1460 ***	-0.0539	0.3116	1.6193 ***	0.8291 **	
credit growth	0.0074	0043	0.0076	-0.0027	-0.0025	0.0092	0.0017	-0.0084	
arowth	-0.1572 **	5815 ***	-0.0062	-0.0585 **	-0.0323	-0.6339	-0.0338	-0.1139 ***	
nplr	0.0638	577	0.0358 **	-0.0047	0.0021	-0.0550	-0.0238	-0.0342 *	
coverage	0.0025	142 *	0.0088 ***	0.0036 *	0.0017	0.0029	0.0059	0.0065 *	
cons	6.5804 **	2 99 ***	7.3460 ***	13.0275 ***	18.5976 **	28.3134 ***	13.3402 ***	17.3241 ***	
_									
N of obs	176	5	695	695	82	82	363	363	
R-sq.	0.64		0.31	0.59	0.38	0.50	0.26	0.55	
Dep: Implicit depo	osit rate								
market power	-0.73	0.00	0.9176	1.3436	-3.5313 ***	-3.3751 ***	-3.3162 ***	-1.7436 ***	
x_emiciency	-0.2	-2.54	-0.0001	-2.8174 "	0.5786	1.3100	-0.2552	-0.1635	
market share	-2	-7.4	-2.6878	-4.0140	-3.0304 ***	-3.2111 *	-3.5056 ***	-3.9155 **	
loan to deposit	21 7247 ***	3 4404 ***	1 2020	0.0610	3.0114 ***	3.0548	1.3697	0.6270 *	
loan to assets	-21.7247 ****	-22.1121 ****	-1.3029	-1.0911	-10.1376 ****	-10.9490	-4.3794 ****	-1.7694	
equity to assets	-0.0596	-0.0///	-0.0225	-0.0203	0.0606	0.0413	0.0425	0.0109	
crodit growth	0.0122	2.5430	-0.2447	0.0063	-0.0007	-0.1695	0.0007	-0.1257	
growth	0.0122	0.3644 *	0.0112	0.0003	-0.0055	0.1258	-0.0007	-0.0027	
pplr	0.0276	0.0044	0.0303	-0.0378	0.0785 **	0.0650 *	0.0270	-0.0302	
coverage	-0.0010	0.0250	0.0002	-0.01036	0.0026	0.0000 *	-0.0040	-0.0000	
cons	6 9212 ***	16 8183 ***	5 0483 ***	7 7475 ***	7 0513 ***	9.0586 ***	5 9821 ***	6.0418 ***	
	0.0212	10.0103	0.0400	1.1415	1.0010	0.0000	0.0021	0.0410	
N of obs	163	163	667	667	75	75	355	355	
R-sq.	0.89	0.91	0.05	0.13	0.61	0.63	0.22	0.46	

Note: *,** and *** - significant at 10%, 5% and 1%

Source: Own calculation based on Bankscope data

Quiet –life test (Hicks, 1935: *The best thing about monopoly is quiet life*)

Variables: Coccorese and Pellechina (2010)

Table 3: Testing out the quiet life hypothesis

	Competition efficiency frontier							
	Pre-crisis period		Crisis period		Pre-crisis period		Crisis period	
	OLS	Country f.e.	OLS	Country f.e.	OLS	Country f.e.	OLS	Country f.e.
Dep: Bank efficie	ency							
market power	0.0680	-0.0254	0.0629 *	0.0898 ***	-0.1522 ***	-0.1537 **	0.0524	-0.0461
market share	0.0601	-0.2678 **	-0.1359	-0.3587 ***	0.0967	0.1187	-0.3088	-0.1387
loan to deposit	0.0898 ***	0.0630 ***	0.0001	0.0005	-0.0011	0.0551 *	0.0273	-0.0051
regulation	-0.1359	-0.0097	-0.0002	-0.1792	0.0684	0.0778	-0.1190	-0.4571 **
Liquidity	-0.0016 ***	-0.0009 *	-0.0003	-0.0004 **	-0.0015 ***	-0.0016 *	-0.0013	-0.0012 **
credit growth	0.0000	-0.0004	0.0002	0.0002	0.0003	-0.0003	-0.0008	0.0001
equity to assets	0.0003	0.0029	0.0037 **	0.0042 ***	0.0033	0.0047 *	-0.0045	0.0040 *
_cons	0.6734 ***	0.8415 ***	0.6680 ***	0.7848 ***	0.7611 ***	0.7032 ***	0.7863 ***	0.7999 ***
N of obs	286	286	636	636	290	290	414	414
R-sq.	0.12	0.41	0.03	0.36	0.09	0.14	0.09	0.34

Note: *,** and *** - significant at 10%, 5% and 1%

Conclusion

Market power and stability of CEE banks

- CEE banks risk-build-up happened in the period of increasing competition. Franchise value and Z-score decreased together after 2008.
- Banks with more market power have higher franchise value and higher stability. In good times, they do enjoy their Quiet life.
- Their stability is the result of portfolio stability (better credit risk management)
- No evidence of market power leading to higher prices no evidence of risk shifting (no risk and no shifting)
- We find evidence of franchise value being disciplining mechanism leading to competition fragility relationship
- □ Informational rents instead of economic rents?

Technically

- Perhaps researchers reached an agreement on the indicators to soon to attend the techniques in this area?
- Perhaps Lerner index of market power has to much of market power?
- Higher prices are not the only way to exercise your market power
- Future work dynamic panel and allowing for the nonlinearity of the relationship

- Franchise value seems to be a functional self-disciplining mechanism.
- More competition in banking does not mean higher social welfare.
- However, competition on CEE banking markets is increasing (especially with market shrinking) leading to franchise value decreasing.
- □ Should someone take the role of franchise value in CEE?
- □ The effect of joining Bank union?

Thank you