



Munich Personal RePEc Archive

# **Insolvency Regimes and Firms' Default Risk Under Economic Uncertainty and Shocks**

Gopalakrishnan, Balagopal and Mohapatra, Sanket

Indian Institute of Management Kozhikode, Indian Institute of Management Ahmedabad

1 October 2019

Online at <https://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/96283/>

MPRA Paper No. 96283, posted 03 Oct 2019 07:39 UTC

# Insolvency Regimes and Firms' Default Risk Under Economic Uncertainty and Shocks\*

Balagopal Gopalakrishnan<sup>†</sup> and Sanket Mohapatra<sup>‡§</sup>

## Abstract

One of the arguments often advanced for implementing a stronger insolvency and bankruptcy framework is that it enhances credit discipline among firms. Using a large cross-country firm-level dataset, we empirically test whether a stronger insolvency regime reduces firms' likelihood of defaulting on their debt. In particular, we examine whether it reduces default risk during increased economic uncertainty and various external shocks. Our results confirm that a stronger insolvency regime moderates the adverse effects of economic shocks on firms' default risk. The effects are more pronounced for firms in the top half of the size distribution. We also explore channels through which improved creditor rights influence firms' default risk, including dependence on external finance, corporate leverage, and managerial ethics. Our main results are robust to an alternative measure of default risk, inclusion of currency and sovereign debt crisis episodes, and alternative estimations.

*Keywords:* Insolvency; Bankruptcy; Default risk; Economic policy uncertainty; Sovereign debt crisis; Currency crisis

*JEL Codes:* G30; G32; G33

---

\*The authors are grateful for the suggestions and comments provided by V. Ravi Anshuman, Pavel Chakraborty, Sergio Muro, Pranav Singh and participants in the IIMA-World Bank Research Conference on Financial Distress, Bankruptcy, and Corporate Finance. Funding from IIM Ahmedabad and UTI Asset Management Company is acknowledged. Usual disclaimer applies.

<sup>†</sup>Finance, Accounting, and Control Area, Indian Institute of Management, Kozhikode, Kerala, India. Email: balagopal@iimk.ac.in

<sup>‡</sup>Economics Area, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad, Gujarat, India. Email: sanketm@iima.ac.in

<sup>§</sup>Corresponding author

# 1. Introduction

Institutional measures that protect the interest of various stakeholders in a financial contract are often considered as means to reduce financing frictions and, consequently, improve contracting outcomes of various parties. There are two broad views on how creditor rights impact firms' risk-taking, investment, and financing. One view holds that enhanced creditor rights would improve their debt financing capacity by increasing the availability of private credit by the financial system (Djankov, McLiesh, & Shleifer, 2007). The second view holds that stronger creditor rights would deter firms from undertaking riskier investments (Acharya, Amihud, & Litov, 2011) and lower their leverage (Cho, El Ghouli, Guedhami, & Suh, 2014). Claessens and Klapper (2005) argue that *ex-ante* incentive effects of stronger creditor rights and insolvency systems encourage less risky behavior by firms, thereby reducing their chances of financial distress. In this study, we build on the latter view by empirically examining whether enhanced creditor rights reduce firms' *ex-ante* risk of debt default during episodes of policy uncertainty and economic shocks.

We examine the role of creditor rights in influencing firm behavior across advanced and emerging economies by using their disclosed financial information. First, we consider how institutional changes in the insolvency framework, which improve creditor rights, affect firms' behavior in terms of their risk of defaulting on their debt obligations. Second, we consider whether an improvement in the insolvency regime moderates the effect of economic shocks on their risk of debt distress. Our emphasis on firms' response to economic shocks as an outcome of creditor rights differs from existing literature that considers the impact of creditor rights on risky investments (Acharya et al., 2011); on firms' capital structure decisions (Cho et al., 2014; Gilson, 1997); and on private credit across countries (Djankov et al., 2007). We also complement Bergoing, Kehoe, Kehoe, and Soto (2002) who find a positive effect of bankruptcy reforms on the recovery from a debt crisis.

We examine the above questions by considering the association between the strength of insolvency regimes, economic shocks, and firms' likelihood of financial distress. Our results point to a negative association between the strength of the insolvency framework, a measure

of creditor rights, and firms' risk of debt default. Our finding is consistent with prior studies that show an inverse relationship between creditor rights and firms' risk-taking (Acharya et al., 2011; Cho et al., 2014). We also find that stronger insolvency regimes moderate the adverse effects of heightened economic policy uncertainty and economic shocks on firms' risk of default. This finding suggests that when the insolvency regime is stronger, borrowers are less likely to take on additional risk during adverse economic shocks. One possible channel is the impairment in borrowers' collateral during economic downturns, which can raise the agency costs of financing (Gertler & Bernanke, 1989) and, consequently, increase the likelihood of liquidation under stronger creditor rights. This can discourage managers acting on behalf of the shareholders from taking on risks that can increase the possibility of a debt default (Adler, 1991).<sup>1</sup>

Our results on the positive role of the insolvency framework during adverse economic events are tested with the economic policy uncertainty (EPU) measure, a country-specific measure of uncertain government policies, developed by Baker, Bloom, and Davis (2016). Episodes of higher economic policy uncertainty can lead to a delay in private sector investments and affect consumption. In addition to EPU, we employ other measures of country-specific economic shocks, such as currency crises and sovereign debt crises to validate our results. We also observe the moderating effect of stronger insolvency regimes during those crises periods. The above findings also hold for an alternative measure of default risk, the market signal probability of default (MSPD) developed by Standard and Poor's, which is based on a structural model.

Further, we find that both the average effect of a better insolvency regime, as well as its moderating effect during economic shocks is higher for larger firms. This may be explained by the propensity of professional managers of larger firms, who enjoy more control rights given the diffused shareholder ownership structure that exists in such firms, to maintain their reputational capital. A stronger insolvency regime can discourage managers from taking risky decisions as they stand to lose the private benefits associated with their control rights in the event of

---

<sup>1</sup>Adler (1991) argues that while managers of an insolvent firm may take on *greater* investment risk prior to final bankruptcy resolution, *ex ante* they would reduce their risk in order to avoid bankruptcy (see also Acharya et al. (2011)).

insolvency during a downturn (Eckbo & Thorburn, 2003). In smaller firms, the decisions of the managers and shareholders might be closely aligned, and hence, these firms may not pass up riskier investment activities when the creditor rights are higher. Our key findings hold for all subsamples excluding the United States and Japan.

We also consider the potential channels through which improved creditor rights influence firms' default risk. Using a measure of external financial dependence developed by Rajan and Zingales (1998), we find a larger moderating effect of a better insolvency regime on firms' risk of defaulting on debt obligations during economic shocks for industrial sectors with higher external finance dependence. This suggests that the strength of the insolvency framework plays a larger role for firms with higher reliance on the financial system compared to their internal cash flows. We find that better insolvency regimes lower firms' likelihood of default through a reduction in leverage, an indicator of their risk-taking behavior (Acharya et al., 2011).

While our primary emphasis is on how creditor rights alter firm behavior, it is possible that the results are influenced by their efforts to reduce agency costs in financial contracting. One such signaling mechanism is the ethical behavior of corporate managers, which can help to mitigate the agency costs arising out of asymmetric information (Huang, Louwers, Moffitt, & Zhang, 2008; Husted, 2007; Van Oosterhout, Heugens, & Kaptein, 2006). As expected, we find that both a stronger insolvency framework and a measure of firms' ethics have a negative association with their default risk. However, the interaction of the two suggests that a stronger insolvency framework can result in lower risk-taking even when corporate governance is relatively weak, particularly during periods of greater economic uncertainty.

This study contributes to the literature on the role of regulatory institutions in improving financial contracting outcomes in several ways. To our knowledge, this is the first study that considers the role of the insolvency regime in mitigating the risk of default during economic shocks. We extend the existing literature on creditor rights and firm behavior by examining the ex-ante behavior of firms during economic shocks for a large sample of firms across countries with varying creditor rights. Second, we directly examine firms' default risk rather than investment and capital structure decisions that influence firm risk. Our findings on default risk corroborate earlier studies on the relationship between creditor rights and risk-taking (Acharya

et al., 2011; Eckbo & Thorburn, 2003; Gilson, 1997). Third, we employ a distance-to-frontier measure of creditor rights that is based on the time, cost, and outcome of insolvency proceedings, which determine the recovery rates in bankruptcy (World Bank, 2019). Overall, our findings contribute to the literature on firm behavior in response to changes in regulations that improve creditor rights.

The next section discusses the literature on creditor rights, firm risk-taking, and economic policy uncertainty. The subsequent section discusses the empirical methodology and data used for this study. Our main results and robustness to alternative specifications and subsamples are discussed next. The last section concludes with relevance for policies on creditor rights.

## **2. Related Literature**

Our study relates to a large literature on the role of creditor rights in financial contracting, capital market development, and risk-taking by firms. It also relates to the literature on the role of economic policy uncertainty and economic shocks in financial outcomes, cost of capital, investment, and employment. These two strands of literature are discussed below.

### *2.1. Creditor rights and firm financing*

The literature on the impact of creditor rights on firms can be classified into two strands, the supply-side arguments and the demand-side arguments. In the supply-side strand, studies predominantly examine the effect of improved creditor rights on credit supply and economic growth. The seminal study of La Porta, Lopez-de Silanes, Shleifer, and Vishny (1997) shows that the quality of law enforcement is an important consideration in the development of capital markets. The authors show that the development of both equity and debt markets of civil law countries lag behind those of common law countries. Djankov et al. (2007) find that credit to the private sector goes up in countries with stronger legal systems that protect the rights of the creditors. Rodano, Serrano-Velarde, and Tarantino (2016) find that reforms in Italy, which strengthened creditor rights in liquidation, led to a significant reduction in the cost of bank financing and an increase in firm investment. Bergoing, Loayza, and Repetto (2004) argue

that weaker bankruptcy regimes distort the reallocation of resources across economic units and result in slower growth. [Bergoing et al. \(2002\)](#) find that bankruptcy reforms in Chile helped in a faster recovery after a crisis in the early 1980s.

Studies relating to the demand-side view examine both the financing and the investment choices made by firms. [Gilson \(1997\)](#) finds evidence that bankruptcy costs can induce managers to maintain a capital structure with lower leverage to avoid the possibility of financial distress. In a cross-country study, [Acharya et al. \(2011\)](#) find that stronger creditor rights in bankruptcy reduce corporate risk-taking and leverage. The authors find that firms reduce risk through diversification of value-reducing acquisitions. In a cross-country setting, [Seifert and Gonenc \(2012\)](#) show that firms based in countries with stronger creditor rights reduce cash-flow risk and, consequently, their R&D expenses. [Dewaelheyns and Van Hulle \(2008\)](#) show that the likelihood of distress among Belgian small and medium-sized firms reduced significantly after the introduction of an insolvency reform in 1997.

Stronger creditor rights can reduce riskier activities and potentially reduce innovation and investment. [Acharya and Subramanian \(2009\)](#), using patent data, argue that stronger creditor rights would induce firms to shun innovation. Another strand argues for the presence of managerial conservatism in firms' investment choices to maintain their reputational capital ([Eckbo & Thorburn, 2003](#); [Hirshleifer & Thakor, 1992](#); [Zwiebel, 1995](#)). [Zwiebel \(1995\)](#) argues that managers refrain from riskier investments due to fear of reputational loss. In Sweden, [Eckbo and Thorburn \(2003\)](#) show that private benefits of control derived by the management encourage them to make conservative investment decisions in the face of a stringent bankruptcy process, which can force them out of their jobs. [Chava and Roberts \(2008\)](#) empirically show that firms reduce their investments in response to the threat by creditors to accelerate the loan repayments. The study finds evidence that contingent control rights of the creditors facilitated by the enforcement of debt covenants mitigate distortions in firms' investment decisions that arise from asymmetric information.

## 2.2. *Economic uncertainty and firm outcomes*

Next, we review the emerging literature on economic policy uncertainty and its implications for real-sector outcomes, equity market responses, and bank credit supply. Higher economic policy uncertainty tends to be associated with adverse macroeconomic performance in the form of lower output, investment, and employment (Baker et al., 2016). The authors develop a text-based economic policy uncertainty (EPU) index, which relies on the frequency of certain keywords that appear in articles in leading newspapers. Bloom (2009) uses a structural framework to analyze the impact of uncertainty shocks and finds that higher uncertainty shocks result in temporary delays in investment and employment generation by firms, and a fall in productivity growth. Drobotz, El Ghouli, Guedhami, and Janzen (2018) find that higher policy uncertainty weakens the negative impact of the cost of capital on investments. The authors conclude that higher economic policy uncertainties distort the relationship between capital investments and the cost of capital.

Brogaard and Detzel (2015) find that equity portfolios with higher sensitivity to economic policy uncertainty underperform those with lower sensitivity. Using equity market data from the United States, Nagar, Schoenfeld, and Wellman (2019) show that firms face higher information asymmetries in the form of higher bid-ask spreads and decreased stock price reactions to earnings surprises during heightened economic policy uncertainty. In a general equilibrium setting, Pastor and Veronesi (2012) predict a larger fall in stock prices on an average during greater uncertainty about government policies. Brogaard and Detzel (2015) show that an increase in economic policy uncertainty is associated with a contemporaneous decrease in market returns and an increase in future three-month excess returns.

Bordo, Duca, and Koch (2016) find that economic policy uncertainty negatively affected aggregate bank credit growth in the United States during the 2007-13 period. The weaker credit supply through the bank lending channel resulted in lower economic growth. The authors find that the effects of policy uncertainty are more pronounced in larger, less well-capitalized, and less liquid banks. Chi and Li (2017) find evidence that economic uncertainty is related to higher non-performing loans in China. Berger, Guedhami, Kim, and Li (2018) report that higher eco-



conomic policy uncertainty is associated with greater liquidity hoarding by banks. [Boumparis, Milas, and Panagiotidis \(2017\)](#) find that lower-rated sovereigns in Europe experience a larger negative impact on their creditworthiness during heightened economic policy uncertainty compared to better rated countries.

### 3. Methodology and Data

#### 3.1. Empirical methodology

Drawing on literature that suggests that improved creditor rights may reduce the risk of debt default by increasing credit discipline among firms, we model the effect of creditor rights on firms' default risk using the following estimation equation:

$$\begin{aligned}
 DefaultRiskScore_{it} = & \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 Insol\_score_{jt-1} + \sum_k \alpha_{2,k} X_{i,kt-1} \\
 & + \sum_l \alpha_{3,l} Y_{j,lt-1} + \mu_i + \tau_t + \epsilon_{it}
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $DefaultRiskScore_{it}$  is the default risk score, proxied by  $Z$ -score, of the firm  $i$  in year  $t$ . Higher the default risk score, the lower the chances of a default.  $Insol\_score_{jt-1}$  is a score that captures the relative strength of the insolvency standards for the country  $j$  for the year  $t - 1$ .  $X$  is a set of firm-specific control variables that affect the default risk of the firm. Specifically, we control for the asset size, future and present growth opportunities through the market to book ratio and sales growth, respectively, availability of tangible collateral, and operational cash flows of the firm.

$Y$  is a set of country-specific variables that affect the default risk of the firm.  $\mu_i$  captures the firm-specific time-invariant factors and subsumes any other higher order time-invariant effects, such as industry and country fixed effects.  $\tau_t$  captures any year-specific exogenous shocks that affect all the firms. In alternative specifications, we control for  $Industry \times Year$  fixed effects to account for any change in industry-level time-variant fluctuations that could affect the default risk of firms in a specific industry ([Gormley & Matsa, 2014](#)). All standard errors are clustered at firm-level and controlled for heteroskedasticity, as suggested by [Petersen \(2009\)](#) for corporate

finance applications.

Literature argues that economic policy uncertainty can adversely impact firm performance. In the next specification, we test whether this effect varies with the strength of creditor rights. We employ the following empirical specification to test the moderating role of the insolvency framework during episodes of policy uncertainty shocks.

$$\begin{aligned}
 DefaultRiskScore_{it} = & \beta_0 + \beta_1 Insol\_score_{jt-1} + \beta_2 Shock_{jt-1} \times Insol\_score_{jt-1} \\
 & + \beta_3 Shock_{jt-1} + \sum_s \beta_{4,s} X_{i,st-1} + \sum_l \beta_{5,l} Y_{j,lt-1} + \mu_i + \tau_t + \epsilon_{it}
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The dependent variable is the *DefaultRiskScore*. The *Shock* variable is based on the economic policy uncertainty (*EPU*) index of [Baker et al. \(2016\)](#), currency crisis (*Curr\_crisis*), and sovereign debt crisis (*Debt\_crisis*). The detailed definition of the *Shock* variables is provided in [Table 1](#). The key explanatory variable is the interaction term  $Insol\_score \times Shock$ . As we expect better creditor rights to reduce the effect of shocks on firm default risk, we expect  $\beta_2$  to be positive and significant. We employ several economic shock proxies to capture the effect of creditor rights on firm default risk in the presence of economic uncertainties.

All other variables are similar to those shown in [Equation 1](#). In alternative estimations, we interact firm size with  $Shock \times Insol\_score$  to examine its effect on the moderating effects of the insolvency score during economic shocks. As the variation of the triple interaction term is at the firm-level, we control for country-year fixed effects in these estimations. Country-year dummies capture the effects of any unobserved yearly variation at the country level ([Gormley & Matsa, 2014](#)).

### 3.2. Data

We obtain the data on firm-level financial information from the Worldscope database of Thomson Reuters. In our analysis, we consider only non-financial manufacturing firms (SIC 2 digit 20-39). Our baseline sample covers firm performance for 60 countries over a 15 year period from 2003 to 2017, determined by the availability of the information on creditor rights. All firm-level variables are derived from the field items in the Worldscope database. Detailed defi-

nition of the firm-level variables is shown in [Table 1](#).

The primary dependent variable *Z-score* is derived based on the disclosed firm financial information ([Altman, 1968](#)) (detailed definition in [Table 1](#)). This measure of firm default risk has found wide acceptance in the finance literature ([Almeida, Hankins, & Williams, 2017](#); [Asness, Frazzini, & Pedersen, 2019](#); [Eisdorfer, 2008](#); [Fan, Huang, & Zhu, 2013](#)). Since the *Z-score* is based primarily on accounting information, it offers wider coverage as compared to other measures of financial distress. We also employ an alternative measure of default risk, the market signal probability of default (*MSPD*) developed by Standard & Poor's, which is based on a structural model and ranges from 0 to 100. We transform this variable to *MSPD\_inv*, calculated as  $100 - MSPD$ , in order to be in the same direction as the *Z-score*.

The key explanatory variable that captures the strength of creditor rights, *Insol\_score*, is obtained from the *Doing Business* database of the World Bank. The *Insol\_score* is a distance-to-frontier measure ranging from 0 to 100 based on the time, cost, and outcome of the insolvency proceedings that determine the recovery rate in bankruptcy, as well as the strength of the legal framework for liquidation and reorganization ([World Bank, 2019](#)). This measure, available since 2003, is based on annual surveys of local insolvency practitioners and information on laws, regulations, and insolvency systems across countries.

The measures of economic shocks are obtained from various publicly available sources. Our main measure, the economic policy uncertainty (*EPU*) index, is obtained from the database maintained by [Baker et al. \(2016\)](#). This measure on policy-related economic uncertainty has been used in many recent studies ([Bordo et al., 2016](#); [Drobtz et al., 2018](#); [Harvey & Liu, 2019](#); [Nagar et al., 2019](#)). The information on currency crisis and sovereign debt crisis is obtained from the Global Crises Data based on [Reinhart and Reinhart \(2015\)](#); [Reinhart and Rogoff \(2009\)](#), maintained by the Behavioral Finance and Financial Stability (BFFS) Project database of the Harvard Business School.<sup>2</sup>

The country-level control variables, obtained from the World Development Indicators of the World Bank, include GDP growth, the logarithm of per capita GDP, and the ratio of private

---

<sup>2</sup>We do not include banking crises episodes in this study since such events can be potentially endogenous to the likelihood of debt default by firms, which can, in turn, increase the non-performing loans of the banking system.

credit to GDP (an indicator of the level of financial development). In alternative estimations, we employ *Firm\_ethics*, an indicator of the ethical practices in firms, obtained from the Global Competitiveness Report database of the World Economic Forum.<sup>3</sup> The analysis with firm ethics helps us to consider the potential substitutability between creditor rights and managerial ethics in influencing firms' default risk.

All firm-specific variables are winsorized at the 1 and 99 percentile. The final estimation sample based on the data availability of the baseline specification shown in Equation 1 has 103,576 firm-year observations for 13,019 unique firms across 60 countries. The summary statistics of the variables employed in the study is shown in Table 2. The average firm has a *Z-score* of 3.19 and *MSPD\_inv* of 97.33%, indicating a relatively low likelihood of a default during the estimation period.

The average size of the representative firm in our sample is \$282 million. Such a firm has a mean sales growth of 6.3% and a market-to-book (*M/B*) ratio of 2.31, suggesting future growth opportunities. The average firm has positive operational cash flow and has about 31% of its assets as fixed assets. The firms experienced a currency crisis during 14% of the estimation period. In Table 3, we show the industry-level observations and the corresponding mean and standard deviation of the default score (*Z-score*). There is significant variation in the default risk scores within and across industries subgroups. The least mean *Z-score* is for the Textile mill products and the highest mean *Z-score* is for the Tobacco Products industry group.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Creditor rights and likelihood of debt distress

The findings of the estimation model shown in Equation 1 are presented in Table 4. The results of the estimation in column (1) suggest that higher the quality of the insolvency process in a country, lower the default risk (higher value of *Z-score*) of the firms in that country. In the baseline specifications, we control for fixed effects at the firm, year, and industry-year levels

---

<sup>3</sup>This factor is a part of the Private Institutions subgroup of the Institutions pillar of the Global Competitiveness Report.

and cluster the standard errors at the firm level. In column (2), we additionally control for firm-specific factors that are known to affect the creditworthiness of the firms. The magnitude of the insolvency variable remains stable with the inclusion of these firm controls. In column (3), we control for country-specific factors. The results in column (3) suggest that a 10-unit increase in insolvency score (which is measured on a scale of 0-100) increases the *Z-score* score by 0.07 units. This represents a 2.2% decline compared to the mean *Z-score* of 3.19, suggesting that an improvement in the insolvency score has an economically significant effect in terms of reducing the risk of debt default by firms.

We further examine how this effect of the insolvency regime varies by the size of the firms in our sample. The findings in column (4) are in line with our expectation that stronger creditor rights dissuade larger firms from riskier investments and decisions that increase the chances of distress. We find that the negative association between stronger creditor rights and the likelihood of default is driven by the larger firms. The effects are higher by about 45% (0.010 vs. 0.007) as compared to the smaller firms in our sample (see column (4) in [Table 4](#)).

The coefficients of the control variables are as expected. These results suggest that smaller firms, firms with higher cash flows, and those with higher growth opportunities (higher *Market-to-Book* ratio) tend to have higher *Z-scores*, indicating a lower propensity to default. Firms with higher tangible capital have a lower *Z-score*, which may be explained by a greater reliance on debt financing secured by the firms' tangible assets. The coefficients of country-specific factors indicate that firms in countries with higher GDP growth, higher per capita income, and lower private credit to GDP (implying a lower debt overhang) tend to have a lower likelihood of default.

Our results are robust to the exclusion of the United States and Japan, both advanced economies that constitute about 35% of the observation in our sample (see columns (5) and (6)). These countries have been excluded in robustness tests in earlier studies on creditor rights to ensure that large advanced economies do not drive the main results ([Cho et al., 2014](#)).<sup>4</sup> The coefficient of *Insol\_score* is significant and positive, albeit smaller in magnitude as compared to the full sample. However, in the restricted sample, we do not find any significant difference

---

<sup>4</sup>Our main results hold in terms of sign and significance even if we exclude China, the largest developing country, along with the United States and Japan.

in the effect of the insolvency regime between the larger and the smaller firms.

Next, we estimate [Equation 2](#) in which we test whether firms in countries with stronger insolvency framework would be able to perform better during heightened economic uncertainty. In order to capture large policy uncertainty shocks, we create *EPU\_shock*, a dummy variable which takes the value 1 if the *EPU* index is one standard deviation above its average value and 0 otherwise. We interact this variable with the *Insol\_score*. The positive coefficient of the interaction term  $Insol\_score \times EPU\_shock$ , shown in [Table 5](#) column (1), suggests that the likelihood of debt distress of firms is moderated during episodes of heightened economic policy uncertainty in countries with stronger creditor rights. A one standard deviation increase in the creditor rights score (equivalent to 27.9 unit increase) moderates the adverse effect of an *EPU\_shock* on firm's default risk score by about 0.14, which is about 5.5% of the *Z-score* of the median firm in our sample. As expected, the negative and significant coefficient of the level effect of *EPU\_shock* suggests that the default risk of firms is higher (lower *Z-score*) during episodes of heightened economic policy uncertainty.

The finding that better insolvency regimes moderate the adverse effects of higher economic policy uncertainty on firms' default risk is corroborated for an alternative measure of heightened economic uncertainty (*EPU\_shock\_alt*) that takes the value 1 for the top quartile of the *EPU* distribution (see column (2) of [Table 5](#)). The moderating effect of creditor rights is consistent for the restricted sample that excludes the United States and Japan, with the magnitude of the moderating effect being slightly higher for *EPU\_shock* and similar for *EPU\_shock\_alt* compared to the full sample (see columns (3) and (4)).

#### 4.2. *Size-effects in firms' response to creditor rights*

[Beck, Demirgüç-Kunt, and Maksimovic \(2006\)](#) suggest that weak creditor rights can incentivize firms that are dependent on external financing to increase their size. Larger firms may benefit from internalization of the allocation of capital, particularly when there is ineffective monitoring by intermediaries or as a consequence of weak legal systems for enforcement of creditor rights. In this section, we attempt to understand whether the moderating effect of insolvency regimes on default risk during heightened economic uncertainty is driven by larger or

smaller firms.

We classify the firms into two groups using a dummy variable that takes the value 1 if the asset size is larger than the mean asset size for the sample and 0 otherwise. The result with country-level controls is reported in column (1) of [Table 6](#). In column (2), we include country-year dummies that capture any country-specific time-varying effects. In the latter specification, country-specific level terms, such as *Insol\_score* and *EPU\_shock*, are subsumed by the country-year dummies and, consequently, only interaction terms that vary at a firm-level survive in the regression analysis.

The coefficient of the triple interaction term  $Insol\_score \times EPU\_shock \times Large\_size$  is positive and significant, as shown in [Table 6](#), suggesting that the moderating effects discussed in the earlier subsection are driven by larger firms. This finding is consistent with the argument of [Eckbo and Thorburn \(2003\)](#) that stronger creditor rights can dissuade managers from taking riskier decisions as they may lose the private benefits associated with higher control rights, a facet of large-sized firms with diffused ownership ([Demsetz & Lehn, 1985](#)). The findings are consistent for the restricted sample of observations that excludes the firms from the US and Japan (see columns (3) and (4)).

### 4.3. *Alternative measure of default risk*

Our primary measure of default risk *Z-score* offers computational ease but suffers from some limitations as it is predominantly a book-value measure and does not take into account other factors that could affect the creditworthiness of the firm. In order to address this concern, we test the robustness of our main results for an alternative proxy for default risk, *MSPD\_inv*, computed based on a proprietary structural model of default risk. Therefore, the higher the *MSPD\_inv*, the lower the chances of default. One limitation of the *MSPD\_inv* data is that it is available only since 2013 and for a relatively small subsample of 6,432 observations for 1,617 unique firms.

We then re-estimate [Equation 2](#) with *MSPD\_inv* as the dependent variable. The results of the estimation shown in columns (1) and (2) of [Table 7](#) are consistent with the findings shown in [Table 5](#) for *EPU\_shock* and *EPU\_shock\_alt*. The coefficient of the interaction terms that

captures the role of better creditor rights during periods of shock is positive and significant. A one standard deviation increase in the insolvency framework of the country reduces the probability of default by 0.45 percentage points. Our findings remain robust for the subsample excluding the United States and Japan, as reported in columns (3) and (4).

#### 4.4. *Alternative measure of economic shocks*

In order to test whether our results for firms' default risk during economic policy shocks is robust to alternative measure of country-specific shocks, we employ two measures, namely, the presence of currency crisis in a country and the presence of sovereign debt crisis in a country. The results of the estimation in [Table 8](#) suggest that the moderating effects found for periods of higher economic policy uncertainty is prevalent during periods of currency crisis (see coefficient of the interaction term  $Insol\_score \times Curr\_crisis$  in column (1) for the full sample and column (3) for the subsample excluding the United States and Japan). A similar result is observed when firms are faced with sovereign debt crisis. The coefficient of the interaction term  $Insol\_score \times Debt\_crisis$  in columns (2) and (4) is positive and significant. A comparison of the coefficients of the interaction terms above suggests that the effect of creditor rights is higher during sovereign debt crisis as compared to currency crisis.

#### 4.5. *Continuous measure of economic policy uncertainty*

Next, in order to address the concerns regarding the choice and construction of the binary  $EPU\_shock$  variable, we re-estimate [Equation 2](#) with the continuous measure of economic policy uncertainty  $EPU$  of [Baker et al. \(2016\)](#). The results of the re-estimation in column (1) for the full sample and column (3) for the subsample excluding the United States and Japan capture the effect of stronger creditor rights during higher policy uncertainty. Similarly, in columns (2) and (4), we estimate the large-size effect described in the earlier sections. The results are consistent with our findings for the discrete measure of economic uncertainty shocks reported in [Table 5](#) and [Table 6](#).



#### 4.6. *Role of alternative institutional factors*

Although our focus is on whether a stronger insolvency regime influences firms' behavior in response to changes in creditor rights, the prevailing ethical practices of managers in a country may help to reduce agency costs in debt contracts. Hence, we employ *Firm\_ethics*, a measure of ethical practices of firms provided by the Global Competitiveness Index of the World Economic Forum. We re-estimate the model shown in Equation 1 by interacting the *Insol\_score* with the *Firm\_ethics* measure described above. The results of the estimation are reported in Table 10 column (1) for the full sample and column (3) for the subsample that excludes the United States and Japan. The level terms of both *Firm\_ethics* and *Insol\_score* are positive and significant, suggesting that both these institutional variables lower the default risk of firms. The findings on the effect of *Firm\_ethics* is consistent with the arguments advanced by earlier studies that ethical practices in firms reduce the information asymmetry in financial contracting (Huang et al., 2008; Husted, 2007; Van Oosterhout et al., 2006). However, the interaction between creditor rights and firm ethics is negative and significant, suggesting that the strength of the insolvency regime and firm ethics may act as substitutes in influencing firm behavior.

Additionally, we estimate the incremental effects of *Firm\_ethics* during episodes of higher economic policy uncertainty. The results in columns (2) and (4) of Table 10 show that the coefficient of the interaction term  $Firm\_ethics \times EPU\_shock$  is positive and significant, suggesting that ethical practices in firms have a positive effect on firm default risk during periods of economic policy shocks. This finding is consistent with the effects observed for  $Insol\_score \times EPU\_shock$ . However, the coefficients of the triple interaction  $Insol\_score \times Firm\_ethics \times EPU\_shock$  suggest that *Insol\_score* and *Firm\_ethics* may act as substitutes in moderating the adverse effects of economic policy shocks.

#### 4.7. *Channels of firm responses to improved creditor rights*

While we find evidence substantiating our hypothesis that creditor rights moderate the adverse effects of economic shocks on firms' default risk, it is important to explore the potential channels through which creditor rights can affect the risk of debt default during heightened policy

uncertainty. First, we examine the role of dependence of firms on external finance. The measure of external financial dependence (*EFD*) is based on the seminal work of [Rajan and Zingales \(1998\)](#). The variable that is computed at the firm-level captures the amount of the capital expenditure that is not financed by internally generated cash flows. We aggregate this measure at the industry-level by taking the median value of *EFD* for each of the 2-digit SIC industry sectors. We classify the industries in our sample into two groups based on their dependency on external finance.

We re-estimate [Equation 2](#) for the two groups of firms belonging to industries with low (below median) and high (above median) values of *EFD*. The results of the estimations shown in columns (1) and (2) of [Table 11](#) for high and low *EFD*, respectively, suggest that the moderating effect of *Insol\_score* is more pronounced in the case of firms belonging to industries with relatively high dependence on external finance. This finding suggests that the importance of creditor rights is likely to be germane for firms that rely on external sources of financing as compared to those that rely mostly on internal sources. This is consistent with a larger role of creditor rights in reducing financing frictions when a firm has higher reliance on external debt financing. A similar result is observed for the restricted subsample that excludes the United States and Japan, shown in columns (3) and (4) for high and low *EFD*, respectively.

Next, we examine the role of leverage, identified as one of the primary causes of financial distress ([Andrade & Kaplan, 1998](#)), and cash holdings in the response of firms to an improved insolvency framework. Strong creditor rights have been associated with lower leverage in several studies ([Acharya et al., 2011](#); [Cho et al., 2014](#)). In a similar vein, better creditor rights are linked to lower cash holdings given the precautionary motive of riskier firms ([Huang, Elkinawy, & Jain, 2013](#)). Financially constrained firms with high hedging needs have a strong propensity to save cash out of a firm's cash flows ([Acharya, Almeida, & Campello, 2007](#)).

We employ a two-stage least squares (2SLS) estimation to understand the channels through which improved creditor rights influence firms' risk-taking. In the first stage, we regress contemporaneous values of leverage and cash holdings on the *Insol\_score* and  $Insol\_score \times EPU\_shock$ . In the second stage, we regress *Z-score* on leverage and cash. Since *Z-score* includes market value leverage, we also estimate the second stage equation for a variant of *Z-*

*score* that excludes this component (see [MacKie-Mason \(1990\)](#)). The first stage results shown in [Table 12](#) column (1) suggest that firms on average reduce their cash holdings during an economic shock in order to wade over the crisis. However, we do not find the interaction term to be significant, suggesting that a stronger insolvency framework does not play an important role in moderating the adverse effects of economic policy uncertainty on cash holdings.

The results reported in column (2) suggest that firms' leverage increases (lower value of *MktLeverageInv*) during economic policy shocks. The interaction term *InsolScore*  $\times$  *EPUShock* is positive and significant, supporting the argument that a stronger insolvency regime induces firms to reduce their leverage during economic uncertainty shocks. The second-stage results for the *Z-score* in column (3) and a measure of *Z-score* without the market-value leverage component in column (4) suggest that the moderating effect of *InsolScore* during *EPUShock* acts through the leverage channel.

#### 4.8. Revised measure of insolvency

One possible concern regarding the measure employed to capture the strength of the insolvency regime is a change in methodology undertaken by the World Bank's *Doing Business* report in 2015. This change in methodology incorporates some subjective components such as the efficacy of the legal system in the country, in addition to the time, cost, and outcome of insolvency proceedings that determine the recovery rates in bankruptcy used in the earlier methodology. In order to address this concern, we extend the insolvency score from 2015 onward with the distance-to-frontier methodology employed until 2014. The new measure *InsolScoreExt* is calculated by normalizing the recovery rate in the year  $t$  with the maximum recovery rate across the full sample of countries for all years such that the index ranges from 0 to 100. The new measure that captures the distance to frontier is employed in the estimations shown in [Table 13](#). We re-estimate [Equation 2](#) for both *Z-score* as well as *MSPDInv*. The results for the interaction term *InsolScoreExt*  $\times$  *EPUShock* in column (1) for full sample and column (3) for the subsample excluding the United States and Japan are very similar in sign and magnitude as that in [Table 5](#). Similarly, the interaction terms in columns (2) and (4) for *MSPDInv* are similar to those in [Table 7](#).

#### 4.9. *Extended sample with service sector firms*

We have included manufacturing firms in the analysis so far in order to have a relatively homogenous sample of firms. The default risk score that is used in our analysis was developed by Altman (1968) for manufacturing firms. However, this measure has also been used for services firms in recent studies (see, for instance, Eisdorfer (2008) and Acharya, Bharath, and Srinivasan (2007)). In this section, we conduct robustness of our main results for an extended sample of firms that also includes service sector firms. In addition to manufacturing firms with 2-digit SIC codes 20 to 39, we include all firms except for those in the financial services and real estate (SIC codes 60-67), utility and public transportation (SIC codes 40-49), and public service establishments (SIC codes 90-99). The results of the estimations shown in Table 14 are consistent with the findings observed for manufacturing firms.

## 5. Conclusion

In this study, we examine whether stronger creditor rights reduce firms' risk of default during episodes of heightened economic policy uncertainty using a large cross-country firm-level dataset. Consistent with earlier studies that argue for an inverse relationship between creditor rights and firms' risk-taking, we find a negative association between the strength of the insolvency framework and firms' risk of debt default. Further, we find that stronger creditor rights moderate the adverse effects of economic shocks and crises on firms' likelihood of default.

Our findings are relevant for countries that seek to improve the institutional framework for efficient financial contracts. The presence of stronger creditor rights may improve the outcomes of both the contracting parties by dissuading managers and entrepreneurs from undertaking riskier profitable investments that may increase the risk of debt default. While the passing up of riskier and value-increasing investments may not be in the best interest of the shareholders, in some instances, this can potentially reduce agency costs and improve contracting outcomes. The conservative risk choices of managers could also be an outcome of a fear of loss of reputational capital if strong creditor rights result in a greater likelihood of a management change in the event of a debt default.

The results of the moderating effect of stronger creditor rights during economic policy uncertainty suggest that the utility of having a sound insolvency regime extends beyond normal economic conditions. Not only do creditor rights improve contracting outcomes, but they also provide a conducive environment for the corporate sector to experience a lower risk of debt distress during a crisis event. In such instances, firms are likely to actively manage business risks in anticipation of a crisis so as to avoid entering bankruptcy.

Overall, our findings suggest that a stronger insolvency framework improves the stability of the corporate sector and its ability to withstand government policy uncertainty and various economic shocks, such as currency and sovereign debt crisis episodes. The improvement in the credit discipline of firms can have important positive spillovers on the financial stability of banks that lend to such firms. The implications of institutional factors on such bank-firm linkages can be a direction for future research.

## References

- Acharya, V. V., Almeida, H., & Campello, M. (2007). Is cash negative debt? A hedging perspective on corporate financial policies. *Journal of Financial Intermediation*, 16(4), 515–554.
- Acharya, V. V., Amihud, Y., & Litov, L. (2011). Creditor rights and corporate risk-taking. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 102(1), 150–166.
- Acharya, V. V., Bharath, S. T., & Srinivasan, A. (2007). Does industry-wide distress affect defaulted firms? evidence from creditor recoveries. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 85(3), 787–821.
- Acharya, V. V., & Subramanian, K. V. (2009). Bankruptcy codes and innovation. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 22(12), 4949–4988.
- Adler, B. E. (1991). Bankruptcy and risk allocation. *Cornell L. Rev.*, 77, 439.
- Almeida, H., Hankins, K. W., & Williams, R. (2017). Risk management with supply contracts. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 30(12), 4179–4215.
- Altman, E. I. (1968). Financial ratios, discriminant analysis and the prediction of corporate bankruptcy. *The Journal of Finance*, 23(4), 589–609.
- Andrade, G., & Kaplan, S. N. (1998). How costly is financial (not economic) distress? evidence from highly leveraged transactions that became distressed. *The Journal of Finance*, 53(5), 1443–1493.
- Asness, C. S., Frazzini, A., & Pedersen, L. H. (2019). Quality minus junk. *Review of Accounting Studies*, 24(1), 34–112.
- Baker, S. R., Bloom, N., & Davis, S. J. (2016). Measuring economic policy uncertainty. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 131(4), 1593–1636.
- Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Maksimovic, V. (2006). The influence of financial and legal institutions on firm size. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 30(11), 2995–3015.
- Berger, A. N., Guedhami, O., Kim, H. H., & Li, X. (2018). Economic policy uncertainty and bank liquidity hoarding. *Available at SSRN 3030489*.
- Bergoing, R., Kehoe, P. J., Kehoe, T. J., & Soto, R. (2002). A decade lost and found: Mexico

- and Chile in the 1980s. *Review of Economic Dynamics*, 5(1), 166–205.
- Bergoing, R., Loayza, N., & Repetto, A. (2004). Slow recoveries. *Journal of Development Economics*, 75(2), 473–506.
- Bloom, N. (2009). The impact of uncertainty shocks. *Econometrica*, 77(3), 623–685.
- Bordo, M. D., Duca, J. V., & Koch, C. (2016). Economic policy uncertainty and the credit channel: Aggregate and bank level US evidence over several decades. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 26, 90–106.
- Boumparis, P., Milas, C., & Panagiotidis, T. (2017). Economic policy uncertainty and sovereign credit rating decisions: Panel quantile evidence for the Eurozone. *Journal of International Money and Finance*, 79, 39–71.
- Brogaard, J., & Detzel, A. (2015). The asset-pricing implications of government economic policy uncertainty. *Management Science*, 61(1), 3–18.
- Chava, S., & Roberts, M. R. (2008). How does financing impact investment? the role of debt covenants. *The Journal of Finance*, 63(5), 2085–2121.
- Chi, Q., & Li, W. (2017). Economic policy uncertainty, credit risks and banks' lending decisions: Evidence from Chinese commercial banks. *China Journal of Accounting Research*, 10(1), 33–50.
- Cho, S.-S., El Ghouli, S., Guedhami, O., & Suh, J. (2014). Creditor rights and capital structure: Evidence from international data. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 25, 40–60.
- Claessens, S., & Klapper, L. F. (2005). Bankruptcy around the world: explanations of its relative use. *American Law and Economics Review*, 7(1), 253–283.
- Demsetz, H., & Lehn, K. (1985). The structure of corporate ownership: Causes and consequences. *Journal of Political Economy*, 93(6), 1155–1177.
- Dewaelheyns, N., & Van Hulle, C. (2008). Legal reform and aggregate small and micro business bankruptcy rates: evidence from the 1997 Belgian bankruptcy code. *Small Business Economics*, 31(4), 409.
- Djankov, S., McLiesh, C., & Shleifer, A. (2007). Private credit in 129 countries. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 84(2), 299–329.
- Drobtz, W., El Ghouli, S., Guedhami, O., & Janzen, M. (2018). Policy uncertainty, investment,

- and the cost of capital. *Journal of Financial Stability*, 39, 28–45.
- Eckbo, B. E., & Thorburn, K. S. (2003). Control benefits and CEO discipline in automatic bankruptcy auctions. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 69(1), 227–258.
- Eisdorfer, A. (2008). Empirical evidence of risk shifting in financially distressed firms. *The Journal of Finance*, 63(2), 609–637.
- Fan, J. P., Huang, J., & Zhu, N. (2013). Institutions, ownership structures, and distress resolution in China. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, 23, 71–87.
- Gertler, M., & Bernanke, B. (1989). Agency costs, net worth and business fluctuations. In *Business cycle theory*. Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd.
- Gilson, S. C. (1997). Transactions costs and capital structure choice: Evidence from financially distressed firms. *The Journal of Finance*, 52(1), 161–196.
- Gormley, T. A., & Matsa, D. A. (2014). Common errors: How to (and not to) control for unobserved heterogeneity. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 27(2), 617–661.
- Harvey, C. R., & Liu, Y. (2019). Cross-sectional alpha dispersion and performance evaluation. *Journal of Financial Economics*.
- Hirshleifer, D., & Thakor, A. V. (1992). Managerial conservatism, project choice, and debt. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 5(3), 437–470.
- Huang, P., Louwers, T. J., Moffitt, J. S., & Zhang, Y. (2008). Ethical management, corporate governance, and abnormal accruals. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 83(3), 469–487.
- Huang, Y., Elkinawy, S., & Jain, P. K. (2013). Investor protection and cash holdings: Evidence from US cross-listing. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 37(3), 937–951.
- Husted, B. W. (2007). Agency, information, and the structure of moral problems in business. *Organization Studies*, 28(2), 177–195.
- La Porta, R., Lopez-de Silanes, F., Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1997). Legal determinants of external finance. *The Journal of Finance*, 52(3), 1131–1150.
- MacKie-Mason, J. K. (1990). Do taxes affect corporate financing decisions? *The journal of finance*, 45(5), 1471–1493.
- Nagar, V., Schoenfeld, J., & Wellman, L. (2019). The effect of economic policy uncertainty on investor information asymmetry and management disclosures. *Journal of Accounting*



- and Economics*, 67(1), 36–57.
- Pastor, L., & Veronesi, P. (2012). Uncertainty about government policy and stock prices. *Journal of Finance*, 67(4), 1219–1264.
- Petersen, M. A. (2009). Estimating standard errors in finance panel data sets: Comparing approaches. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 22(1), 435–480.
- Rajan, R., & Zingales, L. (1998). Financial development and growth. *American Economic Review*, 88(3), 559–586.
- Reinhart, C. M., & Reinhart, V. R. (2015). Financial crises, development, and growth: a long-term perspective. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 29(suppl\_1), S53–S76.
- Reinhart, C. M., & Rogoff, K. S. (2009). *This time is different: Eight centuries of financial folly*. Princeton University Press.
- Rodano, G., Serrano-Velarde, N., & Tarantino, E. (2016). Bankruptcy law and bank financing. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 120(2), 363–382.
- Seifert, B., & Gonenc, H. (2012). Creditor rights and R&D expenditures. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 20(1), 3–20.
- Van Oosterhout, J., Heugens, P. P., & Kaptein, M. (2006). The internal morality of contracting: Advancing the contractualist endeavor in business ethics. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(3), 521–539.
- World Bank. (2019). Ranking & Ease of Doing Business Score. Retrieved February, 23.
- Zwiebel, J. (1995). Corporate conservatism and relative compensation. *Journal of Political Economy*, 103(1), 1–25.

**Table 1: Variable description & data source**

Variable	Definition and construction	Data source
<i>Z-score</i>	Computed based on the Altman model of default risk (Altman, 1968). The measure is computed as $1.2 \times \text{Working capital to assets} + 1.4 \times \text{Retained earnings to total assets} + 3.3 \times \text{EBITDA to total assets} + 0.6 \times \text{Market value of equity divided by book value of liabilities} + 0.999 \times \text{Sales to assets}$	Worldscope
<i>Insol_score</i>	An index that provides a score based on the time, cost and outcome of the insolvency proceedings of domestic entities in a country.	Doing Business World Bank
<i>Firm_ethics</i>	An index that captures the level of corporate ethics in interactions with politicians, bureaucrats, and other firms	Global Competitiveness Index of the World Economic Forum
<i>MSPD_inv</i>	Market signal probability of default (ranging between 0 and 100) is a measure of default risk computed using structural models. The measure is transformed as $100 - \text{Probability of default}$ . Higher the <i>MSPD_inv</i> , lower the likelihood of default.	S&P Capital IQ
<i>EPU</i>	An index that provides a measure of country-specific economic policy uncertainty.	Economic Policy uncertainty Index of Baker, Bloom and Davis (2016)
<i>EPU_shock</i>	A dummy variable that takes the value of 1 if the <i>EPU</i> is higher than one standard deviation above the mean <i>EPU</i> and 0 otherwise	Authors' calculations
<i>Curr_crisis</i>	A country-specific dummy variable that takes the value 1 for all the years in which there was a currency crisis in a country and 0 otherwise.	Behavioral Finance and Financial Stability data from Harvard Business School
<i>Debt_crisis</i>	A country-specific dummy variable that takes the value 1 for all the years in which there was a sovereign debt crisis in a country and 0 otherwise.	Behavioral Finance and Financial Stability data from Harvard Business School
<i>Sales_gro</i> (%)	Growth in sales in a year	Worldscope
<i>Log_Asset</i>	Natural logarithm of inflation adjusted total assets in USD ( <i>WC07230</i> ) of the firm	Worldscope
<i>Mkt_leverage_inv</i>	Ratio of market value of equity to total liabilities ( $\text{WC07210}/(\text{WC07230} - \text{WC07220})$ )	Worldscope
<i>Op_CF_Asset</i>	Operational cash flow divided by the total assets at the end of the year of a firm ( $\text{WC04201}/\text{WC02999}$ )	Worldscope
<i>M/B</i>	Ratio of market value of the equity to book value of equity ( $\text{WC07210}/\text{WC07220}$ )	Worldscope

*Continued on next page*

Table 1 – *Continued from previous page*

Variables	Definition and Construction	Data Source
<i>Tangibility (%)</i>	Fixed assets to total assets of a firm ( <i>WC02501/WC02999</i> ).	Worldscope
<i>GDP_growth (%)</i>	GDP growth of the country where the firm is headquartered.	World Bank WDI
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP (%)</i>	Ratio of private credit to the GDP of the country where the firm is headquartered.	World Bank WDI
<i>Log_GDPPC</i>	Log of the annual GDP per capita of a country where the firm is headquartered.	World Bank WDI

**Table 2: Summary statistics**

P(x) refers to the  $x^{th}$  percentile of the distribution. The definition of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

Variable	Obs.	Mean	Std. Dev.	Median	Min.	Max.	P10	P90
<b>Firm-specific</b>								
<i>Z-score</i>	103,576	3.19	3.32	2.53	-5.77	20.43	0.09	8.89
<i>Log_asset</i>	103,576	12.55	1.87	12.44	8.38	17.53	9.60	15.94
<i>Sales_gro</i>	103,576	6.26	25.09	5.42	-85.47	102.78	-31.26	45.63
<i>Op-CF_Asset</i>	103,576	0.06	0.10	0.07	-0.41	0.28	-0.09	0.19
<i>M/B</i>	103,576	2.31	2.90	1.41	0.18	19.94	0.34	7.15
<i>Tangibility</i>	103,576	0.31	0.18	0.29	0.01	0.77	0.05	0.64
<i>Mkt leverage_inv</i>	103,576	3.05	4.96	1.36	0.06	32.20	0.18	11.98
<i>Cash_asset</i>	103,159	0.14	0.13	0.10	0.00	0.68	0.01	0.41
<i>MSPD_inv</i>	7,544	97.33	3.56	98.49	36.02	100.00	90.55	99.92
<b>Country-specific</b>								
<i>Insol_score</i>	103,576	69.15	27.92	82.55	0.14	100.00	27.36	99.83
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i>	103,576	181.51	88.41	159.74	4.91	363.25	52.20	350.08
<i>Log_GDPPC</i>	103,576	9.75	1.21	10.46	6.10	11.69	7.32	10.93
<i>GDP_growth</i>	103,576	3.57	3.73	2.76	-17.00	25.56	-2.25	10.04
<i>Curr_crisis</i>	99,784	0.14	0.35	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<i>Debt_crisis</i>	98,047	0.00	0.06	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	0.00
<i>EPU</i>	88,577	123.11	50.64	119.53	27.00	364.83	65.82	209.98
<i>EPU_shock</i>	88,577	0.12	0.32	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<i>EPU_shock_alt</i>	88,577	0.24	0.43	0.00	0.00	1.00	0.00	1.00
<i>Firm_ethics</i>	79,499	4.93	0.87	5.02	2.74	6.78	3.61	6.21

**Table 3: Industry-specific Altman Z-score**

The number of firm-year observations by SIC 2-digit industry codes for the manufacturing sector are shown in the table. The mean and standard deviation of the *Z-score* by each industry group is also shown.

SIC code	Industry	Mean	Std. Dev.	Obs.
20	Food & Kindred Products	3.28	2.90	10,571
21	Tobacco Products	5.68	4.90	229
22	Textile Mill Products	2.33	2.39	3,191
23	Apparel & Other Textile Products	3.33	3.01	2,294
24	Lumber & Wood Products	2.62	2.53	1,565
25	Furniture & Fixtures	2.87	2.43	1,077
26	Paper & Allied Products	2.48	2.23	3,315
27	Printing & Publishing	2.73	2.60	3,028
28	Chemical & Allied Products	3.54	4.04	16,278
29	Petroleum & Coal Products	3.14	2.19	1,318
30	Rubber & Miscellaneous Plastics Products	3.03	2.95	2,942
31	Leather & Leather Products	4.42	4.00	560
32	Stone, Clay, & Glass Products	2.76	2.86	4,701
33	Primary Metal Industries	2.70	2.50	6,909
34	Fabricated Metal Products	2.95	2.34	4,458
35	Industrial Machinery & Equipment	3.17	2.94	11,967
36	Electronic & Other Electric Equipment	3.36	3.81	14,069
37	Transportation Equipment	2.69	2.52	6,239
38	Instruments & Related Products	4.15	4.78	6,859
39	Miscellaneous Manufacturing Industries	3.52	3.12	2,006
	Overall	3.19	3.32	103,576

**Table 4: Insolvency framework and firms' default risk**

The dependent variable in the estimations is the *Z-score* of the firm in year *t*. A higher value of *Z-score* indicates a lower likelihood of default. *Large\_size* is a dummy variable that takes the value 1 for firms with assets more than the median asset size in the sample and 0 otherwise. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. '\*\*\*', '\*\*' and '\*' indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

<i>Dep_var : Z-score</i>	All countries				Excluding US & Japan	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.016*** (0.002)	0.016*** (0.002)	0.007*** (0.002)	0.007*** (0.002)	0.005** (0.002)	0.006** (0.002)
<i>Large_size</i>				-0.654*** (0.119)		-0.629*** (0.133)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>Large_size</i>				0.003* (0.002)		0.002 (0.002)
<i>Log_asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		-0.429*** (0.038)	-0.611*** (0.044)		-0.713*** (0.048)	
<i>Sales_gro</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		0.000 (0.001)	0.001** (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)
<i>Op.CF_Asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		6.933*** (0.276)	6.991*** (0.277)	6.880*** (0.277)	7.198*** (0.323)	7.123*** (0.324)
<i>M/B</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		0.128*** (0.009)	0.115*** (0.009)	0.133*** (0.009)	0.110*** (0.010)	0.133*** (0.010)
<i>Tangibility</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		-2.449*** (0.183)	-2.410*** (0.181)	-2.367*** (0.183)	-2.381*** (0.203)	-2.376*** (0.205)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>			-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.002* (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)
<i>GDP_growth</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>			0.022*** (0.004)	0.023*** (0.004)	0.018*** (0.005)	0.018*** (0.005)
<i>Log_GDPPC</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>			0.951*** (0.076)	0.636*** (0.069)	0.995*** (0.092)	0.614*** (0.085)
<i>Constant</i>	2.074*** (0.165)	7.481*** (0.496)	1.552** (0.663)	-2.764*** (0.688)	2.642*** (0.771)	-2.312*** (0.795)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	103,576	103,576	103,576	103,576	66,981	66,981
<i>No. of firms</i>	13,019	13,019	13,019	13,019	8,956	8,956
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Industry-year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Adj._R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.642	0.669	0.672	0.669	0.679	0.675

**Table 5: Economic shocks and firms' default risk**

The dependent variable in the estimations is the *Z-score* of the firm in year *t*. A higher value of *Z-score* indicates a lower likelihood of default. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. ‘\*\*\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*’ indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

<i>Dep_var : Z-score</i>	All countries		Excluding US & Japan	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.008** (0.003)	0.008*** (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)
<i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.157** (0.071)		-0.225*** (0.074)	
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.005*** (0.001)		0.007*** (0.001)	
<i>EPU_shock_alt</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		-0.390*** (0.060)		-0.435*** (0.066)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>EPU_shock_alt</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		0.005*** (0.001)		0.005*** (0.001)
<i>Log_asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.651*** (0.050)	-0.651*** (0.050)	-0.791*** (0.056)	-0.791*** (0.056)
<i>Sales_gro</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.001** (0.001)	0.001** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)
<i>Op.CF_Asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	7.031*** (0.315)	7.024*** (0.315)	7.327*** (0.393)	7.340*** (0.392)
<i>M/B</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.111*** (0.009)	0.111*** (0.009)	0.102*** (0.010)	0.103*** (0.010)
<i>Tangibility</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-2.325*** (0.210)	-2.317*** (0.210)	-2.279*** (0.244)	-2.250*** (0.245)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)
<i>GDP_growth</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.023*** (0.005)	0.018*** (0.005)	0.012** (0.006)	0.009 (0.006)
<i>Log_GDPPC</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	1.016*** (0.081)	1.067*** (0.082)	1.106*** (0.099)	1.102*** (0.102)
<i>Constant</i>	1.491** (0.708)	0.923 (0.713)	2.819*** (0.840)	2.885*** (0.858)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	88,554	88,554	51,947	51,947
<i>No. of firms</i>	11,210	11,210	7,146	7,146
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Industry-year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Adj_R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.672	0.672	0.681	0.681

**Table 6: Size-effects in firms' response to creditor rights**

The dependent variable in the estimations is the *Z-score* of the firm in year *t*. A higher value of *Z-score* indicates a lower likelihood of default. *Large\_size* is a dummy variable that takes the value 1 for firms with assets more than the median asset size in the sample and 0 otherwise. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. '\*\*\*', '\*\*' and '\*' indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

<i>Dep_var : Z-score</i>	All countries		Excluding US & Japan	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.005 (0.003)		0.004 (0.004)	
<i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.253** (0.120)		0.218* (0.123)	
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.000 (0.002)		0.002 (0.002)	
<i>Large_size</i>	-0.720*** (0.137)	-0.829*** (0.139)	-0.675*** (0.155)	-0.774*** (0.159)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>Large_size</i>	0.004** (0.002)	0.005*** (0.002)	0.002 (0.003)	0.004 (0.003)
<i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>Large_size</i>	-0.714*** (0.149)	-0.686*** (0.170)	-0.796*** (0.153)	-0.725*** (0.172)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>Large_size</i>	0.008*** (0.002)	0.008*** (0.003)	0.010*** (0.003)	0.009*** (0.003)
<i>Sales_gro</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.000 (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.001* (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)
<i>Op.CF_Asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	6.864*** (0.315)	6.787*** (0.315)	7.161*** (0.396)	7.074*** (0.390)
<i>M/B</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.129*** (0.009)	0.128*** (0.010)	0.128*** (0.010)	0.125*** (0.011)
<i>Tangibility</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-2.261*** (0.212)	-2.415*** (0.215)	-2.257*** (0.247)	-2.406*** (0.251)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.004*** (0.001)		-0.004*** (0.001)	
<i>GDP_growth</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.024*** (0.005)		0.012** (0.006)	
<i>Log_GDP</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.716*** (0.073)		0.730*** (0.091)	
<i>Constant</i>	-3.395*** (0.749)	3.731*** (0.761)	-3.164*** (0.883)	46.896*** (11.046)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	88,554	88,545	51,947	51,938
<i>No. of firms</i>	11,210	11,210	7,146	7,146
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Industry-year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Country-year fixed effects</i>	No	Yes	No	Yes
<i>Adj.-R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.669	0.678	0.677	0.686



**Table 7: Alternative measure of default risk**

The dependent variable in the estimations is the  $MSPD_{inv}$  of the firm in year  $t$ . A high value of  $MSPD_{inv}$ , which ranges from 0 to 100, indicates a lower probability of default. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. ‘\*\*\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*’ indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

<i>Dep.var : MSPD<sub>inv</sub></i>	All countries		Excluding US & Japan	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Insol_score<sub>t-1</sub></i>	0.007 (0.027)	0.019 (0.026)	-0.015 (0.031)	0.008 (0.029)
<i>EPU_shock<sub>t-1</sub></i>	-1.520*** (0.379)		-1.746*** (0.446)	
<i>Insol_score<sub>t-1</sub> × EPU_shock<sub>t-1</sub></i>	0.016*** (0.005)		0.016*** (0.006)	
<i>EPU_shock_alt<sub>t-1</sub></i>		-1.635*** (0.388)		-1.818*** (0.486)
<i>Insol_score<sub>t-1</sub> × EPU_shock_alt<sub>t-1</sub></i>		0.016*** (0.005)		0.015** (0.006)
<i>Log_asset<sub>t-1</sub></i>	-0.284 (0.235)	-0.267 (0.236)	-0.338 (0.325)	-0.332 (0.324)
<i>Sales_gro<sub>t-1</sub></i>	-0.001 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.002)	0.000 (0.002)	0.000 (0.002)
<i>Op.CF_Asset<sub>t-1</sub></i>	1.086 (0.973)	1.052 (0.971)	0.977 (1.635)	0.979 (1.632)
<i>M/B<sub>t-1</sub></i>	-0.047** (0.020)	-0.044** (0.020)	-0.060** (0.025)	-0.061** (0.025)
<i>Tangibility<sub>t-1</sub></i>	-0.765 (0.886)	-0.788 (0.887)	-0.63 (1.144)	-0.69 (1.144)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP<sub>t-1</sub></i>	0.016*** (0.003)	0.016*** (0.003)	0.012*** (0.005)	0.013*** (0.005)
<i>GDP_growth<sub>t-1</sub></i>	-0.001 (0.034)	-0.007 (0.036)	0.026 (0.042)	0.026 (0.044)
<i>Log_GDPPC<sub>t-1</sub></i>	0.727* (0.436)	0.740* (0.444)	1.664** (0.768)	1.732** (0.752)
<i>Constant</i>	90.580*** (2.882)	89.498*** (2.922)	85.293*** (5.604)	83.471*** (5.437)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	6,432	6,432	3,837	3,837
<i>No. of firms</i>	1,617	1,617	974	974
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Industry-year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Adj_R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.669	0.67	0.651	0.653

**Table 8: Alternative measure of economic shocks - Currency and debt crisis**

The dependent variable in the estimations is the *Z-score* of the firm in year *t*. A higher value of *Z-score* indicates a lower likelihood of default. *Curr\_crisis* and *Debt\_crisis* are dummy variables that captures the presence of a currency and sovereign debt default in a country. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. ‘\*\*\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*’ indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

<i>Dep_Var : Z-score</i>	All countries		Excluding US & Japan	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.007*** (0.002)	0.006** (0.002)	0.006** (0.002)	0.004* (0.002)
<i>Curr_crisis</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.481*** (0.067)		-0.442*** (0.077)	
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>Curr_crisis</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.006*** (0.001)		0.003* (0.001)	
<i>Debt_crisis</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		-0.500* (0.299)		-0.588* (0.308)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>Debt_crisis</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		0.023** (0.010)		0.024** (0.011)
<i>Log_asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.600*** (0.045)	-0.610*** (0.046)	-0.714*** (0.049)	-0.720*** (0.050)
<i>Sales_gro</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.001* (0.001)	0.001** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)
<i>Op.CF_Asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	7.050*** (0.284)	6.950*** (0.286)	7.291*** (0.335)	7.120*** (0.339)
<i>M/B</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.114*** (0.009)	0.114*** (0.009)	0.108*** (0.010)	0.110*** (0.010)
<i>Tangibility</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-2.402*** (0.189)	-2.390*** (0.191)	-2.387*** (0.214)	-2.370*** (0.217)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002** (0.001)
<i>GDP_growth</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.020*** (0.004)	0.028*** (0.004)	0.018*** (0.005)	0.023*** (0.005)
<i>Log_GDPPC</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	1.014*** (0.080)	0.967*** (0.079)	1.069*** (0.095)	1.051*** (0.097)
<i>Constant</i>	0.911 (0.693)	1.560** (0.673)	2.005** (0.780)	2.412*** (0.780)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	99,778	98,041	63,180	61,433
<i>No. of firms</i>	12,522	12,345	8,459	8,282
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Industry-year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Adj-R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.677	0.677	0.688	0.688

**Table 9: Continuous measure of uncertainty**

The dependent variable in columns (1), (2) and (4) is *Z-score*, and in column (3) is *MSPD\_inv*. A higher value of *Z-score* indicates a lower likelihood of default. *Large\_size* is a dummy variable that takes the value 1 for firms with assets more than the median asset size in the sample and 0 otherwise. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. ‘\*\*\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*’ indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in Table 1.

	All countries		Excluding US & Japan	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.001 (0.003)	-0.001 (0.004)	-0.005 (0.004)	-0.003 (0.004)
<i>EPU</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.429*** (0.052)	-0.226** (0.101)	-0.490*** (0.061)	-0.266** (0.111)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>EPU</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.007*** (0.001)	0.005*** (0.002)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.004** (0.002)
<i>Large_size</i>		-0.379* (0.194)		-0.318 (0.219)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>Large_size</i>		0.000 (0.003)		-0.003 (0.004)
<i>EPU</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>Large_size</i>		-0.345*** (0.121)		-0.385*** (0.134)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>EPU</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>Large_size</i>		0.004** (0.002)		0.005** (0.002)
<i>Log_asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.647*** (0.050)		-0.788*** (0.056)	
<i>Sales_gro</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.001** (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)	0.001** (0.001)
<i>Op.CF_Asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	7.030*** (0.314)	6.868*** (0.315)	7.346*** (0.392)	7.186*** (0.395)
<i>M/B</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.111*** (0.009)	0.129*** (0.009)	0.103*** (0.010)	0.129*** (0.010)
<i>Tangibility</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-2.343*** (0.210)	-2.273*** (0.213)	-2.260*** (0.244)	-2.228*** (0.247)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.002** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)
<i>GDP_growth</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.017*** (0.005)	0.019*** (0.005)	0.009 (0.006)	0.009 (0.006)
<i>Log_GDP</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	1.131*** (0.082)	0.830*** (0.074)	1.208*** (0.101)	0.831*** (0.093)
<i>Constant</i>	0.68 (0.713)	-4.359*** (0.786)	2.367*** (0.846)	-3.799*** (0.926)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	88,554	88,554	51,947	51,947
<i>No. of firms</i>	11,210	11,210	7,146	7,146
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Industry-year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Adj_R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.672	0.669	0.682	0.677

**Table 10: Interaction of insolvency framework and governance**

The dependent variable in the estimations is the *Z-score* of the firm in year  $t$ . A higher value of *Z-score* indicates a lower likelihood of default. *Firm\_ethics* is a country-level index that measures the ethical practices of firms based in a country in dealing with various stakeholders. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. ‘\*\*\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*’ indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

<i>Dep_var : Z-score</i>	All countries		Excluding US & Japan	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Firm_ethics</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.308*** (0.095)	0.100 (0.131)	0.383*** (0.104)	0.159 (0.150)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.031*** (0.006)	0.016* (0.009)	0.033*** (0.009)	0.012 (0.013)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub> × <i>Firm_ethics</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	-0.006*** (0.001)	-0.003 (0.002)	-0.006*** (0.002)	-0.002 (0.003)
<i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>		-2.086*** (0.484)		-2.197*** (0.504)
<i>Firm_ethics</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub> × <i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>		0.449*** (0.116)		0.458*** (0.120)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub> × <i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>		0.027*** (0.007)		0.030*** (0.007)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub> × <i>Firm_ethics</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub> × <i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>		-0.005*** (0.002)		-0.005*** (0.002)
<i>Log_asset</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	-0.708*** (0.054)	-0.734*** (0.060)	-0.804*** (0.059)	-0.859*** (0.069)
<i>Sales_gro</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.001* (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)
<i>Op_CF_Asset</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	5.859*** (0.308)	5.915*** (0.355)	6.048*** (0.367)	6.219*** (0.455)
<i>M/B</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.091*** (0.010)	0.088*** (0.010)	0.090*** (0.011)	0.084*** (0.012)
<i>Tangibility</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	-2.559*** (0.207)	-2.576*** (0.242)	-2.587*** (0.233)	-2.648*** (0.285)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	-0.001 (0.001)	-0.002** (0.001)	0.000 (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)
<i>GDP_growth</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.012*** (0.004)	0.008 (0.005)	0.010** (0.005)	0.001 (0.006)
<i>Log_GDPPC</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.575*** (0.092)	0.651*** (0.104)	0.582*** (0.106)	0.664*** (0.122)
<i>Constant</i>	5.327*** (0.843)	6.033*** (0.960)	6.225*** (0.953)	7.458*** (1.114)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	79,152	67,197	53,232	41,278
<i>No. of firms</i>	11,865	10,160	8,371	6,670
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Industry-year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Adj. R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.711	0.711	0.714	0.715

**Table 11: External finance dependence**

The dependent variable in the estimations is the *Z-score* of the firm in year  $t$ . A higher value of *Z-score* indicates a lower likelihood of default. The estimation sample is divided into two sub groups, High Dep. (Low Dep.) based on above median (below median) external finance dependence of the firm's industry. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. '\*\*\*', '\*\*' and '\*' indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

<i>Dep_var : Z-score</i>	All countries		Excluding US & Japan	
	High Dep. (1)	Low Dep. (2)	High Dep. (3)	Low Dep. (4)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.013** (0.005)	0.003 (0.004)	0.009 (0.006)	0.001 (0.004)
<i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	-0.207* (0.107)	-0.117 (0.096)	-0.309*** (0.111)	-0.153 (0.100)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub> × <i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.006*** (0.002)	0.004** (0.002)	0.009*** (0.002)	0.005*** (0.002)
<i>Log_asset</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	-0.731*** (0.073)	-0.562*** (0.066)	-0.887*** (0.077)	-0.678*** (0.079)
<i>Sales_gro</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.002** (0.001)	0.001 (0.001)	0.003*** (0.001)	0.002** (0.001)
<i>Op-CF_Asset</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	7.102*** (0.470)	6.966*** (0.413)	7.596*** (0.581)	7.057*** (0.524)
<i>M/B</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.099*** (0.013)	0.123*** (0.013)	0.085*** (0.015)	0.121*** (0.015)
<i>Tangibility</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	-2.233*** (0.312)	-2.400*** (0.273)	-2.070*** (0.352)	-2.483*** (0.329)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.004*** (0.001)	-0.003** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)
<i>GDP_growth</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	0.033*** (0.008)	0.014** (0.006)	0.015 (0.009)	0.009 (0.007)
<i>Log_GDPPC</i> <sub><math>t-1</math></sub>	1.176*** (0.119)	0.822*** (0.107)	1.281*** (0.146)	0.911*** (0.131)
<i>Constant</i>	0.647 (1.007)	2.533*** (0.976)	2.438** (1.219)	3.222*** (1.125)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	42,159	46,395	25,548	26,399
<i>No. of firms</i>	5,445	5,765	3,542	3,604
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Industry-year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Adj. R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.657	0.69	0.673	0.693

**Table 12: Impacts on market leverage and cash flows under improved creditor rights**

The dependent variable in the first-stage estimations shown in column (1) is the *Cash\_asset* and in column (2) is the *Mkt\_leverage\_inv*. The dependent variable in the second-stage regression in column (3) is the *Z-score* of the firm and in column (4) is the *Z-score* without the market value leverage component. A higher value of *Z-score* indicates a lower likelihood of default. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. ‘\*\*\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*’ indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

	Stage 1		Stage 2	
	<i>Cash_asset</i>	<i>Mkt_leverage_inv</i>	<i>Z-score</i>	<i>Z-score</i> w/o leverage
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	0.011 (0.009)	0.030*** (0.004)		
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub>t-1</sub> × <i>EPU</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	0.006 (0.004)	0.006*** (0.001)		
<i>EPU</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	-0.664*** (0.217)	-0.358*** (0.089)	-0.034 (0.097)	-0.017 (0.080)
<i>Mkt_leverage_inv</i> <sub>t</sub>			0.872*** (0.160)	0.270** (0.132)
<i>Cash_asset</i> <sub>t</sub>			-0.235 (0.293)	-0.186 (0.241)
<i>Log_asset</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	-1.916*** (0.074)	-1.186*** (0.030)	-0.06 (0.396)	0.035 (0.327)
<i>Sales_gro</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	-0.011*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.000)	0.000 (0.003)	0.001 (0.002)
<i>Op_CF_Asset</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	6.525*** (0.446)	5.612*** (0.182)	3.662*** (1.159)	3.471*** (0.956)
<i>M/B</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	0.052*** (0.013)	0.215*** (0.005)	-0.052** (0.022)	-0.054*** (0.018)
<i>Tangibility</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	-21.046*** (0.386)	-2.396*** (0.158)	-5.022 (5.814)	-3.98 (4.798)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	0.018*** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.001)	0.004 (0.005)	0.003 (0.004)
<i>GDP_growth</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	-0.056*** (0.012)	-0.036*** (0.005)	0.000 (0.012)	0.001 (0.010)
<i>Log_GDPPC</i> <sub>t-1</sub>	0.871*** (0.119)	1.287*** (0.049)	-0.187 (0.114)	-0.232** (0.094)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	88,174	88,174	88,174	88,168
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

**Table 13: Extended measure of Insolvency**

The dependent variable in the estimations is the *Z-score* of the firm in year *t*. A higher value of *Z-score* indicates a lower likelihood of default. *Insol\_score\_ext* is an extended measure of insolvency score described in the text. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. ‘\*\*\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*’ indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

<i>Dep_var</i>	All countries		Excluding US & Japan	
	<i>Z-score</i> (1)	<i>MSPD_inv</i> (2)	<i>Z-score</i> (3)	<i>MSPD_inv</i> (4)
<i>Insol_score_ext</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	0.002 (0.003)	-0.024 (0.018)	-0.004 (0.003)	-0.028 (0.022)
<i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	-0.141** (0.071)	-1.521*** (0.380)	-0.203*** (0.074)	-1.775*** (0.459)
<i>Insol_score_ext</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub> × <i>EPU_shock</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	0.005*** (0.001)	0.015*** (0.005)	0.007*** (0.001)	0.016*** (0.006)
<i>Log_asset</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	-0.651*** (0.050)	-0.281 (0.235)	-0.792*** (0.056)	-0.337 (0.325)
<i>Sales_gro</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	0.001** (0.001)	-0.001 (0.002)	0.002*** (0.001)	0.000 (0.002)
<i>Op_CF_Asset</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	7.029*** (0.315)	1.084 (0.973)	7.330*** (0.392)	0.997 (1.634)
<i>M/B</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	0.111*** (0.009)	-0.046** (0.020)	0.103*** (0.010)	-0.059** (0.025)
<i>Tangibility</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	-2.326*** (0.210)	-0.777 (0.886)	-2.280*** (0.244)	-0.655 (1.146)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	-0.004*** (0.001)	0.016*** (0.003)	-0.003*** (0.001)	0.013*** (0.005)
<i>GDP_growth</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	0.023*** (0.005)	0.004 (0.034)	0.013** (0.006)	0.03 (0.042)
<i>Log_GDP</i> <sub><i>t-1</i></sub>	1.024*** (0.081)	0.802* (0.434)	1.098*** (0.100)	1.514** (0.754)
<i>Constant</i>	1.876*** (0.705)	91.938*** (2.653)	3.369*** (0.843)	87.284*** (5.868)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	88,554	6,432	51,947	3,837
<i>No. of firms</i>	11,210	1,617	7,146	974
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Industry-year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Adj._R</i> <sup>2</sup>	0.672	0.670	0.681	0.651

**Table 14: Extended sample with service-sector firms**

The dependent variable in the estimations is the *Z-score* of the firm in year *t*. A higher value of *Z-score* indicates a lower likelihood of default. Robust standard errors, clustered at firm level are presented in the parenthesis. ‘\*\*\*’, ‘\*\*’ and ‘\*’ indicate significance at the 1%, 5% and 10% respectively. The definition of each of the variables is given in [Table 1](#).

<i>Dep_var : Z-score</i>	All countries			Excluding US & Japan		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.005** (0.002)	0.003 (0.003)	0.003 (0.003)	0.004** (0.002)	0.001 (0.003)	0.001 (0.003)
<i>EPU</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		-0.051 (0.061)			-0.108* (0.065)	
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>EPU</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>		0.003** (0.001)			0.005*** (0.001)	
<i>EPU_shock_alt</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>			-0.277*** (0.052)			-0.309*** (0.056)
<i>Insol_score</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub> × <i>EPU_shock_alt</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>			0.004*** (0.001)			0.004*** (0.001)
<i>Log_asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.608*** (0.035)	-0.626*** (0.038)	-0.626*** (0.038)	-0.713*** (0.041)	-0.766*** (0.047)	-0.766*** (0.047)
<i>Sales_gro</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.002*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.000)	0.002*** (0.001)	0.002*** (0.001)
<i>Op_CF_Asset</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	6.674*** (0.207)	6.747*** (0.232)	6.743*** (0.232)	6.837*** (0.244)	7.016*** (0.290)	7.022*** (0.290)
<i>M/B</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.100*** (0.006)	0.096*** (0.007)	0.096*** (0.007)	0.107*** (0.008)	0.102*** (0.008)	0.102*** (0.008)
<i>Tangibility</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-2.095*** (0.150)	-1.982*** (0.176)	-1.981*** (0.176)	-2.027*** (0.169)	-1.869*** (0.208)	-1.852*** (0.208)
<i>Pvtcredit_GDP</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	-0.002*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.001** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)	-0.003*** (0.001)
<i>GDP_growth</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	0.022*** (0.004)	0.022*** (0.004)	0.018*** (0.004)	0.014*** (0.004)	0.008* (0.005)	0.005 (0.005)
<i>Log_GDPPC</i> <sub><i>t</i>-1</sub>	1.015*** (0.066)	1.059*** (0.070)	1.100*** (0.070)	1.095*** (0.080)	1.169*** (0.087)	1.177*** (0.088)
<i>Constant</i>	0.544 (0.563)	0.561 (0.614)	0.116 (0.615)	1.318** (0.662)	1.534** (0.742)	1.504** (0.749)
<i>Firm-year obs.</i>	183,266	158,031	158,031	115,609	90,364	90,364
<i>No. of firms</i>	24,725	21,499	21,499	16,569	13,342	13,342
<i>Firm fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Industry-year fixed effects</i>	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<i>Adj. R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.663	0.664	0.664	0.655	0.655	0.655



## A. Appendix

**Table A1: Country statistics**

The number of firm-year observations are shown in the table.

Country name	Obs.	Country name	Obs.
Argentina	349	Lithuania	74
Australia	1,701	Luxembourg	96
Austria	457	Latvia	90
Belgium	487	Morocco	222
Brazil	1,064	Mexico	525
Canada	1,032	Mauritius	26
Switzerland	1,381	Malaysia	4,527
Chile	651	Nigeria	209
China	15,971	Netherlands	461
Cote d'Ivoire	82	Norway	317
Colombia	153	New Zealand	123
Czech Republic	37	Peru	421
Germany	3,027	Philippines	411
Denmark	615	Poland	1,219
Egypt, Arab Rep.	570	Portugal	184
Spain	705	Russia	659
Estonia	35	Singapore	1,963
Finland	850	Serbia	226
France	2,898	Slovak Republic	38
United Kingdom	3,361	Slovenia	105
Ghana	53	Sweden	1,416
Greece	1,089	Thailand	1,579
Hong Kong SAR, China	3,092	Tunisia	142
Indonesia	1,272	Turkey	1,816
India	5,925	United States	15,520
Ireland	306	Venezuela	66
Iceland	49	South Africa	840
Italy	1,339	Zambia	29
Japan	21,021	Zimbabwe	15
Kenya	92	<b>Total</b>	<b>103,576</b>
Sri Lanka	593		