

# Impact of Financial Leverage on Profitability of Automobile and Allied Companies of Pakistan 

Muhammad Zahid Farid ${ }^{1}$ and Asma Rafique Chughtai ${ }^{2}$<br>${ }^{1}$ Master of Commerce, Virtual University of Pakistan.<br>${ }^{2}$ Department of Management Sciences, Virtual University of Pakistan, Pakistan.

## ARTICLE INFO

## Article history:

Received: 29 May 2015;
Received in revised form:
20 June 2015;
Accepted: 3 July 2015;

## Keywords

Financial Leverage,
Profitability,
Capital Structure,
Regression Model,
Housman Test,
Random Effect Model,
Automobile, Pakistan.


#### Abstract

Financial leverage is an index of how much company uses equity and debt to finance their cash-flow and improving the financial condition of the company. The objective of this study is to empirically investigate the relationship between the leverage and profitability of 13 Automobiles and allied companies listed on Karachi Stock Exchange companies from year 2010 to 2014. A Cross sectional random effect estimation for the dependent and independent variables were carried out in order to understand the direction of the impact between them. The results indicated a negative correlation between the leverage and profitability for automobile and allied companies of Pakistan.
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## Introduction

One of the major financial management decisions is the balanced capital management and financing its assets. Capital structure (the combination of a company debt and equity) is important as there are various costs associated with the debt that the company borrows for financing (ACCA, 2009). The objective of the capital structure decision is not only to increase the value of the company but also to increase the wealth of the shareholders (Umar, M., Tanveer, Z., Aslam, S., \& Sajid, M. 2012). According to Watson and Head (2013), a great deal of care is needed while making the capital structure and borrowing decisions because any unbalanced capital structure may bring in significant risk to the company or even to the point of failure. The purpose of this paper is to empirically investigate the relationship between the leverage and profitability of Automobile companies listed on Karachi Stock Exchange. A total of 13 companies after the screening were selected in automobile industry, including the assemblers and spare parts manufacturing companies from year 2010 to 2014. A regression model is employed keeping the leverage ratio independent variable and the profitability ratio as dependent variable to see the relationship. The results indicated the relationship between the profitability and financial leverage of the selected companies.

## Automobile Industry in Pakistan

In 1950 General Motors, USA, started an assembly operation and established National Motors Limited, a public limited company which gave rise to the automobile industry in Pakistan. Originally they were known as "General Motors" in Pakistan. The first vehicle developed in Pakistan was a Bedford truck in 1950 (Khalil, S. 2004). Long afterwards, car industry flourished in 1980s. When Suzuki started its assembly of FX 800cc to facilitate the middle class group and captured the large portion of the market. Subsequently, in 1990s, Indus motors
(Toyota) being the competitor of Suzuki entered the market and intensified the competition in the market. In commercial line, HinoPak started its industry in the late 1980s and became the market leader in commercial vehicles (Altinkaya, Z. 2013).

The growth in automobile sector was steady during the last couple of years as evident in Table-I. Altinkaya,Z. (2013) indicated that Pakistan has made a steady progress in this sector because of government's privatization policy, facilitation of healthy competition and development of engineering board whose sole purpose is to facilitate this prosperous industry. However, the automobile industry is faced with various challenges including unrestrained import of used cars which is considered to be a significant factor hampering the growth of this industry. Other factors such as obsolete infrastructure, substandard technology levels, insignificant human resource development, nonexistence of R\&D, lack of quality standards and certifications are preventing the automobile industry growth in the country as well (Altinkaya, Z. 2013). The consumption of automobiles in the country is lower than the countries of the region. However, the recovery in the industry would be a matter of consistency in policy by the government. Economic Survey of Pakistan (2013-14) indicated that the auto industry is currently not provided with any automobile policy yet there are some signs for the recovery of the economy and one important appearance of that effect is a considerable appreciation of Pak rupee. As this may grow, so would growth in the auto industry which is only subject to long term policy, which only is the key to sustainable growth.

## Research Objective

To investigate whether the financial leverage has an effect on financial performance, annual reports of listed automobile and allied companies is to be examined in order to examine the direction of impact being positive or negative (if any) that selected leverage factors variables possess on profitability.

## Significance of Study

The management and finance manager of the companies are always interested in keeping the balance, the use of financial leverage in order to maximize the profitability of the company. They will be benefited from this study in a way that they will get a better understanding that how the financial leverage can affect the profitability. Similarly, they will be able to understand that the while involving the debt to run the operations of the company and how the profitability of the company is affected by the utilization of the debt. The Investors have to consider the financial health of a company before making any investment decisions. The study will help them to understand the company financial health and their investment are safe or not. This study will help in understanding the future finance students who interested in the study of the impact of financial leverage and profitability of the similar or other sectors. The findings acquired from this study also suggested that modern finance and capital structure theories are applicable to Pakistan in some sectors. It is anticipated that the outcome of this study will not only benefit the corporate finance managers, but also the other stakeholders to understand the impact of forces that influence the leverage, profitability and overall capital structure of companies.
Conceptualization


## Data

In order to investigate the relationship between the financial leverage and profitability of automobile companies listed on Karachi Stock Exchange (KSE) during 2010-2014 the annual reports are taken from the companies' websites, Karachi Stock Exchange Data Portal Web Site and State Bank of Pakistan's publication and website. Initially, total 22 companies were selected for the analysis. However, some companies were found with incomplete data, such as incapable to publish annual accounts to any relevant platform. Thus, companies with any missing observations for any variable included in our model during the study period dropped from the sample including some outlier in the interest coverage ratio. Subsequent to this screening our total number of companies reduced to 13 as shown in Table II, thus leaving us with 61 company-years observations. Indicators of financial leverage are Debt to equity ratio (Total liabilities / total shareholders' equity) a degree to which the assets of the business are financed by the debts and the shareholders' equity of a business., Interest coverage ratio (earnings before interest and taxes (EBIT) / interest expenses) which shows that how easily a company can pay interest expenses on outstanding debt. These are taken as independent variables. Similarly the dependent variables indicating financial performance (profitability) includes Earnings per Share after Tax (portion of the company's distributable profit which is
allocated to each outstanding equity share), Net Profit Margin (revenue remaining after all operating expenses, interest, taxes and preferred stock dividends), and Return on Equity(rate of return on the ownership interest). Both leverage and profitability indicators are extracted from annual reports.

## Research Methodology

In this study we use panel data procedures because the sample contains data across companies and over time. In order to see the effects of the independent variables on the dependent variable the regression equation used for analysis is given below:
Model 1
$\mathrm{ROE}_{\mathrm{it}}=\alpha_{\mathrm{i}}+\mathrm{DE}_{\mathrm{it}} \beta_{1}+\mathrm{ICR}_{\mathrm{it}} \beta_{2}+\varepsilon_{\mathrm{it}}$

## Model 2

EPS $_{\text {it }}=\alpha_{i}+$ DE $_{\text {it }} \beta_{1}+\mathrm{ICR}_{\text {it }} \beta_{2}+\varepsilon_{\text {it }}$
Model 3
$\mathrm{NPM}_{\mathrm{it}}=\alpha_{\mathrm{i}}+\mathrm{DE}_{\mathrm{it}} \beta_{1}+\mathrm{ICR}_{\mathrm{it}} \beta_{2}+\varepsilon_{\mathrm{it}}$
Whereas
DE= Debt / Equity Ratio
ICR= Interest Coverage Ratio (Before tax)
EPS=Earning per share (After tax)
NPM $=$ Net profit margin (Before tax)
ROE=Return On Equity (Before tax)
As panel data consists of observation of the same crosssectional units over varied time periods, there was a concern that it could contain cross-sectional effects on each company. In order to address this problem two estimation methods, specifically, fixed effects and random effects were used to conclude the results. But the question arises that which one to use. Therefore, Housman test was used to determine which model is to be used for specific models best to explain our estimations. For interpretation of result Eviews 8 software was used to calculate the results between various models.

## Analysis \& Result

Initially the Housman test for all the models was carried out and its results are given in Table III. It is evident from the results that the estimations from the cross sectional random effect model is used which is supported by the Housman Test. Test results from cross-section random effects are shown in Table IV and Table V.

## Interpretation of Model 1 (ROE) estimations

Based on p-values in our model for listed companies ICR and ROE is statistically significant (sig. $<5 \%$ ), however, DE and ROE is found to be insignificant ( p -value $>5 \%$ ). Interpreting the coefficient value it is found that, although, the dependent variable Debt Equity ratio is in significant, its value is negative which indicates a negative correlation between the ROE and DE. The relationship between ICR and ROE is found to be positive and the coefficients value amounts to 0.001054 . This shows that for one time increase in the ICR, the ROE get increased by $0.1054 \%$. In Table V , value of R -squared (coefficient of determination) is $16.25 \%$ which indicates realization of the regression in predicting the values of the dependent variable within model 2.

## Interpretation of Model 2 (EPS) estimations

Probability value for ICR is also found to be significant as it is less than $5 \%$ significant level. For DE ratio is found to be $67.72 \%$ which is far more than significance level (0.05) thus becoming insignificant.

The coefficient value of DE is found to be negative value which shows negative relationship with the model. The relationship between ICR and EPS is found to be positive and the coefficients value amounts to 0.07676 . This shows that for one time increase in the ICR, the ROE get increased by $7.676 \%$.

Table I

| Production (P) \& Sale (S) of Vehicles in Pakistan 2010-14 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  | $2009-10$ | $2010-11$ | $2011-12$ | $2012-13$ | $2013-14$ |
| CAR | Production | 121647 | 133972 | 154255 | 120332 | 116281 |
|  | Sales | 123957 | 127944 | 157325 | 118830 | 118102 |
| TRUCK | Production | 3425 | 2901 | 2597 | 1923 | 2674 |
|  | Sales | 3620 | 2942 | 2394 | 1948 | 2663 |
| BUS | Production | 628 | 490 | 568 | 522 | 558 |
|  | Sales | 657 | 515 | 609 | 510 | 577 |
| JEEP | Production | 1172 | 883 | 451 | 1475 | 1217 |
|  | Sales | 1201 | 807 | 342 | 1438 | 1151 |
|  | Production | 71607 | 70770 | 48120 | 50859 | 34521 |
|  | Production | 15768 | 19142 | 20929 | 14517 | 17477 |
|  | Sales | 71512 | 69203 | 49745 | 50593 | 33584 |
| MOTOR-CYCLE: | Production | 736861 | 838665 | 828576 | 819556 | 771507 |
|  | Sales | 737768 | 835455 | 829893 | 820217 | 772046 |
|  |  | 16496 | 17746 | 21472 | 15042 | 17635 |

Source: http://www.pama.org.pk/images/stories/pdf/historical-data.pdf

## TABLE II

1. Atlas Battery Ltd.
2. Atlas Honda Ltd.
3. Baluchistan Wheels Ltd.
4. Bolan Castings Ltd.
5. Exide Pakistan Ltd.*
6. Ghandhara Industries Ltd.
7. Ghandhara Nissan Ltd.
8. Hinopak Motors Ltd.
9. Honda Atlas Cars (Pakistan) Ltd.
10. Indus Motor Company Ltd.
11. Millat Tractors Ltd.
12. Sazgar Engineering Works Ltd.
13. The General Tyre \& Rubber Co. of Pak. Ltd.

Table III

| Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROE | EPS | NP |
| Chi-Sq. Statistic | 2.315371 | 2.798622 | 3.780685 |
| Chi-Sq. d.f. | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Prob. | 0.3142 | 0.2468 | 0.151 |

Table IV

|  | Model 1 (ROE) |  |  | Model 2 (EPS) |  | Model 3 (NP) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Variable | DE | ICR | C | DE | ICR | C | DE | ICR | C |
| Coefficient | -0.00219 | 0.00105 | 0.19534 | -0.55904 | 0.07676 | 14.5712 | -0.0055 | 0.00015 | 0.05117 |
| Std. Error | 0.0236 | 0.00032 | 0.05894 | 1.33621 | 0.01429 | 5.23642 | 0.00471 | $6.1 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 0.01208 |
| t-Statistic | -0.09295 | 3.33595 | 3.31453 | -0.41838 | 5.37079 | 2.78266 | -1.16745 | 2.43664 | 4.23483 |
| Prob. | 0.9263 | 0.0015 | 0.0016 | 0.6772 | 0.0000 | 0.0073 | 0.2478 | 0.0179 | 0.0001 |

Table V

|  | $(\mathrm{ROE})$ | $(\mathrm{EPS})$ | $(\mathrm{NP})$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| Weighted Statistics |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.162539 | 0.332379 | 0.115126 |  |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.133661 | 0.309358 | 0.084613 |  |
| S.E. of regression | 0.214255 | 8.358751 | 0.040296 |  |
| F-statistic | 5.628487 | 14.43782 | 3.773027 |  |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.005834 | 0.000008 | 0.028811 |  |
| Mean dependent var | 0.152498 | 3.850704 | 0.027744 |  |
| S.D. dependent var | 0.231076 | 10.09792 | 0.04222 |  |
| Sum squared resid | 2.662499 | 4052.385 | 0.094179 |  |
| Durbin-Watson stat | 1.273147 | 1.703941 | 1.667822 |  |
| Unweighted Statistics |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.238153 | 0.311368 | 0.223916 |  |
| Sum squared resid | 3.487248 | 20859.68 | 0.139864 |  |
| Mean dependent var | 0.240351 | 17.01044 | 0.049913 |  |
| Durbin-Watson stat | 1.042133 | 0.703353 | 1.275202 |  |

R-squared value showing the coefficient of determination is $33.23 \%$.

## Interpretation of Model 3 (NP) estimations

Probability value for ICR is 1.79 \% which is significant and DE as interpreted in previous models is found to be insignificant having the value of $24.78 \%$.

The Coefficient value of DE shows the negative relationship. However the relationship between ICR and NP is found to be positive and the coefficients value amounts to 0.00015 . This shows that for one time increase in the ICR, the NP get increased by $0.15 \%$. Value of R-squared is $11.51 \%$ and adjusted R -squared value is $8.46 \%$.

## Conclusion

The capital structure decisions are critical for any business organization because the primary need of the organization is to maximize returns to their stakeholders and also because such decision impact has an impact on the competitiveness of the organization.

In this study, a sample of 13 companies in the automobile and allied companies were analyzed by using a cross-section random effects to interpret the impact of financial leverage and profitability of these companies.

The results indicated that there was an inverse relationship between the leverage and profitability.

The findings imply that an increase in debt position is associated with a decrease in profitability; thus, the higher the debt, the lower the profitability of the company. Also, because of the economic down turn, the revenue of the company seems to decrease thus default rate of the payment tends to increase therefore decreasing the profitability of the companies.

Moreover, it is observed that the interest coverage ratio has significant positive relationship with profitability, which shows that companies which are able to cover their interest charges tends to be more profitable.

## Recommendation

Based on these results it is suggested that the optimal capital structure of debt and equity should be employed by the companies' management in order to maximize their profit. This should be done keeping in view the performance of the company with the over emphasis on the debt for financing which should be avoided especially in the economically recession period. Every effort should be made by the top management and finance manager to make cautious financing decision in order to remain profitable and competitive. Also managers should be well aware of how and to what extent leverage should be used and how much the leverage has an effect on the profitability of their firm.

## Limitation

This study has the following limitations
a) This study is based on the secondary data confined to five years data from 2010 to 2014.
b) This empirical study has limited dependent and independent variables but future research will provide better output.
c) R squared value for the various models estimations did not exceeded $33.24 \%$ which indicate that there are various other factors and variable that are needed to be taken in account.
d) Outliers in the data sample for which the whole year was taken out of the consideration before making the interpretations.
e) The finding contains the insignificance of relationship. However the interpretation and the direction of impact provided the direction for the results and conclusions.
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## Appendix

| Company | Year | Total Debt / Equity Ratio DE | Interest Coverage Ratio (Before tax) ICR | Earning per (After tax) EPS | share | Net Profit Margin NP | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Return on } \\ & \text { Equity } \\ & \text { ROE } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Atlas Battery Limited | 2010 | 0.764622235 | 20.37820804 | 26.52026065 |  | 0.084804476 | 0.436634188 |
|  | 2011 | 0.843695034 | 15.82080158 | 35.20617893 |  | 0.08948155 | 0.528677237 |
|  | 2012 | 0.753635579 | 11.68991227 | 40.22237866 |  | 0.095557422 | 0.524596511 |
|  | 2013 | 0.852350972 | 16.93757011 | 40.19956678 |  | 0.09285154 | 0.475755228 |
|  | 2014 | 1.082197446 | 9.555220035 | 42.59539308 |  | 0.083540919 | 0.452364061 |
| Atlas Honda Limited | 2010 | 1.189789672 | 11.99551904 | 13.0982917 |  | 0.04215381 | 0.298687968 |
|  | 2011 | 1.081429746 | 18.53980551 | 16.02750982 |  | 0.043370859 | 0.331322897 |
|  | 2012 | 1.022241784 | 427.8777339 | 16.73884757 |  | 0.042618307 | 0.32263391 |
|  | 2013 | 0.83536991 | 2576.912485 | 19.43545687 |  | 0.052156985 | 0.369493095 |
|  | 2014 | 0.815319323 | 8965.726667 | 19.35620887 |  | 0.060465284 | 0.372431347 |
| Baluchistan Wheels Ltd. | 2010 | 0.313102278 | 13.77600758 | 6.273820148 |  | 0.10743348 | 0.198801469 |
|  | 2011 | 0.307095077 | 16.08831537 | 7.124258491 |  | 0.094563984 | 0.17122368 |
|  | 2012 | 0.207904448 | 12.53990644 | 7.695792055 |  | 0.107967534 | 0.183717467 |
|  | 2013 | 0.182224656 | 4.951614645 | 4.189121289 |  | 0.031419143 | 0.038795729 |
|  | 2014 | 0.141557975 | 33.15277254 | 5.137427537 |  | 0.074220781 | 0.086378273 |
| Bolan Castings Ltd. | 2010 | 1.204160588 | 4.074171862 | 7.161211593 |  | 0.073630175 | 0.295472248 |
|  | 2011 | 0.894671021 | 4.883890196 | 6.816735672 |  | 0.063595039 | 0.250363515 |
|  | 2012 | 1.013479657 | 2.637820132 | 4.062584441 |  | 0.040012432 | 0.129877121 |
|  | 2013 | 1.421402787 | 1.724637367 | 1.940379168 |  | 0.019141751 | 0.061460009 |
|  | 2014 | 1.338485752 | -1.944745156 | -9.198169536 |  | -0.131696764 | -0.296414147 |
| Exide Pakistan Ltd. | 2010 | 1.525747369 | 4.960777662 | 34.91867113 |  | 0.049046272 | 0.284898156 |
|  | 2011 | 1.509065918 | 4.742801401 | 48.9194499 |  | 0.055725692 | 0.312709371 |
|  | 2012 | 1.087659247 | 4.471613118 | 45.33090734 |  | 0.052919988 | 0.28763608 |
|  | 2013 | 0.631379701 | 20.65851749 | 62.54099838 |  | 0.067602697 | 0.35668165 |
|  | 2014 | 1.24674967 | 7.258434191 | 51.6298947 |  | 0.052049876 | 0.239393203 |
| Ghandhara Nissan Ltd. | 2010 | 1.082427514 | 0.060437222 | -3.518048997 |  | -0.051446818 | -0.074543799 |
|  | 2011 | 0.804400102 | 0.909160202 | -0.846241875 |  | -0.005846265 | -0.009306343 |
|  | 2012 | 0.829236623 | 0.010544548 | -2.430931615 |  | -0.0703767 | -0.06407699 |
|  | 2013 | 0.647348368 | 1.229979333 | 0.227409588 |  | 0.009552228 | 0.013207501 |
|  | 2014 | 0.828476494 | 7.828585897 | 3.864896395 |  | 0.102940559 | 0.167267184 |
| Ghandhara Industries Ltd | 2010 | 0.706988897 | 3.234585212 | 6.363145641 |  | 0.056518989 | 0.083756068 |
|  | 2011 | 1.017027797 | 1.170220612 | 0.363539926 |  | 0.004810545 | 0.004718774 |
|  | 2012 | 1.136277603 | 0.702293543 | -1.459088263 |  | -0.021978664 | -0.026199961 |
|  | 2013 | 1.072750105 | 2.121076727 | 5.995756745 |  | 0.065115085 | 0.100882028 |
|  | 2014 | 0.840907448 | 1.097003159 | 1.129672744 |  | 0.006411673 | 0.007874924 |
| The General Tyre \& Rubber Co. of Pak. Ltd. | 2010 | 2.617255217 | 2.594351603 | 3.652692557 |  | 0.064400807 | 0.335066438 |
|  | 2011 | 2.922622365 | 2.269871554 | 4.326494761 |  | 0.05287164 | 0.282358537 |
|  | 2012 | 2.589918945 | 1.659609594 | 3.391848088 |  | 0.031680901 | 0.165193955 |
|  | 2013 | 2.348596885 | 3.034200595 | 6.618583349 |  | 0.071013701 | 0.349589651 |
|  | 2014 | 2.231509756 | 4.552546364 | 8.595118891 |  | 0.086934648 | 0.391275199 |
| Hinopak Motors Ltd | 2010 | 2.234285779 | -1.708618899 | -11.94055126 |  | -0.01172046 | -0.070093219 |
|  | 2011 | 0.800648606 | 1.347711835 | -2.430527555 |  | 0.004362291 | 0.018813832 |
|  | 2012 | 1.646876236 | 2.009992779 | 2.073286776 |  | 0.019783278 | 0.068587247 |
|  | 2013 | 1.007691392 | 1.432409098 | 2.353918359 |  | 0.006386704 | 0.019041584 |
|  | 2014 | 1.226629992 | 199.7665816 | 50.31514604 |  | 0.101537289 | 0.316643638 |
| Honda Atlas Cars (Pakistan) Ltd. | 2010 | 3.528031605 | -2.843457626 | -5.967787115 |  | -0.062316838 | -0.411359241 |
|  | 2011 | 5.304239882 | -0.620716135 | -2.09 |  | -0.011115309 | -0.134047554 |
|  | 2012 | 7.413598221 | -2.312507471 | -3.726981793 |  | -0.030049143 | -0.35565132 |
|  | 2013 | 10.0987408 | 3.799322594 | 1.710693277 |  | 0.017335223 | 0.421117289 |
|  | 2014 | 4.15108982 | 62.81278552 | 7.518697479 |  | 0.05356505 | 1.116775926 |
| Indus Motor Company Ltd. | 2010 | 1.15595075 | 68.48370363 | 43.80919847 |  | 0.087240226 | 0.458172024 |
|  | 2011 | 0.900516075 | 161.9797745 | 34.90310433 |  | 0.065012657 | 0.300401805 |
|  | 2012 | 0.620779837 | 281.4579464 | 54.74192112 |  | 0.082017286 | 0.405496702 |
|  | 2013 | 0.418954507 | 18407.57407 | 42.71685751 |  | 0.077860677 | 0.286383362 |
|  | 2014 | 0.311061019 | 179161.6071 | 49.2805598 |  | 0.087910596 | 0.266771496 |
| Millat Tractors Ltd. | 2010 | 1.806477043 | 390.1103207 | 78.01181533 |  | 0.150298859 | 0.882324662 |
|  | 2011 | 0.845345765 | 438.4968146 | 72.95996503 |  | 0.157432427 | 0.885119727 |
|  | 2012 | 0.982957891 | 317.6679515 | 54.02516015 |  | 0.142816591 | 0.582735881 |
|  | 2013 | 1.099758185 | 51.8807107 | 53.11294889 |  | 0.139786809 | 0.628845744 |
|  | 2014 | 0.56379725 | 28.67121204 | 33.45594112 |  | 0.131614257 | 0.466402231 |
| Sazgar Engineering Works Ltd | 2010 | 1.101612131 | 8.935640939 | 3.20450334 |  | 0.043742371 | 0.237701388 |
|  | 2011 | 1.1501655 | 12.19844964 | 6.090938803 |  | 0.058116831 | 0.377388327 |


|  | 2012 | 1.006878012 | 21.7285482 | 7.015446156 | 0.071555633 | 0.415451359 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | 2013 | 0.799073879 | 13.89569876 | 3.700516148 | 0.051071451 | 0.179086425 |
|  | 2014 | 0.669988975 | 19.54856169 | 3.363011096 | 0.041611625 | 0.153744806 |

## Graphical Representation of Data




Hausman Tests and Cross-sectional Random Effect

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test
Equation: Model 1 (ROE)
Test cross-section random effects

| Test Summary | Chi-Sq. Statistic | Chi-Sq. d.f. | Prob. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cross-section random | 2.315371 | 2 | 0.3142 |

Dependent Variable: ROE
Method: Panel EGLS (Cross-section random effects)
Date: 12/22/14 Time: 15:30
Sample: 20102014 IF ICR<1000
Periods included: 5
Cross-sections included: 13
Total panel (unbalanced) observations: 61
Swamy and Arora estimator of component variances

| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | ---: |
| DE | -0.002193 | 0.023597 | -0.092950 | 0.9263 |
| ICR | 0.001054 | 0.000316 | 3.335948 | 0.0015 |
| C | 0.195341 | 0.058935 | 3.314531 | 0.0016 |
| Weighted Statistics |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.162539 | Mean dependent var | 0.152498 |  |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.133661 | S.D. dependent var | 0.231076 |  |
| S.E. of regression | 0.214255 | Sum squared resid | 2.662499 |  |
| F-statistic | 5.628487 | Durbin-Watson stat | 1.273147 |  |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.005834 |  |  |  |
|  | Unweighted Statistics |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.238153 | Mean dependent var |  |  |
| Sum squared resid | 3.487248 | Durbin-Watson stat | 1.042133 |  |

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test
Equation: Model 2 (EPS)
Test cross-section random effects

| Test Summary | Chi-Sq. Statistic | Chi-Sq. d.f. | Prob. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cross-section random | 2.798622 | 2 | 0.2468 |

Dependent Variable: EPS

Method: Panel EGLS (Cross-section random effects)
Date: 12/22/14 Time: 15:31
Sample: 20102014 IF ICR<1000
Periods included: 5
Cross-sections included: 13
Total panel (unbalanced) observations: 61
Swamy and Arora estimator of component variances

| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DE | -0.559043 | 1.336209 | -0.418380 | 0.6772 |
| ICR | 0.076760 | 0.014292 | 5.370788 | 0.0000 |
| C | 14.57118 | 5.236416 | 2.782663 | 0.0073 |
| Weighted Statistics |  |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.332379 | Mean dependent var | 3.850704 |  |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.309358 | S.D. dependent var | 10.09792 |  |
| S.E. of regression | 8.358751 | Sum squared resid | 4052.385 |  |
| F-statistic | 14.43782 | Durbin-Watson stat | 1.703941 |  |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.000008 |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Unweighted Statistics |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.311368 | Mean dependent var | 17.01044 |  |
| Sum squared resid | 20859.68 | Durbin-Watson stat | 0.703353 |  |

Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test
Equation: Model 3 (NP)
Test cross-section random effects

| Test Summary | Chi-Sq. Statistic | Chi-Sq. d.f. | Prob. |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cross-section random | 3.780685 | 2 | 0.1510 |

Dependent Variable: NP
Method: Panel EGLS (Cross-section random effects)
Date: 05/19/15 Time: 17:28
Sample: 20102014 IF ICR<1000
Periods included: 5
Cross-sections included: 13
Total panel (unbalanced) observations: 61
Swamy and Arora estimator of component variances

| Variable | Coefficient | Std. Error | t-Statistic | Prob. |
| :--- | ---: | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| DE | -0.005502 | 0.004713 | -1.167448 | 0.2478 |
| ICR | 0.000148 | $6.06 \mathrm{E}-05$ | 2.436637 | 0.0179 |
| C | 0.051170 | 0.012083 | 4.234827 | 0.0001 |
|  | Weighted Statistics |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.115126 | Mean dependent var | 0.027744 |  |
| Adjusted R-squared | 0.084613 | S.D. dependent var | 0.042220 |  |
| S.E. of regression | 0.040296 | Sum squared resid | 0.094179 |  |
| F-statistic | 3.773027 | Durbin-Watson stat | 1.667822 |  |
| Prob(F-statistic) | 0.028811 |  |  |  |
|  | Unweighted Statistics |  |  |  |
| R-squared | 0.223916 | Mean dependent var | 0.049913 |  |
| Sum squared resid | 0.139864 | Durbin-Watson stat | 1.275202 |  |

