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A prior study by one of the authors (Gritta, et. al. 2006) published in the Journal of the Transportation Research Forum, examined the extent of operating, financial, and total leverage facing the major U.S airlines, those carriers with total revenues of $\$ 1.0$ billion or more. The study found that the vast majority of the carriers were highly leveraged at both the operating and financial levels and that this resulted in highly unstable profitability and increased the dangers of bankruptcy.

The global airline industry has always been highly cyclical and somewhat fixed-cost driven. Airlines are thus high in what financial analysts refer to as operating leverage. In addition, the many airlines have followed aggressive debt strategies; that is, they have chosen to use large amounts of long-term debt finance to purchase assets. This results in a high degree of financial leverage. In the past, the resulting combined leverage has created severe financial problems for major carriers, both domestically and internationally.

The current study seeks to examine a sample of foreign carriers in order to measure the extent of risks on the international level. In doing so, comparisons will be made to the large U.S. carriers. If possible, the authors will use the same time horizon as in the published paper, although in some cases carriers are too new to have such a history.

## INTRODUCTION

The profitability of the global airline industry has always been highly volatile. Periods of high profits have usually been followed by periods of significant losses. The causes of the instability of this industry are manifold; the vulnerability to economic cycles, the price elasticity of demand, the relative high fixed costs of the carriers, the debt burdens taken on by carriers, the periods of both high interest rates and low oil prices (and vice versa), the intense competition in many domestic and international markets, the regulation of carriers, and other variables. Some of these variables are inherent in the nature of the business itself, while others are the direct result of carrier management decision making. All industries face three levels of risk. They are business risk, financial risk, and total or combined risk. Business risk is caused by the cyclical nature of demand, the presence of fixed costs, the degree of competition faced by competing firms in the industry, and government regulation. Financial risk has but one cause-interest on debt. Combined risk, it will be shown in this paper, is the multiplicative (not additive) interaction of both business and financial risks.

The purpose of this paper is to define and measure these risks quantitatively and demonstrate the causes of this inherent volatility. The period covered in this study is 1990-2013. The sample includes 37 carriers that are members of International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) and for which complete data were available for the entire period. The methodology utilized is that ingrained in leading finance textbooks and in the finance literature (for example; Moyer, et. al 2014). It is the same as that used to document the instability of the U.S. airline industry in earlier domestic carrier studies (Gritta et. al 1998; Gritta et. al 2006).

The first section of the paper will define the risks facing all carriers. The second will derive statistical measures to gauge these risks over time. The third will apply these measures to the sample
of ICAO carriers. The conclusion of the paper will then outline the implications for air carrier management.

## DEFINING INDUSTRY RISKS

All firms, regardless of industry type, face three types of risk. These three risks are commonly identified in financial theory as business risk, financial risk, and combined risk. (for example, Moyer, et al. 2014). Business risk can be defined as the variability in a firm's operating profit, often referred to as earnings before interest and taxes (EBIT), over time. It is attributable to the inherent nature of the firm's operations and the environment within which it operates. This type of risk is driven primarily by the firm's cost structure, product demand characteristics, and intra-industry competitive position. Some companies may face high business risk solely because of external, and therefore largely uncontrollable, factors such as high-fixed costs, the cyclical nature of its business, government regulation, and intense competition. However, high business risk can also be the result of poor cost controls, low productivity, or pricing practices that dilute revenues. The airline industry is high in business risk on virtually all these factors. ${ }^{1}$

Financial risk is generally defined as the added variability in earnings available to a firm's common shareholders due to the use of long-term debt to finance the acquisition of assets. It often represents the increased probability of insolvency that comes with excessive debt finance because interest on debt must be paid (unlike common stock dividends, which are paid at management's discretion). High financial risk may indicate that high interest charges are overwhelming a business enterprise, forcing it in some cases to seek court protection. Unlike business risk, financial risk is not primarily the product of the environment within which a company operates, but rather it results directly from a firm's conscious decision to use financial leverage (i.e., long-term debt or preferred stock) over time instead of issuing common stock to raise funds.

Combined (or total) risk, as the name suggests, refers to the risk that results from the interaction of both operating and financial risk. It is important to note that the interaction of the two risk types has a multiplicative, rather than an additive, effect. The impact of the combined effect can be extremely powerful, as will be evident from the discussion and statistical analysis that follows.

## MEASURING RISK

One of the principal measures of a firm's business risk is its degree of operating leverage (DOL). (Moyer et al. 2014) Operating leverage generally refers to the firm's incurrence of fixed operating costs, i.e., costs which do not vary as output changes. As a general rule, high fixed costs create higher and more unstable DOLs. ${ }^{2}$

As an elasticity measure borrowed from microeconomic theory, DOL actually measures the responsiveness of operating profits (often referred to as EBIT, or earnings before interest and taxes) to changes in operating revenue. (Moyer et al. 2014). That is, it directly measures the $\mathrm{X} \%$ change in operating profits that would be induced by a $1 \%$ change in operating revenues. As an elasticity measure, DOL can be defined as the percentage change in operating profits (OP or EBIT) divided by percentage change in operating revenues (OR). Operating revenues can be defined as price per unit of output times output ( pq ) and variable costs ( V ) equal variable cost per unit times output $(\mathrm{vq})$, or $\mathrm{q}(\mathrm{p}-\mathrm{v})$. Since fixed costs are fixed by definition, if the values of p and v remain relatively constant, the only change in OP is the change in quantity times the difference between the price and variable cost per unit (i.e., $\Delta q[p-v]$ ). DOL can then be derived as,
(1) DOL $=\frac{\% \Delta O P}{\% \Delta O R}=\frac{\frac{\Delta q(p-v)}{q(p-v)-F}}{\frac{\Delta q p}{q p}}=\frac{\Delta q(p-v)}{q(p-v)-F} \times \frac{q}{\Delta q}=\frac{q(p-v)}{q(p-v)-F}=\frac{R-V}{R-V-F}$
where $\mathrm{R}(\mathrm{pq})$ is operating revenue and $\mathrm{V}(\mathrm{vq})$ and F are variable and fixed costs (respectively).
The sign and the magnitude of DOL are both important indicators of risk. For example, consider a situation in which a firm's operating revenues $(\mathrm{R})$ are $\$ 500$, its variable costs $(\mathrm{V})$ are $\$ 100$, and its fixed costs $(\mathrm{F})$ are $\$ 150$. In this case
(2) $\mathrm{DOL}=\frac{500-100}{500-100-150}=+1.6$

Since revenues (R) exceed the sum of variable plus fixed costs $(\mathrm{V}+\mathrm{F})$ here, the firm is above its operating breakeven point and DOL is positive. The positive DOL indicates that as R increases, operating profits will increase (and vice versa). In this case, a $1 \%$ increase in revenues will produce a $1.6 \%$ increase in operating profits; a $1 \%$ decrease in revenues will produce a $1.6 \%$ decrease in operating profits. In general, when $R$ exceeds the sum of $(\mathrm{V}+\mathrm{F})$, DOL will take on a value between +1 and $+\infty$. The relatively small positive value for DOL indicates a relatively low business risk (i.e., low variability in operating profit), since changes in revenue will induce relatively small changes in operating profits. In contrast, had fixed costs (F) been higher relative to (R-V), say $\$ 350$ rather than $\$ 150$, DOL would increase (to +8.0 ), indicating a significantly higher level of business risk. If the firm has no fixed costs; that is, if $\mathrm{F}=0$, that firm has no operating leverage. Thus business risk would be low and DOL would equal +1.0 .

Should costs $(V+F)$ exceed operating revenues, operating profit would be negative and the picture changes. Suppose, for example, that: $\mathrm{R}=\$ 500, \mathrm{~V}=\$ 400$ and $\mathrm{F}=\$ 110$. Here the firm is below its operating breakeven and
(3) $\mathrm{DOL}=\frac{500-400}{500-400-110}=-10$

The implication here is that a $1 \%$ change in operating revenues will induce a $10 \%$ change in operating profits or, more accurately, in operating losses. The negative sign indicates that when revenues increase, operating losses will decrease (and vice versa). The relatively large absolute value for DOL implies a relatively high degree of variability in operating profits (losses), which can be dangerous since the firm is operating below its breakeven point. However, such large negative values can actually be interpreted as less serious than very low negative numbers, since large absolute values indicate that current losses are relatively small and that a small increase in operating revenues can be expected to cut deeply into operating losses. Had fixed costs (F) been larger relative to (R V), say $\$ 600$ rather than $\$ 110$, DOL would have remained negative-again indicating an operating loss-but its absolute value would have been substantially smaller. (In this case, DOL would have been -.2.) This smaller absolute value would be especially alarming since (1) it reflects the large size of current operating losses, and (2) it implies that positive changes in operating revenues will have only a minimal effect on reducing those losses. Negative DOL values will be between 0 and $-\propto$.

Although fixed costs are generally seen as the key to determining the value of DOL, inefficient management policies affecting variable costs or gross revenues can also contribute to high business risk. In the airline industry, for example, factors such as poor cost controls or inefficiencies in a carrier's route structure can produce unfavorable DOLs. Reduced revenues caused by aggressive fare wars may have a similar effect.

A firm's financial risk can be measured by its degree of financial leverage (DFL). This interest (I) driven measure reflects the responsiveness of net profit (NP) to changes in operating profit. The lever here is interest on debt, which is a fixed charge. More specifically, DFL measures the percentage change in net profit (NP) given a percentage change in EBIT or:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{DFL}=\frac{\% \Delta N P}{\% \Delta E B I T}=\frac{\frac{\Delta N P}{N P}}{\frac{\Delta E B I T}{E B I T}} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since NP=R-V-F-I and EBIT (OP) $=$ R-V-F, this means that
(5) $\mathrm{DFL}=\frac{\frac{\Delta(R-V)}{R-V-F-I}}{\frac{\Delta(R-V)}{R-V-F}}=\frac{R-V-F}{R-V-F-I}=\frac{\text { Operating Profit }}{\text { Operating Profit }-\mathrm{I}}$

In this latter form, the roles of both F and I can readily be seen. Like DOL, DFL is an elasticity measure, here measuring the $\mathrm{X} \%$ change in net profit (R-V-F-I) that would be produced by a $1 \%$ change in operating profits. It is usually assumed that tax rates are relatively constant, so that net profits before and after taxes will vary in unison. As in the case of DOL, both the sign and the magnitude of DFL are significant. To illustrate, suppose operating profit is $\$ 90$, since R-V-F is $500-$ $400-10$. If interest is $\$ 10$, then
(6) $\mathrm{DFL}=\frac{90}{90-10}=+1.125$

This indicates that a $1 \%$ change in operating profit will produce a $1.125 \%$ change in net profit. The positive sign reflects the fact that the firm is above its financial breakeven (i.e., operating profits exceed interest). It also indicates that when operating profits increase, net profits will increase; when operating profits decrease, net profits will decrease. The relatively small value of DFL here means that (1) net profit is relatively large (relative to operating profit) and (2) variability in net profit (i.e., risk) is relatively small.

Had interest been higher, the positive value of DFL would increase (so long as interest did not exceed operating profit). For example, if interest (I) were $\$ 88$, DFL would equal +45 . A $1 \%$ change in operating profits here would produce a $45 \%$ change in net profit. The firm would still be operating above financial breakeven (hence the plus sign), but there would be significant variability (risk) in net profits. For positive DFLs, values will range from +1 (when the firm is debt-free, i.e., when $\mathrm{I}=$ $0)$ to $+\propto$ (when interest $=$ operating profit).

When interest exceeds operating profit, the firm is showing a net loss and DFL is negative. This negative DFL means that an increase in operating profit will lead to a decrease in the firm's net loss and vice versa. As in the case of negative DOLs, small absolute values for negative DFLs are especially serious since they indicate (1) large net losses for the firm, and (2) a lack of net loss responsiveness to improvements in operating profits. Negative DFL values will range from $-\propto$ to 0 . It should also be noted that if operating profits are negative, DFL will be reported as negative irrespective of the value of I.

A firm's combined (or total) risk-the product of its business and financial risks-can be measured by its degree of combined leverage (DCL). The multiplicative effect of business and financial risks in the calculation of DCL means that the core causes of risk-interest and fixed costs - magnify total risk to a degree that exceeds their simple sum. Similar to the effect of levers in physics, it is as though one lever (interest) is magnifying what another lever (fixed costs) has already magnified. Specifically,

$$
\text { DCL }=\text { DOL } x \quad \text { DFL }
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
D C L=\frac{R-V}{R-V-F} x \frac{R-V-F}{R-V-F-I}=\frac{R-V}{R-V-F-I} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

As defined here, DCL measures the $\mathrm{X} \%$ change in net profit that would be produced by a $1 \%$ change in operating revenues.

If revenue $(\mathrm{R})$ is greater than total costs $(\mathrm{V}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{I})$, the firm is operating above its total breakeven point and DCL will be positive. In such a case, smaller DCL values indicate relatively low combined risk since fixed costs and interest would be relatively low when compared to revenue. In the extreme, if DCL is +1 , combined risk is minimal since fixed costs and interest would necessarily be 0 .

When total costs $(\mathrm{V}+\mathrm{F}+\mathrm{I})$ exceed revenue, the firm is operating below its combined breakeven point and DCL will be negative. Low absolute values for DCL are especially alarming here since they indicate that (1) losses are large and, (2) responsiveness to improvements in revenue will be sluggish. Insolvency is more likely and the firm has a long way to go to restore profitability (Gritta et al. 2006). If either DOL is negative or DFL is negative, or if both DOL and DFL are negative, DCL will be reported as negative. It is the absolute value that is important for reasons that will be explained shortly.

Critically, the multiplicative interaction that produces combined risk highlights the danger of employing debt finance when a company faces a high-risk DOL. To illustrate, assume two companies face the same large positive DOL, meaning that a very small decline in revenue can precipitate a very large decrease in net profits. In this case, assume DOL for both companies is +10 . Company A, perceiving the business risk it faces and wary of any downturn in the economy, decides to use no debt in its capital structure, and thus has a DFL of +1 . Its resulting DCL is $10 \times 1=+10$. Company B , on the other hand, chooses to ignore the incremental risk associated with debt financing and, as the result of interest on its debt, faces a DFL of +4 . DCL for this firm is a far more dangerous +40 ( 10 x 4 ). Should the industry experience a slowdown in activity or face a recession, Company B is clearly more seriously exposed. A $5 \%$ reduction in revenue will cause a $50 \%$ reduction in Company A's net profits ( $5 \%$ x 10 ), a serious enough drop, but B's net profits will plummet by $200 \%$ ( $5 \% \times 40$ ).

The situation is even worse in cases where DCL values are negative with small absolute values, especially where such conditions persist over a long period of time. (As suggested earlier, this is because the base of losses is so large that the financial solvency of the enterprise in the long run is severely threatened.)

Because of the multiplicative effect of business and financial risks, most companies and industries try to balance risk. That is, a company high in business risk will tend to avoid significant long-term debt finance. A company low in business risk will be more likely to use debt finance since it will tend not to threaten the firm's basic stability. ${ }^{3}$

## AIR CARRIER RISK ANALYSIS

Values for the leverage measures described in the previous section were calculated for the entire sample of the 37 ICAO airlines for which adequate data were available. Table 1 shows the ICAO carriers in the sample.

Table 1: Carriers in the Study

| Aero Mexico | AMX | Korean Air | KAL |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| Air Canada | ACA | Lan Chile | LAN |
| Air Europa | ARA | LOT | LOT |
| Air France | AFR | Lufthansa | DLH |
| Air India | AIC | Malaysian | MAS |
| Air Nostrum | ANE | Monarch Airlines | MON |
| All Nippon Airways | ANA | Oman Air | OMA |
| Avianca | AVA | Philippine Airlines | PAL |
| British Airways | BAW | Pakistani International Air | PIA |
| Cathay Pacific | CPA | Royal Jordanian | RJA |
| Czech Airlines | CSA | Scandinavian Airlines | SAS |
| EasyJet | EZY | Singapore Airlines | SIA |
| El Al | ELY | Spanair | JKK |
| Ethiopian | ETH | SriLankan | ALK |
| Flybe British European | BEE | TAP Air Portugal | TAP |
| Iberia | IBE | Thai Airways | THA |
| Iran Air | IRA | Turkish Airlines | THY |
| Jet2 | EXS | Virgin Atlantic | VIR |
| Kenya Airways | KQA |  |  |

The detailed results for all the carriers are summarized in Table 2. In the computation of these values, variable costs ( V ) are defined as the sum of flying operations, maintenance, passenger service, and air traffic costs. Fixed costs (F) are the summation of promotion and sales expenses, general and administrative costs, depreciation and amortization expenses, and various transportation related costs. ${ }^{4}$ The Appendix to the paper shows the actual figures for each carrier for the years 19902000 and 2001-2013.

As can be seen from the table, many of the carriers had negative combined leverage (DCLs) for the study time horizon. On the excessive leverage side, Aero Mexico, Air Canada, Air India, Air Nostrun, Iberia, and Jet2 really stand out, and several of these carriers have had severe problems. To some extent, this analysis understates the situation since there were missing data for a few years for some of the carriers. Only a few airlines had moderate levels of risk; Kenya Airways, Ethiopian, and Thai Airways are examples. The difficult and volatile financial situation faced by the majority of the carriers is clearly evident. While the carriers' negative DOLs were certainly an important part of the problem, the biggest factor was the large number of carriers having negative DFLs during the 23 -year time horizon.

The volatile nature of the industry is also apparent in some of the dramatic extremes shown in the Appendix. Such extraordinarily large positive values are typically produced when the base of profits is so small that a relatively small absolute change in value represents a very large percentage change. The tables in the Appendix also show a large number of cases in which negative levels of DFL are alarmingly small (in absolute value) -an indication that these carriers have followed financial strategies which are inappropriate in an industry characterized by high business risk. (As already discussed, very small negative values often result when the base of losses is so large that a significant absolute increase in revenue or profits has little effect in percentage terms.) While many of the carriers are subsidized by their governments, the record is still appalling. ${ }^{56}$

Table 2: Number of Years with Negative Leverage, 1990-2013

| CARRIER | DOL | DFL | DCL | CARRIER | DOL | DFL | DCL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AMX | 12 | 18 | 18 | LOT | 12 | 15 | 15 |
| ACA | 9 | 17 | 17 | LDH | 9 | 15 | 15 |
| AIC | 13 | 16 | 16 | MAS | 11 | 12 | 12 |
| ANE | 6 | 17 | 17 | MON | 3 | 6 | 6 |
| ANA | 4 | 11 | 11 | OMA | 8 | 10 | 10 |
| AVA | 8 | 14 | 14 | PAL | 8 | 9 | 9 |
| BAW | 3 | 6 | 6 | PIA | 8 | 11 | 11 |
| CPA | 2 | 6 | 6 | RJA | 3 | 5 | 5 |
| CSA | 5 | 11 | 11 | SAS | 8 | 10 | 10 |
| EZY | 0 | 7 | 7 | SIA | 1 | 14 | 14 |
| ELY | 5 | 9 | 9 | JKK | 7 | 7 | 7 |
| ETH | 2 | 3 | 3 | ALK | 11 | 14 | 14 |
| BEE | 10 | 11 | 11 | TAP | 10 | 13 | 13 |
| IBE | 10 | 15 | 15 | THA | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| IRA | 8 | 8 | 8 | THY | 11 | 17 | 17 |
| EXS | 3 | 18 | 18 | VIR | 6 | 8 | 8 |
| KQA | 0 | 0 | 0 | Source: Cumulated from tables in the Appendix. |  |  |  |
| KAL | 2 | 9 | 9 |  |  |  |  |
| LAN | 0 | 3 | 3 |  |  |  |  |

The penalty of these financing patters is detailed in Table 3. The table shows the ROA (the return on assets), ROE (the return on equity), and the standard deviations around the ROA and ROE for a subset of the IOCA carriers.

Table 3: Return Characteristics: Reduced Sample (2002-2013)

|  | YR | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROA } \\ & \text { AVG } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ROA } \\ \text { SD } \end{gathered}$ | ROA MED | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ROE } \\ & \text { AVG } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { ROE } \\ \text { SD } \end{gathered}$ | ROE <br> MED | $\begin{gathered} \text { NDOL } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | NDFL <br> (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { NDCL } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| AEA | 11 | 0.0589 | 0.0548 | 0.0615 | -0.0220 | 1.0347 | 0.3350 | 18.18 | 18.18 | 18.18 |
| AFR | 9 | 0.0043 | 0.0312 | 0.0089 | -0.0622 | 0.4273 | 0.0428 | 33.33 | 33.33 | 33.33 |
| ANE | 11 | -0.0210 | 0.1343 | 0.0063 | -0.2110 | 1.0050 | 0.1653 | 45.45 | 36.36 | 45.45 |
| ANA | 11 | 0.0239 | 0.0271 | 0.0323 | 0.0211 | 0.0812 | 0.0526 | 27.27 | 27.27 | 27.27 |
| BAW | 11 | 0.0317 | 0.0273 | 0.0370 | 0.0538 | 0.1947 | 0.1119 | 18.18 | 18.18 | 18.18 |
| CPA | 10 | 0.0146 | 0.0341 | 0.0209 | 0.0567 | 0.1027 | 0.0915 | 20.00 | 30.00 | 30.00 |
| CSA | 12 | -0.0494 | 0.1282 | 0.0090 | -3.2622 | 10.6174 | -0.0361 | 41.67 | 58.33 | 66.67 |
| EZY | 12 | 0.0600 | 0.0377 | 0.0560 | 0.1213 | 0.1428 | 0.0688 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| BEE | 11 | -0.0141 | 0.0567 | -0.0127 | -0.5882 | 2.2708 | 0.0412 | 63.64 | 72.73 | 72.73 |
| EXS | 12 | 0.0275 | 0.0571 | 0.0306 | -0.0014 | 0.8628 | 0.1891 | 16.67 | 16.67 | 16.67 |
| DLH | 12 | 0.0053 | 0.0133 | 0.0043 | 0.0668 | 0.1561 | 0.1032 | 33.33 | 75.00 | 75.00 |
| MAS | 11 | -0.0376 | 0.0899 | -0.0117 | -0.1458 | 0.7572 | 0.0559 | 54.55 | 54.55 | 63.64 |
| MON | 11 | -0.0128 | 0.0663 | 0.0121 | -0.0997 | 0.4068 | 0.0453 | 36.36 | 27.27 | 36.36 |
| OMA | 10 | -0.0604 | 0.0879 | -0.0178 | -0.5514 | 0.8301 | -0.1185 | 60.00 | 80.00 | 80.00 |
| PAL | 9 | 0.0203 | 0.0464 | 0.0450 | -0.5484 | 1.9440 | 0.1039 | 33.33 | 33.33 | 33.33 |
| RJA | 9 | 0.0100 | 0.0871 | 0.0261 | -0.1904 | 0.7831 | 0.1284 | 33.33 | 33.33 | 33.33 |
| SAS | 10 | -0.0019 | 0.0462 | -0.0113 | -0.0334 | 0.1065 | -0.0446 | 60.00 | 70.00 | 70.00 |
| SIA | 11 | 0.0263 | 0.0209 | 0.0313 | 0.1521 | 0.1964 | 0.0919 | 9.09 | 9.09 | 9.09 |
| VIR | 11 | -0.0065 | 0.0530 | 0.0119 | -0.1957 | 1.1603 | 0.1244 | 27.27 | 18.18 | 27.27 |

Note that in too many cases, the average ROAs and ROEs are exceeded by the standard deviations around those returns. Finally, Table 4 shows the frequent inverse correlations that have existed between ROAs and ROEs and the standard deviations around those means.

Table 4: Correlation Analysis: Reduced Sample (2002-2013)

|  | ROA <br> AVG | ROA <br> SD | ROA <br> MED | ROE <br> AVG | ROE <br> SD | ROE <br> MED | NDOL | NDFL | NDCL |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ROA <br> AVG | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ROA <br> SD | -0.6479 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ROA <br> MED | 0.8649 | -0.3473 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ROE <br> AVG | 0.5409 | -0.6009 <br> $(.0065)$ | 0.2127 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| ROE <br> SD | -0.4413 | 0.5698 | -0.1199 | -0.9868 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| ROE <br> MED | 0.6591 | -0.1323 | 0.6589 | 0.3715 | -0.2453 | 1 |  |  |  |
| NDOL | -0.8050 <br> $(.0000)$ | 0.4855 | -0.8618 <br> $(.0000)$ | -0.3101 | 0.2148 | -0.5441 <br> $(.0160)$ | 1 |  |  |
| NDFL | -0.7257 <br> $(.0004)$ | 0.2807 | -0.8174 <br> $(.0000)$ | -0.3540 | 0.2600 | -0.5844 <br> $(.0086)$ | 0.8744 | 1 |  |
| NDCL | -0.8039 <br> $(.0000)$ | 0.3828 | -0.8569 <br> $(.0000)$ | -0.4088 <br> $(.0822)$ | 0.3174 | -0.5829 <br> $(.0088)$ | 0.9027 | 0.9862 | 1 |

Carriers generally recognized to be financially troubled do stand out. In general, the data suggest an alarming pattern of reliance on debt finance in the face of significant business risk. The leverage situation is not unlike evidenced in the U.S. airline industry during roughly the same period (Gritta et al. 1998 and Gritta et al. 2006).

## CONCLUSION

This paper has defined airline industry risks and quantitatively measured the degrees of operating, financial, and total leverage facing major ICAO carriers, using elasticity measures borrowed from microeconomics. The findings of this research are quite revealing. The international airline industry has long been noted as one high in business risk with a variability in operating profits over time. The result of the analysis confirmed this observation. The study also, however, detailed the extremely high financial leverage persistent in the industry. It was argued that firms facing high business risk should moderate their exposure to financial risk (by employing relatively low levels of financial leverage). The majority of the carriers did not and the penalty for that strategy was confirmed in the high volatility documented in Tables 2, 3, 4, and in the Appendix.

Given the data presented, it seems clear that the long-term operating and financial performance of the international industry airline industry has been poor. Historically high-risk levels, as measured by the DOL, DFL, and DCL indicators, and chronically low rates of return, bode ill for an industry that has had more than its share of obstacles to overcome during the past three decades. Largely closed off to debt financing because of already worrisome leverage positions, and offering little in the way of reward to potential investors, some of the carriers may have to turn to selling assets, trading labor concessions for equity, finding new partners with whom to share the risk, or even merging with one another, if they are to survive the next 20 years.

One last question in this analysis remains. Has the situation facing/faced by the airlines been different from other industries, or is the situation fairly common across many different industries? While this paper's purpose is not to explore the research internationally, there is an answer in the case of the domestic U. S. airlines. Research has shown that the domestic airline industry has been unique (Gritta et al. 2005). In a sample of 35 different industrial groups, the U.S. domestic carriers ranked not only first in business risk and also first in financial risk, resulting in very high levels of total or combined risk. Furthermore, almost all of the industrial groups balanced risk (that is, those high in business risk, employed low levels of debt, and vice versa), thus conforming to the sound principle of finance that dictates that firms high in business risk should/must take on less financial risk (Moyer et al. 2014). The failure to balance risk has greatly increased the risk of financial stress/ bankruptcy (Gritta et al. 2006). The lesson in the United States is conclusive evidence of this. The list of major U.S. airlines filing under the U.S. bankruptcy codes since deregulation in 1982 includes American, Continental, Delta, Northwest, TWA, United, as well as former major carriers such as Braniff, Eastern, National, PanAm, and Western, which have ceased operations or been merged to forestall the inevitable. History does provide strong support for the above mentioned sound principle of finance.

## Endnotes

1. Frederick (1961) and Caves (1962) were the first airline writers/economists to discuss carrier cost structure and its effect on business risk. Dogainis (Dogainis 2002) provides a more recent and excellent discussion of airline operating cost structures and their effects on operating profit instability. Bijan Vasigh (Bijan Vasigh et al. 2010) also discusses the extremely cyclicality of carrier profits and discusses some of the measures utilized in this paper.
2. Brigham (Brigham et al. 1993) has noted that airlines must invest heavily in fixed assets, which results in high DOLs, other things being equal. As noted, this is a situation that lies largely outside of management's control.
3. The need to balance business and financial risk is a principle advanced in virtually all finance textbooks. See, for example, Moyer (2014), Brigham and Gapenski (1993), and Bijan (Bijan et al. 2010). Gritta et al. (2005) found this to be true in an empirical study contrasting levels of business, financial, and total risk in the airline industry with risk levels in other industries.
4. The accounts used are the standard account lines presented in the publication, ICAO. One further point must be noted here: To the extent that some airline variable costs, such as fuel, are "sticky" or "constant" in the economic lexicon (or, as accountants would say, they are stepvariable in nature), the analysis of the DOL presented in this paper actually understates the true level of risk in the airline industry. Caves (1962), a prominent airline economist, argued that to a large extent, costs which might appear to be structurally quite variable, may be in fact far less so in the airline industry. As traffic declines, classical variable costs, such as fuel, cannot be cut immediately in response. Hence, they behave in a sticky manner, increasing operating leverage. The accounts used are the standard account lines presented in the publication, ICAO.
5. As described earlier, the most severe conditions a carrier can face are (1) small negative DOLs, DFLs, and DCLs, the latter being the most severe; and (2) volatile DOLs, DFLs, and DCLs over time. There are several reasons for this. First, very small negative DCLs indicate considerable financial distress since net profits (EBIT-I) are strongly negative and the carrier could default on loan payments (interest, principal, and lease obligations. Several bankruptcy studies (Gritta, et al. 2006) clearly demonstrate the effect of excess leverage on U.S. carrier solvency, one quite early on in the pre-deregulation era. Second, volatility (extreme variability) is abhorrent to stockholders and other investors, unless compensated by commensurably higher rates of return. Investors, ex-post, must perceive that they will be rewarded for assuming risk. Ex-ante, their expectations may not be fulfilled.
6. As noted earlier, if either DOL or DFL is negative, then DCL must also be negative since DCL is the product of the two values. Less obviously, should both DOL and DFL be negative, DCL will also be reported as negative. In every case, the absolute values of DOL and DFL that are multiplied, with the sign applied appropriately to the resulting product.
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| AMX |  | 2013 | 2012 | 2011 | 2010 | 2009 | 2008 | 2007 | 2006 | 2005 | 2004 | 2003 | 2002 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ROA | NA | 0.0343 | 0.0872 | 0.1319 | -0.1005 | -0.1844 | -0.2215 | -0.0670 | 0.0140 | NA | -0.0969 | -0.0584 |
|  | ROE | NA | -0.0639 | 0.2878 | 3.5663 | NA | NA | NA | -0.3337 | 0.0997 | NA | -0.5393 | -0.2794 |
| ACA | ROA | NA | NA | 0.0180 | 0.0275 | -0.0333 | 0.0026 | 0.0367 | 0.0085 | 0.0305 | -0.0071 | -0.1213 | -0.0536 |
|  | ROE | NA | NA | NA | 0.0947 | -0.0195 | -1.7983 | 0.1515 | -0.0238 | 0.1382 | -4.2692 | NA | NA |
| AEA | ROA | 0.1727 | -0.0041 | -0.0161 | 0.0914 | 0.0704 | 0.0030 | 0.0928 | 0.0340 | 0.0133 | 0.0949 | 0.0615 | 0.0477 |
|  | ROE | 0.7069 | -2.8697 | -0.9363 | 0.4742 | 0.4390 | 0.1847 | 0.4780 | 0.2478 | NA | 0.3350 | 0.3260 | 0.3726 |
| AFR | ROA | NA | NA | -0.0316 | -0.0153 | -0.0612 | -0.0113 | 0.0344 | 0.0429 | 0.0229 | 0.0040 | 0.0089 | 0.0133 |
|  | ROE | NA | NA | NA | 0.2125 | -1.0649 | -0.4300 | 0.1541 | 0.2143 | 0.2400 | 0.0326 | 0.0383 | 0.0428 |
| AIC | ROA | -0.0684 | -0.0800 | NA | -0.0981 | NA | -0.1623 | -0.0919 | -0.1281 | -0.0602 | -0.0370 | -0.0241 | -0.0368 |
|  | ROE | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.0603 | 0.4137 | NA | NA |
| ANE | ROA | -0.2427 | -0.2426 | -0.1314 | -0.0011 | -0.0684 | 0.0063 | 0.0509 | 0.0674 | 0.0674 | 0.0740 | 0.1308 | 0.1260 |
|  | ROE | -2.9921 | -0.8974 | -0.1750 | 0.2537 | -0.2239 | 0.0000 | 0.1653 | NA | 0.2769 | 0.2953 | 0.3951 | 0.5816 |
| ANA | ROA | 0.0259 | 0.0443 | 0.0461 | 0.0323 | -0.0341 | -0.0004 | 0.0434 | NA | 0.0462 | 0.0477 | 0.0183 | -0.0069 |
|  | ROE | -0.0082 | 0.0591 | 0.0526 | 0.0472 | -0.1263 | -0.0048 | 0.1279 | NA | 0.0867 | 0.0528 | 0.0684 | -0.1228 |
| AVA | ROA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.0254 | 0.0546 | NA | NA | NA | NA | -0.1554 | -0.2242 |
|  | ROE | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.0268 | -0.0573 | NA | NA | NA | NA | NA | -3.5640 |
| BAW | ROA | 0.0430 | 0.0180 | 0.0370 | NA | -0.0161 | -0.0146 | 0.0718 | 0.0465 | 0.0555 | 0.0466 | 0.0367 | 0.0244 |
|  | ROE | 0.1479 | 0.1337 | 0.2771 | NA | -0.2720 | -0.3177 | 0.2170 | 0.0095 | 0.2353 | 0.1119 | 0.0640 | -0.0151 |
| CPA | ROA | 0.0134 | -0.0004 | 0.0155 | NA | NA | -0.0716 | 0.0357 | 0.0262 | 0.0275 | 0.0473 | 0.0075 | 0.0453 |
|  | ROE | 0.0416 | 0.0160 | 0.0983 | NA | NA | -0.2104 | 0.1384 | 0.0894 | 0.0936 | 0.1344 | 0.0420 | 0.1240 |
| CSA | ROA | -0.2452 | -0.0648 | -0.1790 | 0.0089 | -0.3200 | 0.0193 | 0.0127 | 0.0091 | -0.0077 | 0.0619 | 0.0440 | 0.0686 |
|  | ROE | -1.4923 | -0.3118 | -0.6271 | -0.0498 | -36.9456 | 0.0355 | 0.0267 | -0.0223 | -0.0626 | 0.1046 | 0.1019 | 0.0966 |
| EZY | ROA | 0.1048 | 0.0571 | 0.0602 | 0.1560 | 0.0164 | 0.0327 | 0.0626 | 0.0550 | 0.0302 | 0.0381 | 0.0429 | 0.0640 |
|  | ROE | 0.4663 | 0.3401 | 0.1320 | -0.0569 | 0.0629 | 0.0704 | 0.1307 | 0.0974 | 0.0507 | 0.0521 | 0.0427 | 0.0673 |
| ELY | ROA | 0.0222 | 0.0043 | NA | 0.0513 | -0.0448 | -0.0057 | NA | NA | 0.0520 | 0.0368 | 0.0182 | 0.0136 |
|  | ROE | 0.1414 | -0.1431 | NA | 0.2305 | -0.6164 | -0.3532 | NA | NA | 0.2366 | 0.1810 | NA | -0.1034 |
| ETH | ROA | NA | 0.0395 | 0.0131 | NA | NA | NA | 0.0262 | 0.0323 | 0.0556 | 0.0511 | 0.0449 | 0.0588 |
|  | ROE | NA | 0.1541 | 0.1722 | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.0567 | 0.1395 | 0.1169 | 0.0588 | 0.0970 |
| BEE | ROA | -0.0127 | -0.0647 | -0.0110 | -0.0059 | 0.0298 | -0.0384 | 0.0219 | 0.0210 | -0.0016 | 0.0678 | -0.1493 | 0.0088 |
|  | ROE | 0.0412 | 0.8690 | 0.0717 | 0.0350 | 0.3318 | 1.0535 | 0.5430 | NA | -7.1873 | 1.0197 | 0.6197 | 0.1206 |
| IBE | ROA | -0.0395 | NA | -0.0185 | -0.0060 | -0.0945 | -0.0007 | 0.0483 | 0.0249 | 0.0147 | 0.0407 | 0.0311 | 0.0513 |
|  | ROE | -1.9580 | NA | -0.0433 | 0.0400 | -0.4832 | 0.0279 | 0.3743 | NA | NA | NA | 0.1296 | 0.1771 |
| IRA | ROA | NA | NA | NA | NA | -0.0912 | -0.0589 | -0.0421 | -0.0538 | -0.0572 | -0.0079 | NA | -0.0903 |
|  | ROE | NA | NA | NA | NA | -0.1608 | -0.0680 | -0.0302 | -0.0631 | -0.1056 | 0.0052 | NA | -0.1042 |
| EXS | ROA | 0.0465 | 0.0000 | 0.0327 | 0.0556 | 0.0285 | 0.1165 | -0.1214 | -0.0001 | 0.0269 | 0.0807 | 0.0418 | 0.0226 |
|  | ROE | 0.2076 | 0.2727 | 0.1706 | 0.2699 | 0.1442 | 0.6760 | -2.6808 | 0.0020 | 0.2415 | 0.4707 | 0.1428 | 0.0664 |
| KQA | ROA | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.0251 | NA | 0.0857 | 0.0988 | 0.1112 | 0.1470 | 0.0910 | 0.0346 |
|  | ROE | NA | NA | NA | NA | 0.1018 | NA | 0.1715 | 0.2102 | NA | 0.3303 | 0.1613 | 0.0509 |
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