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Abstract

Analysis of Post-Merger Integration of Automobile Firms

By Ziyue Gao

This paper’s objective is to determine whether merger announcements of world automobile companies would influence the stock price of acquired companies and whether the market reaction to merger announcements is good or bad. 24 acquired companies from the OTC market and 10 acquired companies come from the NYSE market are randomly chosen for this study. The time period is chosen from 1998 to 2012. The DJ (USA) index is used as market return in this paper.

The Market Return Model, the Average Abnormal Return Model and the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) will be used in this paper. In summary, this study is going to prove whether the merged world automobile firms would gain or loss after merger announcement.
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Contents

Chapter One

Introduction ................................................................................................. 1

1.1 Merger ................................................................................................. 1

1.2 Stock exchange market ................................................................. 3

1.2.1 Over-The-Counter Market (OTC) .............................................. 3

1.2.2 New York Stock Exchange (NYSE) ........................................... 4

1.3 Automobile companies ................................................................. 4

1.3.1 Overview ..................................................................................... 4

1.3.2 Merger in the Automobile Industry ....................................... 5

1.4 Organization of Study ....................................................................... 5

Chapter Two

Literature Review .................................................................................... 7

2.1 Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH) .................................................. 7

2.2 Events and study on merger of automobile ..................................... 11

Chapter Three

Methodology ............................................................................................. 13

3.1 Models ............................................................................................... 13

3.1.1 Market Return Model ............................................................... 13

3.1.2 AR and AAR and ACAR ......................................................... 14
Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Merger

From online dictionary.com (2013), a merger has been defined as: “Any combination of two or more business enterprises into a single enterprise”.

More specifically, acquiring corporations should purchase the total firm value of its target corporations which includes both debt and equity. After merger, the acquiring corporations will control the power of the combined firms. From © 2013 Answers Corporation, a merger needs a majority vote of shareholders. A merger is also a way for pursuing realized gain, since the two firms, one is acquiring firm and the other is its target firm, merge together will worth more than the total value when they are separated.

Mergers carry with the risk which may cause problems in the future. Deutsch and West (2010, June) argued that mergers often occur at a rapid volume during the downturn of economy, especially a financial crisis. Because stock prices of some firms are low and the competitors may be in trouble, it is a favorable time for many powerful firms to take over other firms in a horizontal concentration. However, economic uncertainty has caused the boards of such companies to worry about their company’s ability to implement and manage the merger successfully.

Gallant (2009) indicated that the acquiring company can use several methods to
purchase the assets of target companies. For example, cash for some or of all the
equity and a share exchange. For example, the acquiring company should use X
numbers of its shares to exchange one share owned by the target company’s
shareholders.

Mergers are different from straight investment decisions. As © 2013 Answers
Corporation confirms, there are difficulties in measuring pre and post-merger value,
the accounting, tax, and legal aspects are complex and there are issues of corporate
control, governance and management.

According to the © 2013 Answers Corporation and © 2010 Investopedia.com, there
are three strategies to describe the merger process.

The first one is a horizontal merger, which occurs between two firms in the same
industry. Horizontal mergers usually occur in industries with fewer firms, since the
competitive power of such firms is really high and the synergy effects can cause
1+1>2 results.

The second one is a vertical merger, which occurs between two or more firms,
operating at different levels within an industry's supply chain. A vertical merger
usually happens through the integration of enterprises. For example, an agricultural
machinery manufacturer may purchase a retail machinery store.
The third one is a conglomerate merger, which occurs when two firms are involved in unrelated business activities. There are two types of conglomerate mergers: pure and mixed. Pure conglomerate mergers involve firms with anything different, while mixed conglomerate mergers involve firms with the purpose of product extensions or market extensions.

For the post-merger integration process, Lassere (2003) argued that the quality of post-merger processes such as integration framework, transition management and consolidation, are major sources of success or failure for cross-border mergers.

1.2 Stock exchange market

1.2.1 Over-The-Counter Market (OTC)

As © 2013 Investopedia US (“OTC”) introduces, the OTC market is one of the oldest stock exchange in the world, which is derived from the ‘original’ bank engaged in the business of buying and selling shares. Because the trading stock activity is at the counter of the bank, it is called over-the-counter markets. An OTC market and an exchange market are the foundations of organized financial markets. In an OTC market, dealers do the trading work. A trade can be carried out between two people in an OTC market without the disturbance and attention of others. So an OTC market has less regulation and communication is not transparent.

The majority trading activities of OTC markets include bonds, currencies, derivatives
and structured products. For equity, they include the OTCQX, OTCQB and OTC Pink marketplaces in the U.S. The Financial Industry Regulatory Authority (FINRA) regulates the U.S. OTC markets. The stocks of OTC market in this paper all come from US OTC markets and the market index is the Dow Jones index (DJ).

1.2.2 New York Stock Exchange (NYSE)

As © 2013 Investopedia US (“NYSE”) confirms, the NYSE is based on total market capital of its listed securities and it is deemed to the world's biggest stock exchange. Originally it was as a private organization, but it became a public entity in 2005 after acquiring electronic trading exchange Archipelago. After the merger with the European exchange in 2007, the New York Stock Exchange’s parent company has been known as NYSE Euronext.

Also known as the "Big Board", the NYSE has evolved from floor trading, which uses only the public bidding system, to electronic trading. Nowadays, more than half of NYSE’s trading is conducted electronically.

1.3 Automobile companies

1.3.1 Overview

Accounting to Haugh et al (2010), the automobile industry’s size is relatively small to overall activity, but it has a strong link and impact with the broader economy. The industry is intertwined with business cycles and has suffered from constrained credit in the crisis. The automobile industry has also benefited from government support,
including Gm. and Chrysler. Even though the medium-term sales trends of automobile are likely to be divergent across regions, the sales are set to rebound in many countries like North America, Japan and the United Kingdom.

Hauguet et al (2010) also discussed the importance of industry variations across countries of OECD economies on the basis of value added and employment. For example, automobile exports obtain about 15% of total exports in Japan, the Slovak Republic, Hungary, Canada and Spain.

1.3.2 Merger in the Automobile Industry

In the past two decades, automobile companies has been eager to enter new markets, get new automobile technology, expand influence and brand effect, and avoid economy risks by mergers. Mergers can lead to gain from complementary resources, garnering tax advantages, eliminating efficiencies, obtaining propriety rights, increasing market power, shoring up some weakness areas, entering new emerging market and providing managers with more rights and opportunities to emerge their business (“c 2013 Answers Corporation”).

1.4 Organization of Study

In Chapter 2, we will discuss the efficient market hypothesis (EMH) and introduce some events of mergers of automobile companies. In addition, financial structure of automobile companies will be recommended. Chapter 3 covers the methodology used
in the study—Market Return Model, the Average Abnormal Return Model and the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) will be introduced in detail. Chapter 4 provides an analysis of the test results. Chapter 5 is by way of a conclusion and discusses limitations of the study and recommendations for future research.
Chapter 2

Literature Review

2.1 Efficient Market Hypothesis (EMH)

The EMH in its various forms, argues that present share prices are influenced by all the relevant information, so it is impossible for investors to "beat the market". The theories of EMH means that investors could neither purchase stocks which are underprices nor sell stocks for overvalued prices for the reason of “stocks always trade at their fair value on stock exchanges” (c 2013 Investopedia US). As a result, the only way for an investor to gain higher returns is to purchase risker stocks, since investors cannot obtain higher return than average through expert stock selection or market timing.

Even though it is a cornerstone of modern financial theory, EMH is a controversial topic. Supporters argue that fundamental or technical analyses are not warranted. The empirical literature is split. On the one hand, the “Quantum fund” always makes abnormal returns in the stock market, which is certainly not evidence of EMH. Additionally, the Dow Jones Industrial Average (DJIA) fell more than 20% in one period when occurring to a credit squeeze. This example is suggestive that stock prices can trade at a great difference from their fair values.

From the supporters of the EMH, they improve and develop the EMH theory and they also publish evidence to prove the hypothesis. For Fama (1970), an early supporter
showing that when information occurs in a stock market, the news will rapidly spread and the price of securities will be reflected without delay. “In an efficient capital market, prices fully reflect available information” (Fama, 1970). He came up with three forms for market efficiency: weak, semi-strong and strong.

© 2013 Investopedia US (“Securities Markets”) clearly explain three forms:

The weak form of EMH argues that stock prices are being fully reflected by market information at once. If the market remains in the weak form, no one could predict the future stock prices based on past stock information, therefore the work of stock analysts have no value. What’s more, investors will receive the same return whether they use investment strategies which rely on historical market databases. Future prices must follow a random walk. The random walk means that stock price patterns are in the same trend and independent of each other, so the historical stock price trend cannot be used to predict its future data. In sum, stock prices are only dominated by information related in the market.

The ways to test the weak form of the EMH include autocorrelation tests which mean that returns are not always significantly correlated and the runs tests which mean that stock price changes are independent.

The semi-strong form of EMH reckons that stock prices are affected by public
information in an unbiased fashion. If the market remains in the semi-strong form, nobody could predict future stock price or find undervalued stocks by analyzing public information, therefore fundamentalist and technical analysts are not worthy of their jobs. In addition, investors will receive the same return whether they use investment strategies which rely on public information. However, the work of the fundamentalists is helpful to market efficiency by eliminating the opportunities to produce consistent excess return.

The tests of the semi-strong form of the EMH are event tests and regression/time series tests. An event test analyzes the stocks both before and after an event to establish whether will achieve an abnormal return.

The strong-form of EMH argues that the stock prices are reflected of both public and private information. If the market remains in the strong form, no investors could predict future stock prices even when insider information is given. What’s more, investors will receive same return whether they use investment strategies which rely on all information.

The tests for the strong-form center are divided in groups of investors: insiders, exchange specialists, analysts and institutional money managers. Insiders such as senior managers have access to inside information and have been forbidden to use such information to gain. Exchange specialists can also obtain more than average
returns if they use the specific order information. For equity analysts, tests have been performed to assess whether an analyst's opinion can help an investor achieve above average returns. Much of the empirical evidence suggests that institutional money managers do not beat the market on a consistent basis.

Khan (1986) had proved semi-strong efficiency through grain futures markets. Firth (1976, 1979, and 1980) in the UK analyzed the share prices before and after a merger announcement. He found that the UK stock market was semi-strong-form efficient, since the share prices fully and immediately return to their “correct” levels.

However, as Vivian (2007) has mentioned ‘the market's ability to efficiently respond to a short term, widely publicized event such as a takeover announcement does not necessarily prove market efficiency related to other more long term, amorphous factors.’

Fama (1993) realized the problems in the EMH, which included the joint-hypothesis. So he modified his earlier work to address these problems. He used return predictability, events studies and private information to test, which make the study clearer and easier to distinguish. The stock prices adjusted with firm-specific information such as investment decisions, dividend changes and changes in capital structure.

Malkiel (2003) argued that the efficient market hypothesis had lost the authority it once had. However, the emergence of behavioral finance is reviving an interest in the ability to predict stock price.
2.2 Events and study on merger of automobile

Some well-known mergers in the automobile sector include the Daimler-Benz merger with Chrysler (1998), Renault SA and Nissan Motor (1999), Volvo AB and Mitsubishi Motor (1999), Daimler Chrysler with Hyundai Motor (2000). Aktas et al. (2003) has argued that the purpose of such mergers is to produce vehicles with better equipment, lower sale price and more standardized management. Thus, a higher focus of the automobile market can be created by mergers. Aktas et al. (2003) studies the effects of the merger on business combinations. By using 443 business combinations samples, they conclude that the wealth creation is positive and statistically significant.

However, not all mergers mean a success. An example of merger failure is the 1998, Daimler-Benz AG merge with the Chrysler Corp. for $39 billion. This was the largest transnational merger at the time. Daimler took a 57% share while Chrysler had 43%. Daimler Chrysler then became the second largest car manufacturer and the world's fifth largest car company. The corporate company’ goal was to realize cost savings of $1.4 billion in the first year after the merger and $3 billion over the next few years. The problem was that this company could not benefit from fast cost reductions via layoffs and factory elimination. This was due to the fact that their businesses are so different from each other and they rarely compete. The reason for merging was to deal with the global financial crisis and to have a low cost expansion. (Anonymous, 1998 May 11)
However, after six months, the revenue of the merged company rose while profits remained the same (Sterz & Vlasic, 2000). More seriously, DaimlerChrysler stock price dropped $13 per share in only two days and $10 billion evaporated (Sterz & Vlasic, 2000). Chrysler continued to have many problems and the losses were almost the equivalent of DaimlerChrysler net profit in 2000 (Carpiaux, 2002). As the situation continued and shareholders considered Chrysler as an "affliction," Daimler finally sold Chrysler for $650 million to Cerberus Capital Management in 2007 (© 2013 Time Inc). In short, this merger is regarded as a failure.
Chapter 3

Methodology

The paper is going to explain and analyze the market impact of a multinational merger in the world automobile industry and to test the market efficiency by using data from 1998 to 2012. The purpose is to determine whether abnormal returns will occur and the change of firm value before or after a merger announcement happen. Copeland and Weston (1988) mentioned that models such as Market Return Model, the Average Abnormal Return Model and the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) could be used to test event studies.

3.1 Models.

3.1.1 Market Return Model

To test semi-strong form of EMH, we can use an event study methodology. For the Market Model, we need to calculate the return on a stock at first and Equation 3.1 is:

$$ R_t = \frac{P_t - P_{t-1}}{P_{t-1}} $$

(3.1)

$R_t$ = return on stock at time $t$.

$P_t$ = stock price at time $t$.

$P_{t-1}$ = stock price at time $t-1$.

Then we can use STATA normal Equation 3.2 as follows:

$$ R_{i,t} = \beta_{1t} + \beta_{2t} R_{m,t} + u_{i,t} $$

(3.2)

$R_{i,t}$ = return on stock $i$ at time $t$
\( \beta_{1t} \) = intercept of equation for stock \( i \)

\( \beta_{2t} \) = slope of equation for stock \( i \)

\( R_{m,t} \) = market rate at time \( t \)

\( u_{i,t} \) = random disturbance of equation

Regression of (3.2) can be used by STATA procedure. The NYSE index will be treated as \( R_{m,t} \). \( u_{i,t} \) would be the risk of one stock for a certain company.

For the Equation 3.2, Gujarati & Porter (2009) provide four assumptions:

- Zero mean value of the statistical error \( u_i \): \( E(u_i) = 0 \)
- Homoscedasticity or constant variance of the statistical error \( u_i \): \( \text{Var}(u_i) = \sigma^2 \)
- No autocorrelation between statistical errors \( u_i \) and \( u_j \): \( \text{Cov}(u_i, u_j) = 0 \)
- The values of \( u_i \) are normally distributed: \( u_i \sim N(0, \sigma^2) \)

### 3.1.2 Abnormal Returns (AR), Average Abnormal Returns (AAR) and Average Cumulative Abnormal Returns (ACAR)

**Average Cumulative Abnormal Returns (ACAR)**

The Abnormal Return (AR) will have the equation form as follows:

\[
AR_{i,t} = R_{i,t} - (\beta_{1t} + \beta_{2t}R_{m,t})
\]

(3.3)

\( AR_{i,t} \) = the abnormal return on security \( i \) at time \( t \)

\( R_{i,t} \) = return on stock \( i \) at time \( t \)

\( \beta_{1t} \) = intercept of equation for stock \( i \)

\( \beta_{2t} \) = slope of equation for stock \( i \)

\( R_{m,t} \) = the index for NYSE
For Average Abnormal Return (AAR), we have Equation 3.4:

\[ AAR_t = \frac{1}{n} \sum AR_{i,t} \quad (3.4) \]

n= number of stocks

Then, a t-test will be used for testing and the null hypothesis and alternative hypothesis will be set up like:

**Null hypothesis:** \( H_0: AAR_t = 0 \)

**Alternative hypothesis:** \( H_1: AAR_t \neq 0 \)

After a t-test, we would have two answers. The first one is that t-test rejects the null hypothesis, so we obtain the result that market is efficient. The second one is that the t-test does not reject null hypothesis, so we can conclude that the market is not efficient.

### 3.1.3 Capital Asset Pricing Model – CAPM

As © 2013 Investopedia US (“CAPM”) suggests, the CAPM clearly expresses the relationship between risk and expected return, it could also be used to evaluate risky stocks value. The Equation 3.4 would be as follows:

\[ R_{it} = R_{ft} + \beta_i(R_{mt} - R_{ft}) \quad (3.4) \]

\( R_{it} \) = return on stock i at time t

\( R_{ft} \) = risk free rate at time t

\( R_{mt} \) = expected market rate at time t

\( \beta_i \) = Beta (systematic risk) for stock i
According to © 2013 Investopedia US (“CAPM”), ‘the expected return of a security or a portfolio equals the rate on a risk-free security plus a risk premium.’ If the expected return of stock is lower than the required return, then the investor should not purchase the stock. If the expected return of stock is higher than the required return, the stock is worthy of purchase. Different stocks have different risks (betas) in the security market. We can also notice in the CAPM a linear relationship between expected return and beta. Beta stands for systematic risk, which cannot be avoided.

3.2 Research Procedure

3.2.1 Trading Volume

The impact of a merger announcement to a market can be tested by event studies. At the beginning, I use an event window of 20 days which means that 10 days before $t=0$ (merger announcement occur) and 10 days after that time. $V_0$ means the return on the event window. Then, I will put forward 40 days ex-event window and 40 days post-event window. At this point, $V_{-1}$ and $V_{+1}$ mean the return on ex-event window and the return on post-event window.

I use STATA to test $V_0, V_{-1}$ and $V_{+1}$. $V_0$ and $V_{-1}$ is the first to determine whether a merger announcement can influence trading volume. If $V_0$ is bigger than $V_{-1}$ while $V_0$ is positive and significant, we can get the result that the announcement has influenced trading volume’s changes and vice versa. $V_{-1}$ and $V_{+1}$ can be compared to test whether post-merger can create value for global automobile companies. If $V_{+1}$
is bigger than $V_{-1}$ and it is significantly positive, we can get the results that the firm value of global automobile companies has increased after a merger transaction and vice versa.

**Figure 3.1**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex event window</th>
<th>Event window</th>
<th>Post event window</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$I$ --------------</td>
<td>$I$ ---------</td>
<td>$I$ --------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t= -40$</td>
<td>$V_{-1}$</td>
<td>$t= -10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t= 0$</td>
<td>$t+= 10$</td>
<td>$V_{+1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t+= 40$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.2.2 Stock price**

Just as with the work of trading volume above, STATA is used to test $R_0$, $R_{-1}$ and $R_{+1}$. $R_0$ and $R_{-1}$ would be the first to justify whether a merger announcement will influence stock price. If $R_0$ is bigger than $R_{-1}$ while $R_0$ is positive and significant, we can get the result that the merger announcement has influenced trading volume’s changes and vice versa. What’s more, I compared $R_{-1}$ and $R_{+1}$ to test whether post-merger can create value for global automobile companies. If $R_{+1}$ is bigger than $R_{-1}$ and it is significantly positive, we can obtain the result that the value of global automobile companies is increased after a merger transaction and vice versa.

**Figure 3.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ex event window</th>
<th>Event window</th>
<th>Post event window</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$I$ --------------</td>
<td>$I$ ---------</td>
<td>$I$ --------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t= -40$</td>
<td>$R_{-1}$</td>
<td>$t= -10$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t= 0$</td>
<td>$t+= 10$</td>
<td>$R_{+1}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$t+= 40$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
<td>$I$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3.3 Data Selection**
This study chooses global automobile companies traded on the Over-The-Counter Market (OTC) and NYSE market. The merger announcement is from January 1998 to December 2012. The company list in the sample would meet the following criteria:

1) It is a common stock and traded on the OTC market or NYSE Market.
2) The companies in the list must have an IPO at least 6 months before the merger announcement and be successfully completed, and
3) The repeated cases will be eliminated in the data list.

3.4 Data sources

The data of merger announcements for this study were collected from Bloomberg.

Data of daily trading volume and daily closing prices from 1998 to 2012 can be found from: http://ca.finance.yahoo.com/
Chapter 4

Analysis of Results

4.1 Overview

This section will analyze and explain the results of the models using a sample of 24 acquired companies from the OTC market and 10 acquired companies come from the NYSE market. The data collected covered a wide range of time and STATA software was used.

4.2 Stock Price

4.2.1 Regression Analysis

Equation (3.2) from the previous chapter describes the linear relationship between beta (systematic risk) and expected return and the DJ (USA) index was used for the expected market return.

By using command “reg index retn” (index stands for series of the DJ index, retn stands for series of daily price), I get:

Table 4.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>1.98146069</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.98146069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>1.59757544</td>
<td>1840</td>
<td>0.000868248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.79572151</td>
<td>1841</td>
<td>0.000975405</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of obs</th>
<th>F( 1, 1840)</th>
<th>Prob &gt; F</th>
<th>Adj R-squared</th>
<th>Root MSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1842</td>
<td>228.21</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.1103</td>
<td>0.02947</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|      | coef.  | std. err. | t     | p>|t| | [95% conf. interval] |
|------|--------|-----------|-------|-------|---------------------|
| retn | 0.7814953 | 0.917315  | 15.11 | 0.000 | 0.6800366 to 0.882954 |
| _cons | -0.000472 | 0.006874 | -0.69 | 0.492 | -0.018201 to 0.007962 |
From this table, we can know that the intercept $\widehat{\beta_{1t}}$ is -0.000472 and the slope $\widehat{\beta_{2t}}$ is 0.7814953. Ceteris paribus, the slope $\widehat{\beta_{2t}}$ means that when the return of the stock increases by 1%, the expected return will increase by 0.7814953%. Then we can know that a change in these stocks is sensitive to the market change.

Gujarati & Porter (2009) confirmed the use of that R-squared to evaluate how well the data fit the regression line. The R-squared is certainly a nonnegative quantity. In addition, when R-squared behaves closer to 1 the stock match the Market Model better and better, and vice versa. From the Table 4.1, we know that the R-squared=0.1103 and adjusted R-squared=0.1099, which are relatively low. So we can conclude that the stocks trend in the sample could not influence the performance of DJ index.

For the event window, we can also check for the regression:

**Table 4.2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>Number of obs = 497</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>0.034161842</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>F (1, 495) = 47.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>0.356348543</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>0.000719896</td>
<td>Prob &gt; F = 0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.390510385</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>0.000787319</td>
<td>R-squared = 0.0875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adj R-squared = 0.0856</td>
<td></td>
<td>Root MSE = 0.02683</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|          | Coef.       | Std. Err. | t     | P>|t| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|----------|-------------|-----------|-------|------|----------------------|
| retn     | -0.669144   | -0.0971368 | 6.89  | 0.000 | 0.4782927 - 0.8599953 |
| _cons    | -0.0010302  | 0.0012059 | -0.85 | 0.393 | -0.0033994 - 0.001339 |

Table 4.2 shows the regression result of market model Equation (3.2) only in the period of the event window. By this result, we know that the intercept $\widehat{\beta_{1t}}$ is -0.
0010302 and the slope $\beta_{2t}$ is 0.669144. Ceteris paribus, the slope $\beta_{2t}$ means that when return of stock increases by 1%, the expected return will increase by 0.669144%. Then we can know that a change in these stocks’ price is sensitive to the market change. However, when these results are compared to those of Table 4.1, we can observe that the $\beta_{2t}$ is less (0.669144 < 0.7814953). So the change in stocks’ price for a long period may be more sensitive to market change than a short period.

From Table 4.2, we know the R-squared=0.0875 and adjusted R-squared=0.0856 which are relatively low. So we can conclude that the stocks trend in the sample could not influence the performance of the DJ index in the short period.

**4.2.2 Average Abnormal Return (AAR) Analysis and Result**

For the average abnormal return (AAR), we should test whether the market is efficient and whether a merger announcement can influence stock price. What’s more, AAR can test whether the firm value of global automobile companies will increase after the merger announcement. For the AAR model, the event window is 20 days, which are 10 days before merger announcement and 10 days after merger announcement. The model also has 40 days *ex-event* window and 40 days *post-event* window.

At first, we will use the whole data for testing market efficiency. By using the STATA menu: Statistics > Summaries, tables, and tests > Classical tests of hypotheses > one sample mean-comparison test, we get the Table 4.2 as follows:
For the t-test, we use hypotheses as follows:

**Null hypothesis:** \( H_0: AAR_t = 0 \)

**Alternative hypothesis:** \( H_1: AAR_t \neq 0 \)

If the \( \Pr(|T| > |t|) > 0.05 \) (P-value > 0.05), we will accept the null hypothesis. If the \( \Pr(|T| > |t|) < 0.05 \) (P-value < 0.05), we will reject the null hypothesis. From Table 4.3, we know that P-value is 0.9857 > 0.05, so we will accept the hypothesis. The t value = 0.0518 < Critical t value = 1.96 (when \( \alpha \) is at 95% level), so the value is statistically significant. So we can conclude that the market is semi-strong efficient.

About the event window, we can also use STATA to perform the t-test just as above:

**Table 4.4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>retnl</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>-0.005146</td>
<td>0.001286</td>
<td>0.0280992</td>
<td>-0.0029875 to 0.0019583</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{mean} = \text{mean(retnl)} \) \hspace{1cm} \( t = -0.4088 \) \hspace{1cm} \( \text{degrees of freedom} = 496 \)

\( \text{Ha: mean < 0} \) \hspace{1cm} \( \text{Ha: mean \neq 0} \) \hspace{1cm} \( \text{Ha: mean > 0} \)

\( \Pr(T < t) = 0.3414 \) \hspace{1cm} \( \Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.6828 \) \hspace{1cm} \( \Pr(T > t) = 0.6586 \)
For Ex-event window, we can also use STATA for the t-test:

**Table 4.5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>retnbef</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>0.0014832</td>
<td>0.0012705</td>
<td>0.0325399</td>
<td>-0.0010115, 0.0039779</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
. ttest retnbef = 0
One-sample t test

Variable | Obs  | Mean  | Std. Err. | Std. Dev. | [95% Conf. Interval] |
----------|------|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|
retnbef   | 656  | 0.0014832 | 0.0012705 | 0.0325399 | -0.0010115, 0.0039779 |
```

mean = mean(retnbef)  
Ho: mean = 0  
degrees of freedom = 655

| Pr(T < t) | Pr(|T| > |t|) | Pr(T > t) |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| 0.8783    | 0.2434      | 0.1217    |

Comparing Table 4.4 and Table 4.5, the mean return $R_0$ in the event window’s is -0.0005146 which is less than 0.0014832 of the mean return $R_{-1}$ in the ex-event window. The difference of P-value is 0.6828-0.2434= 0.4394>0.05, so we accept the hypothesis. At the end, we can conclude that the merger announcement has no impact on stock price in the US market.

For the *post-event* window, we can also use STATA to perform a t-test:

**Table 4.6**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Obs</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Err.</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>[95% Conf. Interval]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>retnafter</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>-0.0009395</td>
<td>0.0012252</td>
<td>0.0321362</td>
<td>-0.003345, 0.0014661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
. ttest retnafter = 0
One-sample t test

Variable | Obs  | Mean  | Std. Err. | Std. Dev. | [95% Conf. Interval] |
----------|------|-------|-----------|-----------|----------------------|
retnafter | 688  | -0.0009395 | 0.0012252 | 0.0321362 | -0.003345, 0.0014661 |
```

mean = mean(retnafter)  
Ho: mean = 0  
degrees of freedom = 687

| Pr(T < t) | Pr(|T| > |t|) | Pr(T > t) |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|
| 0.2217    | 0.4435      | 0.7783    |

By comparing Table 4.5 and 4.6, the mean return $R_{+1}$ in the *post-event* window is -0.0009395 which is less than 0.0014832 of the mean return $R_{-1}$ in *ex-event* window. The difference of P-value is 0.4435-0.2434= 0.2001, so we accept the hypothesis. At
the end, we can conclude that the value of global automobile companies does not increase after a merger transaction.

4.3 Volume

For the daily volume of merged firms in the global automobile industry, the data were all collected from http://ca.finance.yahoo.com/. The first thing is to test whether the merger announcement can influence trading volume. For the AAR model, the event window is 20 days; 10 days before merger announcement and 10 days after merger announcement. The model also has a 40 days ex-event window and 40 days post-event window.

By using the excel sum and average command, we can get that:

For the event window: Sum= 1706560700, the average volume for \( V_0 \) is 3555334.792.

For the ex-event window: Sum= 3045662400, the average volume for \( V_{-1} \) is 4518786.944 which is larger than 3555334.792 of event window \( V_0 \). So the merger announcement has not influenced trading volume’s changes.

For the post-event window: Sum= 2387679000, the average volume for \( V_{+1} \) is 3595902.108 which is less than ex-event window \( V_{-1} \) of 4518786.944. So the value of global automobile companies will not be affected after a Merger transaction.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

5.1 Conclusions

By using STATA, I obtained five results for the analyzing part of stock price

Firstly, I use STATA to do the regression of the Market Model for the total period and the period of the event window. By analyzing the output, both of the two results suggest that change in these stocks is sensitive to the market change. However, both of the two results point put that the stocks trend in the sample could not influence the performance of the DJ (USA) index. Secondly, the outputs of average accumulative return (AAR) model leads to the results that market is semi-strong efficient, since we accept the null hypothesis. Null hypothesis: \( H_0: \text{AAR}_t = 0 \). Thirdly, the merger announcement has no impact on stock price in the US market. Fourthly, the return in the ex-event window and post-event window does not have difference. Therefore, the value of global automobile companies does not increase after a merger transaction.

I also use excel to analysis the trading volume part. The result is that the merger announcement has not influenced trading volume’s changes and the value of global automobile companies will not be affected after a Merger transaction.

5.2 Limitations and Recommendations

The conclusions express that merger announcements do not influence stock prices and the merged firm could not gain value. There are several reasons to explain the results.
Firstly, not only the merger announcement can affect the stock price, like policy factor. For example, steel price rise, then the benefit of automobile companies is reduced. Therefore, stock price of automobile companies go down. Secondly, the sample I chose is at a long time period. Because time effect can affect stock price, the merger announcement does not have too much influence. Finally, I chose world automobile stocks on the NYSE market and OTC market and the sample is relatively small. So there is no statistically significant result for this paper. The sample is limited to meet the requirement for event studies. If we have more samples to analysis, our output may be better. If we limit the areas of automobile companies, like only in the US, we may receive more favorable result.
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**Appendix:**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deal Type</th>
<th>Announce Date</th>
<th>Target Name</th>
<th>Acquirer Name</th>
<th>Announced Total Value (mil.)</th>
<th>Payment Type</th>
<th>Deal Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JV</td>
<td>2011/2/18</td>
<td>Sollers OJSC</td>
<td>Ford Motor Co</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2010/3/28</td>
<td>Volvo Personvagnar AB</td>
<td>Geely Holding Group</td>
<td>1800</td>
<td>Cash and Debt</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2009/10/1</td>
<td>Australian Car Loan Portfolio</td>
<td>Macquarie Group Ltd</td>
<td>899.6</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2009/2/2</td>
<td>Automatic Transmissions</td>
<td>HZ Holding</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2008/3/26</td>
<td>Jaguar Land Rover Operations</td>
<td>Tata Motors Ltd</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>2007/4/11</td>
<td>Troller Veículos Especiais SA</td>
<td>Ford Motor Co</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>2005/8/2</td>
<td>Jiangling Motors Corp Ltd</td>
<td>Ford Motor Co</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2004/3/26</td>
<td>Polar Motor Co Ltd</td>
<td>Ford Motor Co</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>2000/9/21</td>
<td>Hertz Corp/Old</td>
<td>Ford Motor Co</td>
<td>706.42</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2000/3/17</td>
<td>Land Rover</td>
<td>Ford Motor Co</td>
<td>2912.7</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>1999/8/25</td>
<td>Bougourd Bros Ltd</td>
<td>Ford Motor Co</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>1999/5/11</td>
<td>YOUNG DRIVERS</td>
<td>Ford Motor Co</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>1999/1/28</td>
<td>Volvo Cars unit</td>
<td>Ford Motor Co</td>
<td>6451.33</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2012/10/16</td>
<td>General Motors India Pvt Ltd</td>
<td>General Motors Co</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2010/2/23</td>
<td>DaimlerChrysler</td>
<td>SAIC Motor Corp Ltd</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JV</td>
<td>2010/5/28</td>
<td>Byd Co Ltd</td>
<td>Daimler AG</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JV</td>
<td>2009/11/24</td>
<td>Kamaz OJSC</td>
<td>Daimler AG</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>2009/5/19</td>
<td>Tesla Motors Inc</td>
<td>Daimler AG</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2008/12/12</td>
<td>Kamaz OJSC</td>
<td>Daimler AG</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2008/4/30</td>
<td>Tognum AG</td>
<td>Daimler AG</td>
<td>910.9</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>2007/11/14</td>
<td>DaimlerChrysler Luft- und New Venture Gear Inc</td>
<td>Daimler AG</td>
<td>660.15</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2004/5/17</td>
<td>Mitsubishi Fuso Truck &amp; Bus Corp</td>
<td>Magna International Inc</td>
<td>440.14</td>
<td>Cash and Debt</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2004/1/15</td>
<td>Hyundai Motor Co</td>
<td>Daimler AG</td>
<td>490.06</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>2000/6/26</td>
<td>Hyundai Motor Co</td>
<td>Daimler AG</td>
<td>385.06</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>1999/1/20</td>
<td>ADTRANZ</td>
<td>Daimler AG</td>
<td>472</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2009/5/12</td>
<td>Michel Thierry SA</td>
<td>Peugeot SA</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>2001/10/30</td>
<td>Renault SA</td>
<td>Nissan Motor Co Ltd</td>
<td>1726.65</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2000/4/25</td>
<td>Renault VI</td>
<td>Volvo AB</td>
<td>1722.74</td>
<td>Stock</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>2011/5/9</td>
<td>MAN SE</td>
<td>Volkswagen AG</td>
<td>7418.43</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>2009/12/9</td>
<td>Suzuki Motor Corp</td>
<td>Volkswagen AG</td>
<td>2531.86</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACQ</td>
<td>2009/8/13</td>
<td>Porsche Automobil LeasePlan Corp</td>
<td>Volkswagen AG</td>
<td>5568.03</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2004/4/21</td>
<td>LeasePlan Corp NV</td>
<td>Volkswagen AG, Olayan</td>
<td>2527.03</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>2003/3/27</td>
<td>Scania AB</td>
<td>Volkswagen AG</td>
<td>1597</td>
<td>Undisclosed</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIV</td>
<td>1998/3/25</td>
<td>Rolls-Royce Motor Cars Ltd</td>
<td>Volkswagen AG</td>
<td>802.18</td>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Complete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>