The Impact of non Interest Income on Bank Risk in Australia

Williams, Barry

Licence:
CC BY-NC-ND

[Link to output in Bond University research repository.](#)

Recommended citation(APA):
Williams, B. (2012). *The Impact of non Interest Income on Bank Risk in Australia*. Poster session presented at Research Week 2012, Gold Coast, Queensland, Australia.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

For more information, or if you believe that this document breaches copyright, please contact the Bond University research repository coordinator.

Barry Williams, School of Business, Bond University, Globalisation and Development Center, Bond University.
Visiting Researcher, KOF Institute, ETH Zurich.

How has bank income diversification impacted upon bank risk?

The last two decades has seen bank revenue evolve away from the ‘traditional intermediation model’ towards increased income from non interest income.

What are the benefits of this study?

- \$ Provides more information about the factors impacting upon bank risk.
- \$ Banks are under increased scrutiny post GFC and increased regulation; these debates should be informed by facts.

All Banks Revenue Composition

Bank fees on deposit and loan accounts are only a small proportion of total revenue

Interest Income is still the most important

What is new about this study?

- \$ No Australian evidence to date.
- \$ Applies data drawn from the confidential quarterly return provided by all Australian bank to the Australian Prudential regulation Authority (APRA).
- \$ These data has not been analysed by external researchers.
- \$ Applies new measure of bank revenue risk.

Research Design and Method.

- \$ Data covers 2002 to 2008.
- \$ All banks in Australia.
- \$ Feasible GLS estimation to control for autocorrelation and heteroscedasticity.

Model Design

- \$ Four measures of bank risk (i) volatility of Return on assets, (ii) volatility of return on equity (iii) distance to default (z score) (iv) distance to breach of capital regulations (regulatory z score)
- \$ Volatility measured using range based variables ($\log [\text{high value} - \text{low value}]$)
- \$ Controls for portfolio composition, size and bank type.
- \$ Break revenue into six categories to determine which contribute to bank risk or risk reduction.

First stage results:

\$ Does revenue diversification reduce bank risk?

[illegible]

***, **, * significant at 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively

\$ Answer:

\$ NO

\$ Increased revenue concentration is associated with lower risk

Second stage Results:
Which components of revenue increase or decrease bank risk?

	Range based on the number of banks	Range based on the number of banks (1/2 sample)	Regularity
Weight Net Income based on the number of banks	0.0000*** (0.0040)	0.0000*** (0.0038)	0.230** (0.031)
Weight Trading and investment income based on the number of banks	-0.0033*** (0.0010)	-0.0050*** (0.0010)	0.138 (0.004)
Weight Investment Bank fees based on the number of banks	0.0000*** (0.0008)	0.0000*** (0.0004)	0.000*** (0.000)
Weight Interest Other based on the number of banks	0.0038*** (0.0037)	0.0029*** (0.0047)	0.000*** (0.40)
Weight Real Estate and other based on the number of banks	0.0000*** (0.0000)	0.0000*** (0.0000)	0.000*** (0.000)
Log Capital Ratio	0.0000*** (0.253)	0.0000*** (0.301)	0.000*** (0.48)
Log Bank resources	0.0000*** (0.253)	0.0000*** (0.277)	0.000*** (0.48)
Major Banks	0.0000*** (0.56)	0.0000*** (0.56)	0.000*** (0.51)
Other Domestic Banks	0.0000*** (0.56)	0.0000*** (0.56)	0.000*** (0.51)
Foreign Bank	0.0000*** (0.56)	0.0000*** (0.56)	0.000*** (0.51)
Constant	0.0000*** (0.253)	0.0000*** (0.253)	0.000*** (0.51)
Observations	2,229	1,115	2,229
Number of Banks	38	19	38

***, **, * significant at 1%, 5% and 10% levels respectively

Overall results

- \$ Trading and investment revenue reduce bank risk.
- \$ Decreasing returns to scale in risk reduction
- \$ Bigger banks are less risky, but only up to a point, the major banks are most likely beyond that point. (This applies ONLY to risk reduction and scale.)
- \$ Model does not work as well for distance to default (z score) measure.
- \$ Australian banks are well-capitalized and so the marginal impact of revenue changes on risk are small.
- \$ Specialisation is risk reducing but non interest income is riskier than traditional revenue.

Implications

- \$ Bank revenue composition is important in determining bank risk.
- \$ Non interest income (except for Trading and Investment income) is risk increasing.
- \$ Australian banks are well capitalised and marginal changes in revenue composition is unlikely to change their level of risk.
- \$ Choosing banks for peer analysis should consider revenue composition.