

Mitchell H. Holt  
Dec 2008  
Senior Thesis



# MACROECONOMICS AND LOAN DEFAULT RATES

# Default Loans

- All lending institutions experience losses from default loans
- They must take steps to minimize their losses
  - Only lend to low risk individuals

# Low Risk Lending

- Application factors
  - Income
  - Job History
  - Home status
  - Purpose of Loan
  - FICO Scores
    - Likely the most significant factor in deciding credit worthiness

# FICO Scores

- Produced by Fair Isaac Company for use by the three credit Bureaus Equifax, Experian, Transunion.
- Calculated based on past credit management
- Indicates how well an applicant has managed their debts in the past

# Low Risk Lending

- Interest rates are calculated based on risk factors largely determined by credit scores
- Low risk individuals pay low interest rates
- High risk individuals pay high interest rates
- High risk lending generates more revenue
  - Dealing with high risks loans ultimately leads to high default rates

# Default Loans

- All lending institutions experience losses from default loans
- They must take steps to minimize their losses
  - Only lend to low risk individuals
  - Utilize collection departments and collection agencies
  - Use legal action to recover losses

# Allowance for Loan Loss

- Creditors must be prepared for their losses
- Loan loss accounts minimize the effects of charge-offs
- How then are the allowances for loan-loss made?

# Allocation Methods

- Allocations are made using historic charge-off rates
  - Based on loan types
  - Based on credit scores
  - Expected risk amount
- All have one underlying assumption
  - Default rates tends to remain constant
  - Stated Differently
    - Little variability exists in charge-off rates





# Hypothesis

This paper proposes that there does exist variability in charge-off rates and that the variability can be explained by macroeconomic indicators

# Variability

- Observed portfolio default rates vary from \$0.00 to \$200,000.00
  - Rate 0% - 0.27%
- 95% confidence intervals \$36,225.89 to \$57,961.42
  - $0.05\% < \mu < 0.08\%$
- The same analysis can be performed for various categories of loans

# Analysis

- Demonstrates loan types with low risk and those with high risk
- Those categories that have the highest mean charge-off rate tend to experience a greater degree of variability
- If there were no exogenous factors then the charge-off rate would be constant
  - There must be other variables that create the risk of default

# Exogenous Variables

- What causes loans to go default?
- Characteristics of people who fit in high risk categories
  - Young, little job history, they don't own property, hold unsecured debt
- These individuals tend to be less responsible money managers
- They are therefore more susceptible to economic conditions

# Economic Indicators

- Unemployment and inflation
  - Taken together form the Misery index
- Retail Sales as a measure of regional product
  - Food Sales as a measure of spending on consumer staples
  - Apparel Sales as a measure of discretionary spending
- Home Prices as a measure of consumer wealth
- Leading vs. Lagging indicators

# Regression Analysis

- Average  $R^2$  value is about .2
- The largest  $R^2$  value is .4463
- The  $R^2$  tends to be higher in loan categories with higher average charge-off rates
  - This demonstrates that economic conditions do tend to explain a significant amount of variation in high risk loans

# Factor Analysis

- Examine the underlying structure of the variables and identifies salient factors
- Aids in building a model by limiting covariance
- Simplifies model by reducing the number of variables
- The factors we select will have eigenvalues greater than one and explain at least 70% of the original variability


# Factor Analysis

- Analysis categories using economic variables
  - Analysis is performed at with four different lead times for indicators
- Yields 12 factors
- The first and fourth factors are relatively constant
  - It is interesting that underlying structure changes, however, it is beyond this research to explain this.





# Factor One

- Loan categories with high default rates tend to load onto factor one
  - Their default ratios are correlated and vary together
    - This means that they tend to exhibit similar default patterns
    - This supports the idea that economic indicators impact default rates
- 

# Factor Four

- Economic indicators load onto factor four almost exclusively
  - They are general measures of economic performance
- A model would then include a single variable that represented economic conditions
  - Likely even if other indicators were considered they would be included in factor four

# Constructing the Factors

- Considered using two different methods
  - ▣ Use loading scores for each variable as a coefficient for that variable
  - ▣ Add the variables together
- Found that very little difference existed between the two methods for ease of use the additive model was utilized



# Hypothesis

This paper proposes that there does exist variability in charge-off rates and that the variability can be explained by macroeconomic indicators

# Constructing the Model

- It has been established that there does exist variability in charge-off rates
- It has been established that the variability can be partially explained by economic conditions
- It is therefore appropriate to construct a model that utilizes the economic indicators to predict charge-off rates

# Constructing the Model

- In order to construct the model a multivariate regression is performed comparing the twelve factors and the portfolio charge-offs by month
- The following  $R^2$  values were returned
  - No lead .4676
  - One Quarter lead .4935
  - Two Quarters lead .4935
  - One Year lead .4622

# Testing the Model

- Using the regression line the expected charge-off rates were computed
- Also a model that utilized historic charge-offs was used to compute expected charge-offs
- The average over/under for the models was compared

# Testing the Model

- Average over/under for historical method was \$25,872.95
- The over/under at each time interval was
  - No Lead \$17,398.74
  - One Quarter \$16,295.20
  - Two Quarters \$17,132.74
  - One Year \$16,254.59
- The model with one year lead reduced average over/under by 60%



# Conclusions

- There is significant variation in charge-off rates
- Economic conditions do explain a portion of this variation
- A model that utilizes economic variables serves as a better predictor of charge-offs

# Further Research

- Examining the loan category of DTI and unsecured debt
- Examining other economic indicators
- Examining the indicators with different intervals for each indicator