

Bond University
Research Repository



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.



The impact of non interest income on bank risk in Australia

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



Research Question

How has bank income diversification impacted upon bank risk?


Background

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.



Specialisation reduces bank risk

Size effects

Bank type

Non interest income increases risk

Research Design and Method.

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

First stage results:

Does revenue diversification reduce bank risk?

	Range based volatility of ROA	Range based volatility of Return	Regulatory Z score	Range based volatility of Z score	Range based volatility of Z score	Regulatory Z score
Constant	-0.0000*** (1.63e-05)	-0.0440*** (1.43e-05)	0.0000*** (2.72e-05)	-0.0000*** (5.05e-05)	-0.0000*** (5.05e-05)	0.0000*** (0.00119)
Log Average Revenue	-0.402*** (0.227)	0.252 (0.206)	-0.110*** (0.0422)	-0.684 (0.276)	-0.365 (0.276)	0.540*** (0.0000)
Log Average Revenue ²	0.00084 (0.00023)	0.00007 (0.00044)	0.0000*** (0.00019)	0.198 (0.00716)	0.00005 (0.00023)	0.00314** (0.00191)
Major Bank	0.730*** (0.125)	0.016*** (0.126)	-0.219 (0.0325)	-0.421 (0.686)	0.581*** (0.158)	-0.0961 (0.0071)
Other Domestic Bank	0.018*** (0.0057)	0.044*** (0.0023)	-0.00043 (0.0220)	0.028 (0.185)	0.0228 (0.0776)	-0.107 (0.0051)
Foreign Bank	-0.141* (0.062)	0.0023 (0.062)		-0.190** (0.0816)	0.0481 (0.0742)	
Non-Interest Income and Fees (%)				0.0152** (0.00704)	0.00704** (0.00307)	0.00190** (0.00371)
Constant	5.812*** (2.201)	7.330*** (1.565)	1.161*** (0.403)	58.07 (2.682)	2.384 (2.300)	4.119* (0.477)
Observations	1,229	1,229	559	507	1,229	559
Number of Banks	58	58	25	25	58	25
Wald chi2	196.5	110.6	68.85	4.174	200.3	77.07

***, **, * 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?

- Increases Risk
- Decreases Risk
- Increases Risk
- Increases Risk

	Range based volatility of ROA	Range based volatility of Return	Regulatory Z score	Regulatory Z score
Weight Non Interest Income from banking activity	0.0000*** (0.0000)	0.0000*** (0.0000)	0.00108 (0.00178)	2.027** (0.039)
Weight Trading and Investment Income	-0.0033** (0.00156)	-0.0050*** (0.00136)	0.00188** (0.00090)	0.158 (0.237)
Weight Investment Banking Fees	0.004*** (0.0000)	0.00818** (0.00304)	0.00154** (0.00070)	0.184 (0.243)
Weight Interest Other	0.00208 (0.0007)	-0.00482* (0.00202)	-0.00205 (0.00044)	0.482 (1.64)
Weight Non Interest Income other	0.0039*** (0.0008)	0.0116*** (0.00202)	0.00218*** (0.00056)	-0.204 (0.10)
Log Average Revenue	-0.589*** (0.028)	0.187 (0.041)	-0.621 (0.040)	36.36 (28.75)
Log Average Revenue ²	0.0054** (0.00004)	0.0177*** (0.00004)	0.00194 (0.00010)	-0.889 (0.048)
Major Bank	0.131 (0.164)	0.366** (0.146)	-0.0454 (0.040)	-0.791 (1.01)
Other Domestic Bank	-0.224** (0.081)	-0.018 (0.074)	-0.0312 (0.036)	4.181 (1.48)
Foreign Bank	0.232** (0.078)	-0.078 (0.040)		
Constant	5.386** (2.42)	7.317*** (2.44)	0.380 (0.15)	44.23 (25.5)
Observations	1,229	1,229	559	507
Number of Banks	58	58	25	25
Wald chi2	203.4	80.9	77.99	12.55

***, **, * 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.

