The measurement of the volatility of market risk of Viet Nam medicine industry after the low inflation period of 2015-2017

Abstract

The Vietnam economy has gained lots of achievements after the financial crisis in 2007-2011, until it reached a low inflation rate of 0.6% in 2015. This study measures the volatility of market risk in Viet Nam medicine industry after this period (2015-2017). The main reason is that the vital role of the medicine system in Vietnam in the economic development and growth in recent years always go with risk potential and risk control policies. This study aims to figure out the level of increase or decrease in the market risk of Vietnam medicine firms during the post-low inflation period of 2015-2017. First, by using quantitative in combination with comparative data analysis method, we found that the risk level measured by equity beta mean in the medicine industry is acceptable, that is, it is little lower than (<) 1. Then, one of its major findings is the comparison between risk level of medicine industry during the financial crisis 2007-2009 compared to those in the post-low inflation time 2015-2017. In fact, the research findings show market risk fluctuation, measured by equity beta var, during the post-low inflation time has decreased considerably despite the higher asset beta max. Finally, this study provides some ideas that could provide companies and government more evidence in establishing their policies in governance. This is a complex task but the research results caution that the market risk volatility might be higher during the post-low inflation period of 2015-2017. The conclusion part of this study will recommend some policies and plans to deal with it.
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INTRODUCTION

Throughout many recent years, Viet Nam medicine market is evaluated as one of active markets, which has certain positive effect on the economy.

Generally speaking, central banks aim to maintain inflation around 2 to 3%. Increases in inflation significantly beyond this range can lead to possible hyperinflation, a devastating scenario in which inflation rises rapidly out of control. Looking at exhibit 1, we can see the Vietnam economy has properly controlled inflation. High inflation might lead to higher lending rate and harm the medicine, healthcare industry.

This study will calculate and figure out whether the market risk level during the post-low inflation time (2015-17) has increased or decreased, as compared with those statistics in the financial crisis time (2007-2009).

The study is organized as follows: introduction, followed by research issues, literature review, conceptual theories and methodology. Thereafter, the main research
findings/results, some discussion and conclusion and then policy suggestion.

Research problems

The scope of this study are:

Problem 1: Whether the risk level of medicine firms under the different changing scenarios in post-low inflation period of 2015-2017 increase or decrease so much, as compared with the financial crisis of 2007-2009 and?

Problem 2: Because Viet Nam is an emerging and immature financial market and the stock market is still in the starting stage, there will be a large dispersed distribution of beta values in the different changing periods in the medicine industry?

This study also tests three (3) hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: By comparing two (2) periods, during the financial crisis impact, the beta or risk level of listed companies in medicine industry will relatively higher than those in the post-low inflation environment.

Hypothesis 2: Because Viet Nam is an emerging and immature financial market and the stock market that is still in the recovering stage, there will be a large disperse distribution in beta values estimated in the medicine industry.

Hypothesis 3: With the above reasons, the mean of equity and asset beta values of these listed medicine firms tend to impose a high risk level, that is, beta should be higher than (> ) 1. This hypothesis is based on the context of emerging markets including Viet Nam where there is lack of sufficient information and data disclosure, although it might have high growth rate.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Fama et al. (2004) indicated in the three factor model that “value” and “size” are significant components which can affect stock returns. They also mentioned that a stock’s return not only depends on a market beta, but also on market capitalization beta. The market beta is used in the three factor model, developed by Fama and French, which is the successor to the CAPM model by Sharpe, Treynor and Lintner. Dimitrov (2006) documented a significantly negative association between changes in financial leverage and contemporaneous risk-adjusted stock returns.

Umar (2011) found that firms which maintain good governance structures have leverage ratios that are higher (forty-seven percent) than those of firms with poor governance mechanisms per unit of profit. Chen et al. (2013) supported regulators’ suspicions that over-reliance on short-term funding and insufficient collateral compounded the effects of dangerously high leverage and resulted in undercapitalization and excessive risk exposure for Lehman Brothers. The model reinforces the importance of the relationship between capital structure and risk management. Further, Gunarathna (2013) showed that in different industries in Sri Lanka, the degree of financial leverage has a significant positive correlation with financial risk.

During the financial crisis of 2007-2009 in Viet Nam and global financial markets, high inflation causing high lending rates have created risks for many industries such as medicine and the whole economy. Mohamad et al. (2014) showed that financial risk is vital through using both return on asset and return on equity in the performance equation. This result also implied that we cannot avoid the inverse relationship between financial risk and performance; therefore, bank system would be better to make a trade-off between risk and performance.

Wang et al. (2014) presented results showing that firms with long-term institutional investors receive significantly positive abnormal returns around the offering announcement.

Then, Gunarathna (2016) showed that firm size negatively impacts on the financial risk, financial leverage and financial risk and has positive relationship. Hami (2017) showed that financial depth has been affected negatively by inflation in Iran during the observation period.

Park et al. (2019) found that sentiment caused by investors’ inattentiveness mainly drives the underlying potent relationship between investor sentiment and aggregate stock returns. The results accord with the notion that investor attention generally improves market efficiency.

Conceptual theories

Positive sides of low inflation: Low (not negative) inflation reduces the potential of economic recession by enabling the labor market to adjust more quickly in a downturn, and reduces the risk that a liquidity trap prevents monetary policy from stabilizing the economy. This is explaining why many economists nowadays prefer a low and stable rate of inflation. It will help investment, encourage exports and prevent boom economy.

Negative side of low inflation: It leads to low aggregate demand and economic growth, recession potential and high unemployment. Production becomes less vibrant. Low inflation makes real wages higher. Workers can thus reduce the supply of labor and increase rest time. On the other hand, low product prices reduce production motivation.
The central bank can use monetary policies, for instance, increasing interest rates to reduce lending, control money supply or the Ministry of finance and the government can use tight fiscal policy (high tax) to achieve low inflation.

Financial and credit risk in the bank system can increase when the financial market becomes more active and bigger, especially with more international linkage influence. This affects the increasing risk in medicine sector. Hence, central banks, commercial banks, medicine firms and the government need to organize data to analyze and control these risks, including market risk.

**METHODOLOGY**

We use the data from the stock exchange market in Vietnam (HOSE and HNX) during the financial crisis of 2007-2009 period and the post – low inflation time of 2015-2017 to estimate systemic risk results. We perform both fundamental data analysis and financial techniques to calculate equity and asset beta values.

In this study, analytical research method and especially, comparative analysis method are used, in combination with quantitative data analysis. Analytical data are from the situation of listed medicine firms in VN stock exchange.

Specifically, stock price data are from live data on HOSE stock exchange during 3 years 2015-2017, which presents the low inflation environment. Then, we use both analytical and summary method to generate analytical results from data calculated.

Finally, we use the results to suggest policy for both these enterprises, relevant organizations and government.

**MAIN RESULTS**

**General data analysis**

We obtained some analytical results from the research sample with 10 listed firms in the medicine market and live date from the stock exchange.

**EMPIRICAL RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

In the below section, data used are from total 10 listed medicine industry companies on VN stock exchange (HOSE and HNX mainly). Different scenarios are created by comparing the calculation risk data between 2 periods: the post – low inflation period of 2015-2017 and the financial crisis of 2007-2009.

Market risk (beta) under the impact of tax rate, includes: 1) equity beta; and 2) asset beta. We model our data analysis as shown in Figure 1.

Based on the calculation result tables, we analyze data as follows:

Firstly, Table 1 shows that more medicine firms (5 over 10 companies) have equity beta values lower (<) than 1, which means risk level acceptable. There are no firms with equity beta > 1. Thus 3 firms have negative beta values. Table 2 shows that equity beta mean of the sample is 0.036, just little lower than (<) 1. It is acceptable. As shown in Table 3, there are 2 firms with 0 < equity beta values < 1 in the crisis, which turn into negative beta, 1 during the post-low inflation period of 2015-2017. Table 5 shows that equity beta var in the post-low inflation period are lower (>), than those in the financial crisis 2007-2009. Furthermore, Table 5 also shows equity beta max in the post-inflation period of 2015-2017 as well as equity beta mean are smaller (>), than those in the financial crisis of 2007-2009.

Figure 2 shows that the values of asset and equity beta mean and equity beta var in the post-low inflation of 2015-2017 are significantly lower (<) than those in the crisis of 2007-2009, while asset beta max and asset beta var are just little higher (>), than those in the financial crisis of 2007-2009. It means that the level of risk in the post – low inflation period of 2015-17 is lower in general and in average. Although the fluctuation in risk level measured by asset beta var is little higher during the post-low inflation.

**DISCUSSION FOR FURTHER RESEARCHES**

We can continue to analyze risk factors behind the risk scene (risk fluctuation increasing, shown by equity beta var as above analysis) in order to recommend suitable policies and plans to control market risk better.

**CONCLUSION AND POLICY SUGGESTION**

In general, medicine system in Vietnam, a key sector in
Table 1: The volatility of market risk (beta) of medicine industry in the post- low inflation period of 2015-2017.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equity beta</td>
<td>Asset beta (assume debt beta = 0)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMV</td>
<td>-0.556</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>-0.266</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DBM</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DCL</td>
<td>-0.266</td>
<td>-0.193</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DDN</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
<td>89.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DHG</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>BCP</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>0.000180</td>
<td>0.000002</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic results</th>
<th>2015-2017 (post - low inflation)</th>
<th>Note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equity beta</td>
<td>Asset beta (assume debt beta = 0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAX</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td>0.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIN</td>
<td>-0.556</td>
<td>-0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAN</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAR</td>
<td>0.1798</td>
<td>0.0730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Sample size : 10


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Equity beta</td>
<td>Asset beta (assume debt beta = 0)</td>
<td>Equity beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>AMV</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.232</td>
<td>-0.556</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>APC</td>
<td>0.617</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DBM</td>
<td>0.268</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>DBT</td>
<td>0.661</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>DCL</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>-0.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>DDN</td>
<td>-1.575</td>
<td>-0.286</td>
<td>-0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>DHG</td>
<td>0.618</td>
<td>0.262</td>
<td>0.790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>DHT</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.175</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>BCP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>CGP</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The healthcare industry, has been contributing significantly to the economic development and GDP growth rate of more than 6-7% in recent years. The above analysis shows that despite the decreasing market risk, risk volatility (equity beta var) is also decreasing during the post-low inflation period, asset beta max becomes higher. Therefore, medicine firms in Vietnam need to continue to increase their corporate governance system, structure and mechanisms, as well as their competitive advantage to control risk better. Also, they need to reduce risk of quality of medical and healthcare venues and reputation risk of medicine companies.

The present study provides evidence that the market risk potential might be lower in 2015-2017 post-low inflation.
period (looking again chart 1 – equity beta mean values), while the Exhibit 3 also suggests that the credit growth rate increased in 2016 and slightly decrease in later years (2017-2018). It means that the local economy is trying to control credit growth reasonably, however we need to analyze risk factors more carefully to reduce more market risk.

As shown in Figure 2, the result rejects the hypothesis 3 mentioning that the mean of equity and asset beta values of these listed medicine companies tend to impose a little high risk level, that is, beta should be higher than (>1). Because the equity beta mean is lower in the post-low (L) inflation period, it supports the hypothesis 1 saying that comparing two (2) periods, during the financial crisis impact, the beta or risk level of listed companies in medicine industry will relatively higher than those in the post-low inflation environment. Additionally, the above result rejects the hypothesis 2 stating that because Vietnam is an emerging and immature financial market and the stock market still in the recovering stage, there will be a large dispersed distribution in beta values estimated in the medicine industry.

In the light of these, as it generates the warning that the risk fluctuation might be higher in the financial crisis and declines during post-low (L) inflation period, especially under negative impacts from China-Trump commerce war at present, and asset beta max higher in the post-L inflation time, the government and relevant bodies such as Ministry of Finance and State Bank of Vietnam need to consider proper policies (including a combination of fiscal, monetary, exchange rate and price control policies) aiming to reduce the risk volatility and hence, help the real estate system as well as the whole economy become more stable in next development stage. The Ministry of Finance continues to increase the effectiveness of fiscal policies and tax policies which are needed to combine with other macro policies at the same time. The State Bank of Vietnam continues to increase the effectiveness of capital providing channels for medicine companies as we could note that in this study, debt leverage has certain impacts on reducing risk level.

Finally, this study opens some new directions for further researches in risk control policies in medicine system as well as in the whole economy. We need to avoid risks of public to bad quality medicine in VN Pharma case and manage better medicine inventory as well as financial risk management.
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