ISSN: 3079-9325

Assessing the Impact of Enhanced Capital Adequacy, Elevated Liquidity Ratios, Segregation of Banking Activities, and Restrictions on Bankers' Bonuses on Risk Management in Banks

Yifei Lyu[1*], Liping Wang[1]

[1]School of Management, Wuhan University of Technology, Wuhan 430070, China

[*] Corresponding Author

Abstract

This study examines the effectiveness of four key regulatory measures—enhanced capital adequacy requirements, elevated liquidity ratios, separation of banking activities, and restrictions on bankers' bonuses—in mitigating excessive risk-taking and strengthening risk management within the banking sector. Drawing on case studies such as Northern Rock, Bear Stearns, the Glass-Steagall framework, and post-crisis bonus regulations, the paper evaluates both the benefits and limitations of each approach. The findings indicate that while these measures contribute to financial stability by improving loss absorption capacity, reducing systemic risk, and promoting prudent behavior, they also entail potential downsides, including constrained lending, reduced profitability, and unintended risk migration to less-regulated sectors. The analysis underscores that no single policy is sufficient in isolation; rather, a comprehensive, balanced regulatory framework—integrating macro- and micro-prudential measures—is essential to safeguard financial stability without unduly hindering innovation and economic growth.

Keywords

Capital adequacy ratio; liquidity ratio; separation of banking activities; bankers' bonuses; risk management; financial stability; systemic risk; banking regulation.

Table of Contents.

ISSN: 3079-9325

I. Introduction

The global financial system is an intricate network of institutions and markets that facilitate the flow of funds across borders. Banking plays a crucial role in this system by providing financial services to individuals, corporations, and governments around the world. However, the complex nature of banking and the ever-increasing interconnectedness of global financial markets have given rise to concerns regarding the risk-taking behaviour of banks and its potential consequences on financial stability. One of the main factors that have contributed to the growth of excess risk-taking behaviour in the banking sector is the pursuit of higher profits by financial institutions. In their quest for higher returns, banks often engage in activities that involve taking on excessive risks, such as high levels of leverage, investment in complex financial instruments, and lending to borrowers with low credit quality. These activities, while potentially profitable, can lead to financial instability and systemic risks that can reverberate across the entire financial system. A notable example of this phenomenon is the role of securitised lending and shadow banking in the 2008 financial crisis, which was characterised by an unprecedented level of risk-taking by banks and other financial institutions.

The impact of excess risk-taking behaviour in international banking can be far-reaching and devastating. It is noted that the extensive banking losses are substantially attributable to failings within the banking sector itself (Honohan 2008). When banks take on excessive risks, they expose themselves to potential losses that can lead to insolvency or even systemic crises in extreme cases. As seen in the 2008 financial crisis, the collapse of large, interconnected financial institutions can trigger a chain reaction, leading to widespread economic turmoil and significant losses for investors, businesses, and households. Moreover, such crises often necessitate government intervention in the form of bailouts or other support measures, which can impose significant costs on, taxpayers and constrain public resources. Dell'Ariccia et al. (2008) stated output growth and private credit growth dropped significantly below normal levels in the years around banking crises.

In response to the financial crisis and the subsequent calls for increased regulation and oversight, numerous measures have been introduced in an attempt to curb excessive risk-taking and promote financial stability, such as the imposition of higher capital adequacy requirements, higher liquidity ratios, the introduction of higher liquidity ratios, and the introduction of higher liquidity ratios. In the subsequent sections of this essay, we will delve deeper into each of these factors, examining their effectiveness in curbing excess risk-taking and their implications for the broader financial system. By analysing the implementation and impact of these measures, we aim to provide a comprehensive understanding of the challenges and opportunities associated with fostering a more stable and secure international banking sector.

II. Increased Capital Adequacy

Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) represents the proportion of a bank's total capital to its total risk-weighted assets. It can be calculated as:

$$CAR = \frac{Tier\ 1\ Capital + Tier\ 2\ Capital}{Risk\ Wighted\ Assets}$$

ISSN: 3079-9325

Capital is separated into Tier 1 and Tier 2 based on function and quality. Risks can be asset-weighted risks or minimum asset requirements stipulated by the respective national regulators. The CAR serves as an indicator of a bank's ability to absorb losses with its capital before depositors' and creditors' assets are affected. This section discusses the advantages and disadvantages of a high capital adequacy ratio, as well as a case study illustrating its limitations.

A high capital adequacy ratio indicates that a bank can absorb losses to a significant extent with its capital, thereby reducing risks for depositors and creditors. This enhances trust in the bank, potentially leading to lower lending rates. Banks with limited capital may be more risk-averse due to the perception of increased risk and higher borrowing costs. Investor trust and market discipline can limit excessive risk-taking by banks, attracting investment and reducing borrowing costs. Overall, sufficient capital improves risk management, discourages excessive risk-taking, bolsters loss absorption, promotes market discipline, and enhances investor confidence. Capital controls contribute to financial system stability by preventing financial firms from engaging in undue risk.

However, a high capital adequacy ratio also presents drawbacks. Financial institutions must maintain capital adequacy, and equity capital is costlier than debt financing. Due to capital expenditures, banks may not be able to lend or invest in profitable opportunities. Increased capital requirements could constrain loan availability, thereby dampening economic growth. To maintain a high capital adequacy ratio, banks may restrict lending, resulting in reduced income and profits. As capital requirements rise, banks must assume less risk, and a greater proportion of their assets must be funded by equity capital. Banks tend to be more cautious when required to hold more capital since losses become costlier. Furthermore, community banks and credit unions might struggle to meet higher capital adequacy standards due to their smaller asset bases and limited capital markets. Smaller banks could be disproportionately affected, leading to industry consolidation or reduced financial services. Past financial crises have also highlighted inadequacies in preventing bank failures, with loss-absorbing buffers growing in proportion to capital adequacy instead of losses. Banks with more capital can absorb unexpected losses on their own, but complying with capital adequacy regulations entails time and money costs, potentially affecting profitability and competitiveness.

Northern Rock, a UK bank, boasted a Tier 1 capital ratio of 11.5% in 2006, significantly exceeding the regulatory minimum of 4%. However, the bank encountered a liquidity crisis in 2007, culminating in nationalization. The high capital adequacy failed to avert Northern Rock's collapse because its business model relied heavily on short-term wholesale funding and securitization, rendering it vulnerable to a sudden liquidity crunch in the market. This case study demonstrates that a high capital adequacy ratio, while crucial, may not be sufficient to prevent bank failures in certain circumstances.

The analysis of the advantages and disadvantages of high capital adequacy ratios, as well as the case study of Northern Rock, underscores the complexity of risk management in banking. While increased capital adequacy can contribute to financial stability and promote prudent lending practices, it may also impose constraints on bank lending, hinder economic growth, and disproportionately affect smaller financial institutions. Moreover, the Northern Rock case study illustrates that high capital adequacy ratios alone do not guarantee immunity from financial crises, as other factors, such as liquidity risk and business model vulnerabilities, can play significant roles in determining a bank's resilience. This highlights the need for a

ISSN: 3079-9325

comprehensive approach to risk management, encompassing not only capital adequacy but also other dimensions of risk in the financial system.

III. Higher Liquidity Ratio

The liquidity ratio is an indicator used by creditors and, occasionally, debtors to assess an organization's ability to repay its creditors using available cash. It is employed to evaluate the debtor's capacity to repay existing debt without raising external funds. A higher liquidity ratio indicates that a company is better positioned to meet its short-term financial obligations, reflecting the liquidity of its assets. Liquidity ratios, which gauge an organization's ability to meet its debts and margin of safety, can be determined using indicators such as the current ratio, quick ratio, and operating cash flow ratio (Omar et al. 2016). This section delves into the benefits and drawbacks of increased liquidity ratios, and presents a case study that demonstrates their limitations.

A high liquidity ratio demonstrates that a company possesses sufficient cash and assets that can be readily converted into cash to repay debts and obligations. This indicates that the business is better prepared to handle unexpected events or economic downturns. An organization with a higher liquidity ratio is less likely to engage in excessive risk-taking, as it is confident in its ability to offset potential losses. Conversely, a corporation with a lower liquidity ratio may be more inclined to take risks to generate additional revenue for debt repayment. Overall, high liquidity ratios provide businesses with a safety net against excessive risk-taking by ensuring they possess adequate resources to address unforeseen financial challenges.

Central banks play a crucial role in monitoring and regulating liquidity ratios in the financial system, ensuring that banks maintain sufficient liquidity to meet their obligations and support their ongoing operations. By enforcing liquidity regulations, central banks can promote financial stability and prevent excessive risk-taking, while also taking into account the potential drawbacks of high liquidity ratios, such as reduced profitability and long-term growth. Morten L and Todd (2013) developed a liquidity regulation model without collateral constraints, in which banks can choose to borrow from other banks or the central bank to access central bank reserves. These reserves accumulate in the bank's liquid assets, thereby improving its liquidity ratio (Eric & Miklos 2019). Implementing such models can help banks maintain adequate liquidity levels to support their operations while mitigating potential risks.

Despite the benefits of high liquidity ratios, they also have potential drawbacks. Maintaining substantial cash reserves or cash equivalents can negatively impact a company's overall profitability, as investments like stocks and bonds typically yield higher returns than cash and highly liquid assets (Eric & Miklos 2019). Furthermore, a high liquidity ratio may signal to investors that the organization is not making sufficient investments in growth or development, potentially diminishing its long-term prospects and ability to attract new investors or customers. A company may also be more vulnerable to inflation and other economic threats if it holds excessive cash or cash equivalents.

Bear Stearns, a US investment bank, maintained a relatively high liquidity ratio prior to the 2008 financial crisis (Stephen & Hyun Song 2008). However, its significant exposure to the subprime mortgage market and extensive reliance on short-term lending led to a severe liquidity crunch, resulting in its acquisition by JPMorgan Chase in a fire sale. The bank's high

ISSN: 3079-9325

liquidity ratio did not shield it from the crisis, as it underestimated the risks associated with its investments and funding sources.

An exploration of the benefits and pitfalls of increased liquidity ratios, paired with the Bear Stearns case study, highlights the importance of balancing liquidity with risk management. While increased liquidity ratios can contribute to financial stability and discourage excessive risk-taking, they may also hinder profitability and long-term growth. Moreover, the Bear Stearns case study illustrates that high liquidity ratios alone do not guarantee immunity from financial crises, as other factors, such as risk exposure and funding sources, can play significant roles in determining a bank's resilience. This underscores the need for a comprehensive approach to risk management, encompassing not only liquidity ratios but also other dimensions of risk in the financial system.

IV. Separation of Bank Activities

The separation of banking activities refers to the practice of segregating distinct types of banking functions within a financial institution. Typically, such segregation involves dividing commercial banking, investment banking, and insurance services. The primary goal of segregating these operations is to mitigate the risk of banks engaging in speculative activities and protect the interests of depositors and taxpayers. The 2008 financial crisis highlighted the risks associated with financial institutions engaging in multiple lines of business, which prompted structural reforms aimed at reducing systemic risks.

The separation of banking activities has contributed to enhancing the stability of the banking system, dispersing financial risks, reducing the likelihood of risk transmission and proliferation, and strengthening financial supervision. By segregating commercial and investment banking, risk management, transparency, and incentives can be improved, helping to control excessive risk-taking. This, in turn, can assist banks in minimizing systemic risks, optimizing risk management systems, and protecting depositors and taxpayers. The separation of banking activities has contributed to enhancing the stability of the banking system, dispersing financial risks, reducing the likelihood of risk transmission and proliferation, and strengthening financial supervision. By segregating commercial and investment banking, risk management, transparency, and incentives can be improved, helping to control excessive risk-taking. This, in turn, can assist banks in minimizing systemic risks, optimizing risk management systems, and protecting depositors and taxpayers. (Lehmann & Volcker rule 2016).

However, there are several downsides to separating banking activities. Banks may face reduced economies of scale and scope, which can limit their ability to innovate and compete in the financial sector. This can lead to a decline in the diversity of services available to customers and the quality of financial products. Additionally, the separation of businesses necessitates more regulatory mechanisms, potentially increasing management costs. Furthermore, the segregation of supervision may elevate the likelihood of regulatory arbitrage, potentially increasing market instability and the risk of financial crises. Every argument in favour of structural reform of the banks can be challenged. For example, one could argue that diversification into different types of activities increases rather than destabilizes banks. Some deals that might at first glance be considered "risky" or "speculative" actually make them more resilient. An example is participation in the derivatives market, which may help to hedge institution-specific risks.

ISSN: 3079-9325

In addition, there may be fears that risky activities that are now prohibited by banks will be transferred to other parts of the market. The beneficiaries could be the so-called shadow banking sector, for example, made up of hedge funds. These players are subject to far less regulation and oversight than banks. As a result, the macroeconomic dangers of their actions may have largely escaped the attention of regulators (Lehmann & Volcker Rule 2016).

The Glass-Steagall Act of 1933 in the United States mandated the separation of commercial and investment banking activities. Despite this separation, the Savings and Loan Crisis occurred in the 1980s, with more than 1,000 savings and loan associations (S&Ls) failing. The crisis was primarily caused by poor lending practices, deregulation, and fraud, illustrating that the separation of banking activities did not necessarily prevent excessive risk-taking or financial crises. This case study underscores the importance of a comprehensive approach to financial risk management, which should include not only the separation of banking activities but also the improvement of lending practices, effective regulation, and strong oversight.

V. Curbs on Bankers' Bonuses

At the end of a bank's fiscal year, employees in the finance sector often receive bonuses. These bonuses are intended to acknowledge the employees' contributions to the bank's increased earnings during the year, as reflected in the annual accounts (Kent & Owen 2010).

Limiting bankers' bonuses could provide some advantages. Panetta et al. (2009) highlight various unintended consequences of compensation packages in the banking industry, noting that such packages may encourage CEOs and top management to prioritize short-term profits over long-term growth. This could negatively affect the stability of the banking system. Moreover, Bell and Brian (2010) argue that the size and composition of bankers' bonuses may have contributed to the financial crisis, as they incentivized excessive risk-taking based on short-term, non-risk-adjusted results. Therefore, limiting bankers' bonuses could lower the overall risk in the banking system, promoting a safer and more secure environment and preventing financial catastrophes like the 2008 crisis.

However, there are potential negative consequences of limiting bonuses. Xavier and Augustin (2006) contend that bonus restrictions might hinder financial institutions' ability to retain critical staff, as high-performing employees may feel their compensation is unfairly constrained. Additionally, Sebastian et al. (2011) suggest that bonus restrictions could demotivate bankers, leading to a decline in their performance. The financial industry must assume the risks associated with performance-related remuneration, as taking risks can result in substantial profits (Bell & Brian 2010). The challenge lies in balancing risk-taking with the pursuit of long-term goals.

Several countries have taken steps to curb bankers' bonuses in response to concerns about excessive risk-taking. The Financial Stability Board (2009) issued guidelines for sound compensation practices aimed at aligning remuneration with responsible risk-taking. Subsequently, various governments implemented compensation measures. For example, the United States has imposed payment restrictions and is considering mandatory clawback clauses, while the United Kingdom requires the deferral of at least 40% of variable compensation for significant risk-takers for three to seven years, with a seven to ten-year refundability period. The European Union has implemented a bonus cap of no more than 100% of the base salary, subject to shareholder approval.

ISSN: 3079-9325

The impact of these bonus restrictions varies across countries. Gehrig et al. (2009) conducted a survey examining the motivational effects of bonuses on effort, risk-taking, and attention to fundamentals. They found that, among German and Swiss fund managers, bonuses had no impact on effort. In contrast, in the United States, where bonuses are often larger, bonuses positively influenced effort, risk-taking, and a focus on fundamentals.

Bankers' bonuses can positively and negatively affect the banking industry. While limiting bonuses may reduce excessive risk-taking and promote stability, it may also discourage employee motivation and retention. The challenge for policymakers is to find a balance between incentivizing performance and ensuring the long-term health of the financial system. The experiences of different countries demonstrate that the impact of bonus restrictions depends on the specific measures implemented and the cultural context.

VI. Conclusion and Recommendations

In conclusion, the most effective methods for limiting excessive bank risk-taking involve raising capital adequacy, enhancing liquidity ratios, separating banking activities, and reducing bankers' bonuses. While these measures have advantages and disadvantages, a comprehensive approach to regulation is necessary to promote economic growth, pr. Rigid or one-sided regulations can hinder innovation and competitiveness, ultimately harming individuals and businesses.

A balanced regulatory approach combines top-down macro-prudential control with micro-prudential regulation, requiring central banks to provide sufficient liquidity during crises (Masahiro & Eswar 2011). This approach must take into account to protect consumers, and ensure that the financial system's stability fits financial institutions and their clients derived from international borrowing while mitigating the associated currency risks through a robust regulatory framework. Effective collaboration with stakeholders is essential for identifying and managing potential risks while simultaneously fostering innovation and growth.

One of the primary benefits of a multifaceted regulatory approach is its potential to reduce the emergence of systemic risks in financial institutions. By promoting transparency, accountability, and proper governance, regulators can help minimise the likelihood of financial shocks and other destabilizing events.

Moving forward, additional research and policy development are necessary to strengthen the regulatory system and support economic growth. Two key areas warrant further investigation: managing systemic risks and improving regulatory transparency. Systemic vulnerabilities continue to pose threats to the economy, and innovative approaches such as stress tests or more holistic supervision methods that consider the interdependent nature of financial markets could help mitigate these risks. Furthermore, the effectiveness of regulations significantly depends on their disclosure, highlighting the importance of transparency in the regulatory process.

In summary, fostering economic growth and maintaining the stability and health of the financial system requires a balanced, diverse regulatory approach. Governments can facilitate effective, efficient, and adaptive regulations by collaborating with stakeholders and adopting a dynamic,

ISSN: 3079-9325

flexible methodology. Ultimately, a combination of regulatory strategies is needed to safeguard the interests of consumers and businesses while supporting economic growth.

References

[1] Bech, M. L., & Keister, T. 2013. On the Economics of Committed Liquidity Facilities| Conference–2013.

[2] Bell, Brian. 2010. Bankers' bonuses. CEP Election Analysis (CEPEA010). The London School of Economics and Political Science, Center of Economic Performance, London, UK. Available at http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/id/eprint/57934.

[3] Dell'Ariccia, G., Detragiache, E. and Rajan, R. 2008. The real effect of banking crises. Journal of Financial Intermediation 17(1), pp. 89-112. doi: 10.1016/j.jfi.2007.06.001

[4] Gehrig, T., T. Lütje and L. Menkhoff. 2009. Bonus payments and the behaviour of fund managers: transatlantic evidence. CEPR Discussion Paper no. 7118.

[5] Gabaix, X. and Landier, A. 2006. Why has CEO pay increased so much?. SSRN Electronic Journal [Preprint]. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.890829.

[6] Hoerova, M., Mendicino, C., Nikolov, K., Schepens, G., & Van den Heuvel, S. 2018. Benefits and costs of liquidity regulation.

[7] Honohan, P. 2008. Risk management and the costs of the banking crisis. National Institute Economic Review 206, pp. 15–24. doi: 10.1177/0027950108099839

[8] Kube, S., Maréchal, M.A. and Puppe, C. 2011. The currency of reciprocity - gift-exchange in the Workplace. SSRN Electronic Journal [Preprint]. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.1160170.

[9] Kawai, M., & Prasad, E. S. (Eds.). 2011. Financial market regulation and reforms in emerging markets. Brookings Institution Press.

[10] Lehmann M. Volcker rule. 2016. Volker rule, ring-fencing or separation of bank activities–Comparison of structural reform acts around the world. Journal of Banking Regulation 17(3), pp. 176-187.

[11] Morris, S., & Shin, H. S. 2008. Financial regulation in a system context. Brookings papers on economic activity (2), pp. 229-274.

[12] Monnet, E., & Vari, M. 2019. Liquidity ratios as monetary policy tools: Some historical lessons for macroprudential policy. International Monetary Fund.

[13] Matthews, K. and Matthews, O. 2010. Controlling bankers' bonuses: Efficient regulation or politics of envy? Economic Affairs 30, pp. 71-76. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0270.2009.01977.x

[14] Panetta, F., P. Angelini, U. Albertazzi, F. Colomba, W. Cornacchia, A. DiCeasare, A. Pirati, CSalleo and G. Santini. 2009. Financial sector pro-cyclicality: lessons from the crisis. Bank of Italy Occasional Paper no. 44.

[15] Thanassoulis, John E. and Tanaka, Misa. 2016. Bankers' Pay and Excessive Risk. Bank of England Working Paper No. 558. doi: 10.2139/ssrn.2674040.

[16] Matthias Lehmann. "Volcker rule, ring-fencing or separation of bank activities - Comparison of structural reform acts around the world", Journal of Banking Regulation, 2015.