Chapter 16: Financial Distress, Managerial Incentives, and Information

I. Basic Ideas

1. As debt increases, chance of bankruptcy increases
   
   => bankruptcy costs make debt less attractive

2. As debt increases, creditors become more concerned that stockholders will try to exploit them
   
   => decrease in issue price (increase in interest rates) makes debt less attractive

3. Debt motivates managers to work harder for stockholders
   
   => makes debt more attractive

4. Capital structure changes reveal management’s private information about the firm
   
   => debt issues reveal management’s confidence
   => equity issues reveal management’s belief that equity is overvalued

II. The Costs of Bankruptcy and Financial Distress

Note: In perfect markets, bankruptcy does not affect capital structure decisions

   Reason: creditors simply take control of the firm

   => no loss of value
   => no cost

   => need to look at cash flows that go to someone besides stockholders and creditors in bankruptcy

A. Direct Costs of Bankruptcy

   Direct costs: costs stemming from the bankruptcy process

   Primary source of costs: cost to hire outside experts

   Ex. accountants, lawyers, investment bankers

   Results of studies of average cost as a percent of pre-bankruptcy value: 3-4% but 12% for small firms
   => many of costs fixed
Chapter 16: Financial Distress, Managerial Incentives, and Information

B. Indirect Costs of Financial Distress

Indirect costs: costs to the firm associated with an increased chance of bankruptcy

Notes:

1) stem from changes in behavior towards the firm
2) difficult to measure

Examples: loss of customers, loss of suppliers and trade credit, loss of best employees, more difficulty collecting from customers, fire sale of assets, loss of value as management fights fires rather than maximizing value, losses by creditors as we default on what we owe them.

Results of studies of indirect financial distress costs: 10-20% of firm value

C. Expected Financial Distress Costs

\[ E(\text{Financial Distress Costs}) = \text{probability of distress} \times \text{financial distress costs} \]

Notes:

1) Probability of distress increases with:
   a) amount of debt relative to cash flow and assets
   b) volatility of cash flows and asset values

2) Distress costs vary by industry and firm

III. Agency and Debt

Agency: conflicts of interest within the firm

=> conflicts primarily stem from an unequal sharing of the costs and benefits of some action

A. Stockholder-Bondholder Conflict and the Agency Cost of Debt

Note: all of the following issues are more significant if the firm is in financial distress
1. Excessive Risk Taking

Basic idea: shareholders may gain at the expense of bondholders if the firm invests in high risk projects even if the project has a negative NPV

Reason: unequal sharing of upside and downside of risk

1) Bondholder claim: fixed
   
   => downside risk: hurts them
   => upside risk: doesn’t really help them.

2) Stockholder claim: residual with limited liability
   
   => upside risk: stockholders benefit from upside
   => downside risk: doesn’t hurt once value falls below what owed the creditors
   => net result: stockholders prefer high risk while bondholders prefer low risk

Ex. Assume two projects cost $100 each. Assume also that a year from today there is a 50% chance that Project #1 will pay off $120 and a 50% chance that Project #1 will pay off $90. Finally, assume that a year from today there is a 50% chance that Project #2 will pay off $121 and a 50% chance that Project #2 will pay off $0.

Note: Expected payoff on #1 is 105 and on #2 is 60.5.

Q: Which is the better project for stockholders if firm has no debt?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference: -90 1

=> stockholders are better off with project 1

Q: Which is the better project for stockholders if firm owes $100 to bondholders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference: -90 0

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Difference: 0 1

=> stockholders are better off with project 2
2. Under-investment in positive NPV projects

Basic idea: stockholders MAY prefer the firm reject positive NPV projects

Reason:

1) if default is likely, bondholders get much (even all) of the project’s benefit
   => bondholders paid first
   => stockholders may have net loss if they provide funding

2) problem can be solved if can get creditors to help fund the project
   => will be hard to do since default already likely

Ex. Assume a firm has no cash but existing assets that have a 50% chance of paying $120 and a 50% chance of paying $80. A project costing $10 will provide an immediate risk-free payoff of $20.

Q: Will stockholders provide $10 of funding so project can be accepted if the firm has no debt?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

=> stockholders better off if fund project

Q: Will stockholders provide $10 of funding so project can be accepted if the firm owes $130 to bondholders?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reject</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

=> stockholders worse off if fund project

=> 50% chance of only getting back what invested and 50% chance of getting nothing back

3. Cashing Out

Basic idea: stockholders gain at the expense of bondholders when the firm pays out cash to stockholders
Reason: when firm pays out cash, the combined value of the firm’s outstanding stock and bonds falls by the amount of cash paid out

=> as long as bonds drop in value, the drop in stock value < cash paid out
=> since stockholders get all of the cash paid out (dividends, stock repurchases), stockholders have a net gain

Q: Why would bond prices tend to drop when the firm pays out cash to stockholders?

Ex. Assume a firm has $10 of cash and assets that will pay $120 or $150 a year from today. Assume the interest rate equals 10%.

Q: Are stockholders better or worse off if the firm pays out a $10 dividend today?

=> stockholders indifferent to the dividend
=> receive $10 now but give up $11 a year from today
=> same present value

Q: How does the answer change if the firm owes $150 to bondholders?

=> stockholders better off with dividend

=> receive $10 now for sure
=> if economy good, give up $11 a year from today (PV equals $10)
=> if economy weak, give up nothing

4. Agency Costs, Covenants, and Debt

Debt covenant: agreement in debt contract that places restrictions on the firm

Role of debt covenants: attempt to prevent actions that would benefit stockholders at the expense of bondholders
Q: Why would stockholders want to protect bondholders against these problems?

Benefit of covenants: increases issue price (lower interest rate) for debt compared to if bondholder interests are not protected
Cost of covenants: reduces management flexibility

B. Stockholder-Manager Conflict and the Agency Benefit of Debt

Key idea: the interests of managers and owners may not be the same

1. Ownership and the Sharing of Benefits and Costs

   a. Basic ideas

      1) if the manager is also the owner, the goal of the manager and the goal of the owner is the same
         => same person!
      2) if the manager doesn’t own all of the firm’s stock, there is a potential conflict between the owner and the manager if there is an unequal sharing of the costs and benefits
         => almost always the case

   b. Types of conflict between owners and managers

      Key => think about what is optimal for managers and stockholders

      1) Management Effort:

         Q: Who bears the cost of management effort? management
         Q: Who gets the benefit of management effort? management and owners
         => Managers want to expend less effort than is optimal for stockholders

      2) Pay and Perks:

         Q: Who bears the cost of management pay and perks? stockholders
         Q: Who gets the benefit of management pay and perks? management and owners
         Q: Managers want more pay and perks than is optimal for stockholders

      3) Firm diversification:

         Q: How does company-specific risk impact stockholders? Doesn’t since well diversified
         Q: How does company-specific risk impact managers? Makes worse off since not well diversified
         Q: How does diversification of the firm impact stockholders and managers?

         Stockholder: indifferent
Managers: benefits them

=⇒ managers will want to diversify the firm even though it doesn’t help stockholders

Note: only a problem only if firm incurs cost as diversify

4) Empire building:

Q: How does the size of the firm impact stockholders? Doesn’t (unless related to NPV)

Q: How does the size of the firm impact managers? may benefit

=⇒ management at larger firms tend to have higher pay, perks, power, and prestige and less risk

Q: Managers want a larger firm than stockholders. May even want to invest in negative NPV projects to grow firm

Q: Why would managers invest in such projects?

Note: the impact of stockholder-manager conflict likely worse if firm generates high free cash flow

Free cash flow: cash flow left after interest payments and investment in positive NPV projects

2. Debt and owner-manager conflict

1) Issuing debt allows original owners to avoid issuing equity

Why important? stock can only be issued to outside investors at a discount because of future owner/manager conflict

2) Debt helps resolve stockholder-manager conflict after it is issued

=⇒ issue debt and repurchase equity

a) cash will be used for debt service so management can’t waste it
b) creditors help monitor management
c) threat of bankruptcy motivates managers to work harder

Notes:

1) debt may weaken firm so less able to respond to competition
2) management may resist debt because don’t like the discipline and reduced job security

V. The Tradeoff Theory

\[ V_L = V^U + PV(\text{Interest Tax Shield}) - PV(\text{Financial Distress Costs}) - PV(\text{Agency Costs of Debt}) + PV(\text{Agency Benefits of Debt}) \]  
\[ \Rightarrow \text{optimal debt maximizes firm value} \]  

\[ (16.3) \]

V. Asymmetric Information and Capital Structure

Basic idea: management generally knows more about the firm than outside investors

A. Leverage as a Credible Signal

Basic idea: an increase in debt signals management confidence in firm

\[ \Rightarrow \text{signal is credible since costly to send false signal} \]

Q: Why is debt a credible signal?

\[ \Rightarrow \text{if additional debt drives firm into bankruptcy, management likely fired} \]
B. Adverse Selection

1. Key ideas:

   1) sellers typically know more than buyers about the quality of an item.
   2) at any given price, those who have low quality goods will be more eager to sell

2. Results:

   1) products available for sale are likely below average quality
   2) buyers will demand a discount when buying

   Note: 1) and 2) feed off each other

3. Implications for Equity Issuance

   1) stock prices should fall (on average) when firms announce plans to issue equity

      => an equity issue signals that management believes the stock price exceeds its value

      Note: stock prices do indeed fall (on average) when firms announce plans to issue equity

   2) current stockholders will prefer that the firm fund investments with retained earnings or debt rather than equity