



**The impact of the expected credit loss model under  
IFRS 9 on loan loss recognition timeliness: early  
evidence from the Egyptian banks**

*By*

**Karim Mansour Ali Hassouba**

Lecturer of Accounting and Finance Department

Faculty of Commerce, Cairo University

karimmansour@foc.cu.edu.eg

*Scientific Journal for Financial and Commercial Studies and  
Researches (SJFCSR)*

Faculty of Commerce – Damietta University

**Vol.2, No.2, Part 1, July 2021**

**APA Citation:**

**Hassouba, K. M.A.** (2021). The impact of the expected credit loss model under IFRS 9 on loan loss recognition timeliness: early evidence from the Egyptian banks, *Scientific Journal for Financial and Commercial Studies and Research*, Faculty of Commerce, Damietta University, 2(2)1, pp.243-273.

**Website:** <https://cfdj.journals.ekb.eg/>

### **Abstract**

The central bank of Egypt (CBE) has obligated the Egyptian banks as of 2019 to apply IFRS 9 to provide more timely information about the expected credit losses (ECL). However, the implementation of IFRS 9 concerning the ECL requires a significant judgment that may lead to opportunistic accounting behavior. This research aims to examine the impact of the expected credit loss (ECL) model under IFRS 9 on loan loss recognition timeliness (LLRT) of the Egyptian banks, and also investigates the moderating effect of corporate governance (CG) efficiency namely: board size (BSIZE), board independence (BIND), institutional ownership (INSTIT), CEO duality (DUAL), and audit quality (AQ). The research uses data extracted from the quarterly financial reports for a sample of Egyptian banks from 2018 to 2019, the data were processed using the panel corrected standards errors (PCSE). The results reveal a significant positive effect of applying the ECL model on LLRT, also, the results show a positive effect of BIND on the association between ECL model and LLRT, conversely, there is a negative effect of DUAL, while, there is no effect for each of BSIZE, INSTIT, and AQ. This research introduces early empirical evidence from the emerging markets about the implications of the ECL model under IFRS 9, the research results are important for regulators and investors because it supports the effectiveness of the new model, also, the results are important for future reform programs undertaken by regulators in Egypt such as CBE, moreover, the research adds to the literature of LLRT, by providing evidence regarding the effect of applying the ECL model on LLRT.

**Keywords** – Loan loss recognition timeliness (LLRT), International Financial Reporting Standard (IFRS) 9, Expected Credit losses (ECL), Corporate Governance (CG).

## **1. Introduction**

Loan loss provisions (LLP) are allowances designated to meet expected losses from non-performing loans (NPL), LLP is considered the most important method to be used in dealing with expected losses of bank credit risks and safeguard the stakeholders' benefits (Al-Magharem et al., 2019), According to Alali and Romero (2013), who studied banking operations from 1984 to 2010, LLP could be used as an indispensable determinant in foretelling the failure of US banks, likewise, Eastburn and Sharland (2017) and Shan and Xu (2012) indicated that banks might fall because of bad loans and insolvency if there was inadequate LLP.

Loan loss recognition timeliness (LLRT) means the susceptibility of current LLP to future modifications in NPL (Kim et al., 2020), more timely loan loss recognition (LLR) provides an early caution for the problems of loans (Akins et al., 2017), prior literature showed that LLRT is a pivotal accounting policy choice that affects the cyclicity of bank lending, which in turn magnifies the downside risk for banks with low capital and systemic risk (Bushman and Williams, 2012), Beatty and Liao (2011) found that banks that delay the recognition of loan losses diminish their lending during the downturn and vulnerable to capital crunches, the study also shows that the pro-cyclicality of bank lending is less for banks with smaller delays.

Incurred credit loss (ICL) model under IAS 39 has been criticized heavily because banks can recognize LLP only when there is a trigger event e.g., non-payment of interest, non-repayment of principal, and a significant reduction in collateral value (Kim et al., 2020), according to the ICL model, losses must be probable to be recognized and that depends on events in the past and conditions present at the financial reporting date, so the expected losses are ignored (Albian, 2019).

As a result of that, the IASB has developed the expected credit loss (ECL) model in July 2014 under IFRS 9 to better reflect the general pattern of deteriorations or improvements in the credit quality of financial instruments (IASB, 2014), as a response to the update in the IFRSs, the central bank of Egypt (CBE) had decided on January 17, 2018, that all Egyptian banks and branches of foreign banks operating in Egypt are obligated to apply IFRS 9 as of 2019 (CBE, 2019).

Based on the weaknesses of the ICL model, it is predicted that the ECL model will increase the LLRT, as entities are required to consider reasonable and supportable future forecasts of economic conditions, which will result in providing the users with timelier and forward-looking information (IASB, 2014), Kim et al. (2020) investigated the influence of the move to the ECL model on LLRT, the results reveal that this move increases LLRT.

However, the ECL model might lead to more subjective estimates of expected loan losses because it requires significant judgment from the preparers of financial reports, hence, shifting to the ECL model might also lead to a decrease in LLRT (Lim et al., 2018), additionally, the application of the general framework to calculate the ECL requires a large amount of quantitative and qualitative information whether it is historical, represents the current situation, about future forecasts or macroeconomic indicators, therefore the bank must work on developing the necessary systems to provide adequate, accurate, and safe information (CBE, 2019), these requirements may include complexity and considered as challenges for banks.

In addition to the aforementioned, applying the ECL model needs effectual supervision from the bank's board and its related committees to guarantee the proper application of the model (CBE, 2019), so it is predicted that corporate governance (CG) efficiency will influence the relation between applying ECL model and LLRT, in this regard, I test the effect of several dimensions of CG which are board size (BSIZE), board independence (BIND), institutional ownership (INSTIT), CEO duality (DUAL), and audit quality (AQ).

Regarding the studies that investigate the effect of IFRS 9 in the Egyptian context, Shehata (2019) examined the effect of credit losses accounting evaluation according to IFRS 9 and Basel III requirements on banks loans portfolio classifications, using a sample of three banks that voluntarily apply the IFRS 9 during the year 2018 (before the mandatory apply in 2019), the results show that there are significant differences between loan loss allowance based on IFRS 9 and the actual allowance, because the increase in the allowance to meet the ECL, the results also show that there is a correspondence between IFRS 9 and Basel III regarding the measurement and revaluation of ECL, Ibrahim (2018) explored the challenges that the Egyptian banks will find when apply IFRS 9, using the case of the national bank of Egypt during the year 2018, the results showed that the challenges could be the measurement and disclosure's requirements of financial instruments and the measurement and estimation of ECL, as far as I know, there are no studies examined the impact of IFRS 9 on LLRT in the Egyptian context.

The research aims to provide early evidence of the impact of applying the ECL model according to IFRS 9 on LLRT of the Egyptian banks, also, testing the moderating impact of CG efficiency on the relation between ECL model and LLRT, using a sample of 30 Egyptian banks for 2018 and 2019 with total observations of 240, the results show a positive effect of applying ECL model on LLRT, concerning the effect of CG, the results indicate a positive impact of BIND on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, contrariwise, there is a negative impact of DUAL, while BSIZE, INSTIT, and AQ have no impact.

This research provides several contributions, first, it considers among the first few types of research (Kim et al, 2020; Albian, 2019; and Shehata, 2019) that provides early empirical evidence about the implications of the ECL model under IFRS 9, and the second research after Kim et al. (2020) to examine the effect of the ECL model on LLRT, the research also is the first to examine the CG dimensions as determinants of

the relationship between ECL model and LLRT, second, the research results are important for regulators and investors because it supports the effectiveness of the new model, third, these results are important for future reform programs undertaken by regulators in Egypt such as the CBE, fourth, the research adds to the literature of LLRT, by providing evidence that the ECL model increases LLRT.

The rest of the research is classified into six parts: part 2 discusses the institutional framework in Egypt; part 3 shows the literature review and hypotheses development; part 4 presents the research methodology; part 5 introduces the results; part 6 is related to discussion; the last part offers the conclusion.

## **2. The institutional framework in Egypt**

The sector of the Egyptian banking grew considerably in the mid-1970s encouraged by the country's so-called open-door policy, in 1975 the Egyptian parliament issued the banking law No, 120 which defined the nature and mode of operations for all banks, and in the 1990s the Egyptian authorities began influential banking reforms towards a more liberal system (El-Shazly, 2001), CBE completed a banking reform program that commenced in 2004 and finished in December 2008 to strengthen the banking sector and help achieve economic growth, one of the main parts of this program was addressing the issue of NPL, in January 2009, CBE launched the second wave of its reform program scheduled to end by 2011 to continue upgrading banking supervision technical abilities and apply Basel II (CBE, 2009).

As a response to the update in the IFRSs, the CBE decided in its session held on January 17, 2018, that banks are obligated to prepare its financial statements per IFRS 9 as of 2019, and following this decision, the instructions of IFRS 9 are applied to all banks and foreign banks branches operating in Egypt that are subject to the control and supervision of the central bank (CBE, 2019), also, concerning the Egyptian ministerial resolution No. 69 of 2019, some provisions of the Egyptian accounting

standards (EAS) issued by the minister of investment decree No. 110 of 2015 were amended by issuing three accounting standards; one of these standards was the EAS No. (47) for financial instruments, which goes along with IFRS9 (EFRA, 2019).

The new standard introduces a new methodology for recognizing expected losses under a new model based on past, current, and expected events, this research seeks to provide early evidence about the effectiveness of applying ECL model under IFRS 9 in the Egyptian banks which obliged firstly to apply this standard, by examining the impact of ECL model on LLRT as one of the important indicators of banks' stability and risks, this will help in providing recommendations to increase the effectiveness of future reform programs carried out by the CBE.

### **3. Literature review and hypotheses development**

LLR is a main accrual process whereby banks recognize predictable loan losses in the existing period, these results in a decrease in the bank's profits and regulatory capital, which, in turn, can notify the stakeholders to problems that the bank is facing (Bushman, 2014), so the quality of the LLP has a salient impact for banks and their stakeholders (Choi, 2018), the delay in recognizing the expected losses affects the capability of loan loss reserves to meet credit losses during economic downturns. When the reserves are inadequate to cover credit losses, banks are required to recognize more provisions and decrease capital adequacy (Beatty and Liao, 2011), also, Van den Heuvel (2009) confirms that the ability of lending during the downturn is low for banks that delay the recognition of expected losses.

When LLR is timelier, the profitability and regulatory capital of the bank will be affected negatively and in an early manner, which in turn is likely to cause an earlier inspection of the bank by different stakeholders, including external and internal checkers, this inspection improves the chances of earlier detection of fraud in lending, and lower officers' ability to exploit the corruption (Akins et al., 2017).

### *3.1 The effect of IFRS 9 on LLRT*

Based on the ICL model under the preceding IAS 39, a financial asset is impaired when there are events of impairment, examples of these events are the significant financial difficulty of the obligator; a breach of contract; granting a concession to the borrower; and the probability of borrower bankruptcy (IASB, 2001), one of the most important problems of the ICL model is the delay in recognizing credit losses and waiting until they occur, and this was considered as one of the main reasons for the aggravation of the recent global financial crisis (Halilbegovic et al., 2019).

In April 2009, The IASB declared a timetable for substituting IAS 39 in response to the recommendations of the G20 leaders and the international bodies, the replacing project included three main phases, in July 2014, the IASB implemented the second phase which was related to the accounting for ECL on an entity's financial assets, ECL model allows the credit losses to be recognized regardless of the occurrence of the credit event, the new model provides more well-timed information because it updates the ECL since initial recognition to better reflect the modifications in credit risk (IASB, 2014).

According to the ECL model, the financial assets must be categorized into three phases; the first phase is applied when the credit risk of the financial assets does not increase significantly, and when the credit quality deteriorates significantly the second phase is applied, while the third phase is applied in case of default, the loan loss allowance is recognized in the first phase based on 12-month ECL, while in the second and third phases, the allowance is recognized depend on lifetime ECL (IASB, 2014).

Under IAS 39, LLP is only recorded for impaired exposures, whereas ECL requires the LLP to be recorded for all credit exposures based on past, current, and forecasted events, Albian (2019) confirms that banks that apply IFRS 9 do not count more on the incurred loss elements of LLP and there may be other factors that influence these provisions, the shift to the ECL model will probably affect the LLRT positively, as entities are required to consider reasonable and supportable future forecasts of

economic conditions, which will result in providing the users with timelier and forward-looking information (IASB, 2014), using experimental data, Gomaa et al. (2019) found that the introduction of the ECL model increases the adequacy of loan loss reserves over the economic cycle.

Kim et al. (2020) expected that banks that have an accurate expectation of the future economic conditions will recognize the loan losses in a timelier manner in the period after applying IFRS 9 and that based on the limitations of the ICL model, the regulatory intention behind the shift to ECL, and the information signalling role of accounting, their study investigated the impact of the move to the ECL model on LLRT, using a sample of banks from 33 countries, the results showed that this move affects LLRT positively, and also this effect is more noticeable for banks exposed to high risk and banks that have inadequate loan losses before the move.

However, the ECL model demands extensive endeavour to aggregate and process data and unavoidably allows subjective judgments which may offer a path to manipulate earnings (Bushman and Williams, 2012; Albian, 2019; Novotny-Farkas, 2016; Camfferman, 2015), the ECL model allows more discretion to facilitate the incorporation of more information regarding expected losses into LLP, the allowed accounting discretion may increase the opportunistic accounting behaviour that can reduce bank reporting transparency (Bushman and Williams, 2012), the potential allowed discretion as well may affect the comparability of earnings (Gebhardt, 2016).

Also, the calculation of ECL requires the application of automated systems, statistical models, and databases, and therefore the systems must be of high quality whether, in terms of inputs, operations, control, or the results extracted from them (CBE, 2019), these requirements could contain complexity and thus considered as challenges for banks, based on the potential discretion and complexity, the ECL model may attenuate LLRT.

Based on the above discussion, I predict that apply the ECL model will increase the LLRT of Egyptian banks, hence my first hypothesis is:

**H1:** applying the ECL model will increase the LLRT in the Egyptian banks.

### *3.2 The impact of CG on the relationship between IFRS 9 and LLRT*

IFRS 9 aims to measure credit losses through a future view based on historical, current and expected information, which requires the existence of effective oversight from the bank's board and its related committees and work to provide and protect systems used in the application, accordingly, it is the responsibility of the board to provide an appropriate structure and procedures for governance that ensure proper application of the standard, by defining the roles of committees and business units and ensuring the complementarity of work among them and providing the appropriate infrastructure (CBE, 2019).

Leventis et al. (2013) found out that the increase in CG effectiveness, especially concerning board and audit structures allows banks to recognize larger LLP relative to modifications in NPL compared to banks with an ineffective CG, also, Zagorchev and Gao (2015) found that sound CG was positively associated with LLP. Based on that, I predict that CG effectiveness will strengthen the impact of applying ECL model on LLRT, different hypotheses of CG dimensions were developed namely: BSIZE, BIND, INSTIT, DUAL, and AQ, this can be illustrated as follows:

#### *3.2.1. The impact of BSIZE on the relationship between IFRS 9 and LLRT*

BSIZE can be one of the factors that determine the effectiveness of the board's performance, in this regard, controversy has arisen in several academic research, as large boards can provide diversification that helps firms secure the necessary resources and reduce uncertainty. Contrarily, the problems of coordination, communication, and decision-making that hinder the performance of the firms may increase when the number of members increases (Tanna et al, 2011; Goodstein et al, 1994). Yermack

(1996) found an adverse effect of BSIZE on firm value, whereas, Dehaene et al, (2001) noted that BSIZE affects firm performance positively, also, Connelly and Limpaphayom (2004) found that BSIZE does not affect firm performance.

Concerning the effect of BSIZE on LLP, Oyewole et al. (2014) examined the relation between CG mechanisms and credit risk using a sample of 19 listed banks from 2005 to 2009, the study revealed that BSIZE correlated to better credit risk management and decreasing the level of LLP and NPL. Mersni and Ben Othman (2016) tested the effect of BSIZE on LLP using a sample of 20 Islamic banks and found that LLP was negatively associated with BSIZE, also, Kolsi and Grassa (2017) used a sample of 26 Islamic banks to test the same relation and found that Sharia BSIZE has a negative relationship with LLP.

I predict that BSIZE will affect the relationship between IFRS 9 and LLRT positively, as applying IFRS 9 requires boards to perform many tasks to properly implement and achieve the desired benefit, and the increase in board members leads to a diversity of experiences and an increase in the members available to work in various committees which are necessary to participate in the application of the standard, therefore the following hypothesis can be as follows:

**H2A:** BSIZE has a positive impact on the relationship between ECL model and LLRT.

### *3.2.2. The impact of BIND on the relationship between IFRS 9 and LLRT*

BIND supports the supervision of management and limits opportunistic behaviour, Cheng and Courtenay (2006) found a positive correlation between the BIND and the amount of information disclosed voluntarily, concerning the relationship between BIND and LLP, Kolsi and Grassa (2017) found that BIND has a negative relationship with LLP, while Mersni and Ben Othman (2016) found no relation. I predict that BIND will have a positive effect on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, as I

discussed before, ECL model will introduce subjectivity and BIND is important to decrease the opportunistic accounting behaviour that may be conducted by managers, therefore, the next hypothesis can take place as follow:

**H2B:** BIND has a positive impact on the relationship between ECL model and LLRT.

*3.2.3. The impact of INSTIT on the relationship between IFRS 9 and LLRT*

INSTIT has a fundamental role in CG and oversight of management behaviour, whether through direct intervention or the activation of other governance mechanisms, compared to the rest of the shareholders who may not have sufficient shares to enable them to influence management (Shleifer and Vishny, 1986). Feldmann and Schwarzkkopf (2003) find a positive effect of INSTIT on the board efficacy. About the effect of INSTIT on LLP, Kolsi and Grassa (2017) found that INSTIT has no impact on LLP, I predict that INSTIT will have a positive effect on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, as it may decrease the earning manipulation that may be carried out by managers, therefore the following hypothesis can be as follows:

**H2C:** INSTIT has a positive impact on the relationship between ECL model and LLRT.

*3.2.4. The impact of DUAL on the relationship between IFRS 9 and LLRT*

There is a debate regarding the effect of DUAL on firm performance (Rahman and Haniffa, 2005 and Mersni and Ben Othman, 2016), according to stewardship theory, DUAL will reduce the interest conflict between the board and the management (Rechner and Dalton, 1991; Bradbury et al, 2006; Liu, 2012), while agency theory argues that DUAL will damp firm performance (Epps and Ismail, 2009). Concerning the effect of DUAL on LLP, Oyewole et al. (2014) found that the separation of powers between the chairman and the CEO increase NPL ratio and LLP, while Mersni and Ben Othman (2016) found no relation.

In Egypt, a decision was issued by the financial regulatory authority (FRA) No. 47 in April 2020, which requires listed firms to prohibit the combination of the positions of the Chairman and CEO, and that following best governance practices and recommendations of the world bank, to improve the control environment in the firm and avoiding conflicts of interest (EFRA, 2020). Based on that, I predict that CEO duality will have a negative effect on the relationship between IFRS 9 and LLRT, therefore the following hypothesis can be formulated as follows:

**H2D:** DUAL has a negative impact on the relationship between ECL model and LLRT.

### *3.2.5. The impact of AQ on the relationship between IFRS 9 and LLRT*

Kanagaretnam et al. (2010) found that Big 4 auditors affect the extent of bank earnings management through LLP, while Ozili (2017) found that income smoothing by LLP is not decreased by Big 4 auditors, Mersni and Ben Othman, (2016) examined the impact of AQ on LLP and found no relation.

According to the decision of the CBE, which was previously mentioned, it is the responsibility of the auditors to verify the integrity of the bank's procedures regarding methodologies and methods of calculating the ECL, and auditors must provide the CBE with a special report regarding the integrity of the procedures and the adequacy of the provision, and attach this report to the interim and annual financial statements (CBE, 2019). Based on that, I predict that AQ will have a positive effect on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, therefore the following hypothesis can be as follows:

**H2E:** AQ has a positive impact on the relationship between ECL model and LLRT.

---

---

#### **4. Research methodology**

##### *4.1. Data description*

This research focuses on the banking sector in Egypt due to its special importance in supporting and growing the Egyptian economy, in addition to the increasing risks that banks face continuously compared to other sectors. The research population consists of 38 commercial banks operating in Egypt, based on the CBE report in 2018, I select this population because these banks are subject to CBE supervision and obligated to apply IFRS 9, this research was conducted using data extracted from the quarterly financial reports for a sample of 30 banks for 2018 and 2019 with total observations of 240, this sample represents 79% of the population and includes local Egyptian banks, Egyptian branches of international banks, and Islamic banks, this sample also includes all the listed banks in the Egyptian Stock Exchange (ESE) which count for 13 banks, the research is limited to this sample for two reasons; first, I excluded the specialized banks such as agricultural, real estate and industrial banks due to their different nature from commercial banks, second, I excluded banks with missing data especially some international banks that have branches in Egypt not listed in ESE and prepare consolidated financial statements, finally, the data were processed using the panel corrected standards errors (PCSE) by STATA software.

##### *4.2. The research model*

To test the hypotheses, a basic model is designed as follows:

$$LLRT_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 IFRS_{it} + \beta_2 SIZE_{it} + \beta_3 CAP_{it} + \beta_4 EBLLP_{it} + \beta_5 LINT_{it} + \beta_6 LGROW_{it} + \beta_7 INT_{it} + \beta_8 PROF_{it} + \beta_9 BSIZE_{it} + \beta_{10} BIND_{it} + \beta_{11} INSTIT_{it} + \beta_{12} DUAL_{it} + \beta_{13} AQ_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

According to Beatty and Liao (2011), LLRT can be measured using the proportion of loan loss reserve to NPL, this ratio expresses banks' tendency to recognize not only incurred losses but also the expected risk

---

---

in their performing loans, this measure is documented to be used by bank regulators to assess loan credit quality (OCC 2012; Federal Reserve Board 2017), besides, this measure is frequently used by the agencies of credit rating to evaluate the bank's risks (Fitch, 2009), furthermore, this measure does not need time-series data which restrict the sample size (Choi, 2018). Following the literature review of LLRT (Kim et al., 2020; Balakrishnan and Ertan, 2019; Choi, 2018; Akins et al., 2017; Bushman and Williams, 2012; Beatty and Liao, 2011), SIZE, CAP, EBLLP, LINT, LGRO, INT, and PROF were used as control variables. Also, BSIZE, BIND, INSTIT, DUAL, and AQ were used as moderating variables of the relationship between IFRS 9 and LLRT.

Table 1 shows the variables of the research, abbreviations, and measures of each variable, this can be illustrated as follow:

**Table 1: Variables measurement**

| Variables                   | Proxies                                 |              |   |
|-----------------------------|---|--------------|---|
|                             | Name                                    | Abbreviation | Measure   |
| <b>Dependent Variable</b>   | Loan loss recognition timeliness        | LLRT         | the ratio of loan loss reserves to non-performing loans   |
| <b>Independent Variable</b> | Expected credit loss model under IFRS 9 | IFRS 9       | Indicator variable equals one in the period after adopting IFRS 9 and zero otherwise. So, it equals one for 2019 (post-adoption) and zero for 2018 (pre-adoption) |
| <b>Control Variables</b>    | Bank Size                               | Size         | Natural logarithm of total assets   |
|                             | Capital Ratio                           | Cap          | The equity capital as a percentage of total assets at the end of the quarter  |
|                             | Earnings before LLP                     | EBLLP        | Earnings before LLP for period t scaled by total loans at the beginning of the quarter  |
|                             | Loan intensity                          | LINT         | Total loans as a percentage of total assets.  |
|                             | Loan growth                             | LGRO         | Percentage of the quarterly change in total loans   |
|                             | Interest expense                        | INT          | Quarterly interest costs divided by total liabilities.  |
|                             | Profitability                           | PROF         | The return-on-equity ratio  |
| <b>Moderating variables</b> | Board size                              | BSIZE        | Number of board members   |
|                             | Board independence                      | BIND         | The percentage of non-executive directors on the board  |
|                             | Institutional ownership                 | INSTIT       | The proportional of institutions ownership in the banks   |
|                             | CEO duality                             | DUAL         | Dummy variable that takes 1 if the CEO is also the chairman of the board and 0 otherwise  |
|                             | Audit quality                           | AQ           | Dummy variable equals one if the bank audited by Big Four audit firms and zero otherwise  |

## **5. Results**

### *5.1 Descriptive analysis*

Tables (2) and (3) clarify the descriptive analysis of the research variables in the period from 2018 to 2019 for 30 Egyptian banks. In the table (2) the mean of LLRT in the Egyptian banks is .59. Regarding the control variables, the mean of banks size is 8.83, the equity capital and total loans represent on average 9% and 37% of the total assets consecutively, the maximum of earnings before LLP is 18 %, quarterly interest costs represent 2% of the total liabilities, loan growth and profitability have means of 3% and 6% respectively. Concerning the moderating variables, the number of board members ranges from 6 to 14 members, the representation of non-executive directors on the board is 90% on average, it is clear from the table (3) that CEO duality exists in 51.7% of the sample observations, also 78.3% of the quarterly financial reports included in the sample are audited by BIG 4.

Table (4) shows that there are significant differences ( $P < .05$ ) between LLRT in the year 2018 (before applying ECL model) and in the year 2019 (after applying ECL model), the mean of LLRT before ECL is .50 and after ECL becomes .68, which means that there is an increase in the LLRT after applying ECL.

**Table (2): Descriptive analysis**

|        | N   | Minimum | Maximum | Mean  | Std. Deviation |
|--------|-----|---------|---------|-------|----------------|
| LLRT   | 240 | .04     | 2.03    | .5947 | .474           |
| SIZE   | 240 | 6.674   | 1.142   | 8.835 | 1.460          |
| CAP    | 240 | .0104   | .185    | .094  | .037           |
| EBLLP  | 240 | .005    | .184    | .031  | .034           |
| LINT   | 240 | .052    | .625    | .370  | .147           |
| LGRO   | 240 | -.843   | .136    | .034  | .0312          |
| INT    | 240 | .002    | .075    | .021  | .011           |
| PROF   | 240 | .002    | .192    | .066  | .039           |
| BSIZE  | 240 | 6.00    | 14.00   | 9.466 | 1.896          |
| BIND   | 240 | .67     | 1.00    | .901  | .098           |
| INSTIT | 240 | .21     | .99     | .727  | .179           |

**Table (3): Frequencies**

|   | IFRS 9    |     |              | AQ        |       |              | DUAL      |       |              |
|---|-----------|-----|--------------|-----------|-------|--------------|-----------|-------|--------------|
|   | Frequency | %   | Cumulative % | Frequency | %     | Cumulative % | Frequency | %     | Cumulative % |
| 0 | 120       | 50% | 50%          | 52        | 21.7% | 21.7%        | 116       | 48.3% | 48.3%        |
| 1 | 120       | 50% | 100%         | 188       | 78.3% | 100%         | 124       | 51.7% | 100%         |

**Table (4): Paired Samples Test**

|            | N   | Mean | Std. Deviation | Std. Error Mean | Sig. (2-tailed) |
|------------|-----|------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| LLRTBEFORE | 120 | .501 | .366           | .03343          | .000            |
| LLRTAFTER  | 120 | .687 | .548           | .05007          |                 |

### 5.2. Correlation

The correlation matrix is shown in the following table between the dependent variable (LLRT), and all other variables in the basic model.

**Table (5): Variables correlation**

|        | LLRT                | IFRS9              | SIZE                | CAP                 | EBLLP               | AQ                  | LINT                | LGRO               | INT                 | PROF                | BSIZE        | INSTIT             | BIND               | Dual  | VIF  |
|--------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------|------|
| LLRT   | 1.000               |                    |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                    |                     |                     |              |                    |                    |       |      |
| IFRS9  | <b>.196</b><br>***  | 1.000              |                     |                     |                     |                     |                     |                    |                     |                     |              |                    |                    |       | 1.29 |
| SIZE   | .061                | .016               | 1.000               |                     |                     |                     |                     |                    |                     |                     |              |                    |                    |       | 1.46 |
| CAP    | <b>.142</b><br>**   | .037               | <b>-.458</b><br>*** | 1.000               |                     |                     |                     |                    |                     |                     |              |                    |                    |       | 1.75 |
| EBLLP  | -.066               | .022               | -.081               | <b>.180</b><br>***  | 1.000               |                     |                     |                    |                     |                     |              |                    |                    |       | 1.58 |
| AQ     | .085<br>*           | .040               | .035                | .066                | <b>-.185</b><br>*** | 1.000               |                     |                    |                     |                     |              |                    |                    |       | 1.91 |
| LINT   | <b>-.187</b><br>*** | .026               | .044                | <b>.124</b><br>**   | -.060               | <b>.130</b><br>**   | 1.000               |                    |                     |                     |              |                    |                    |       | 1.40 |
| LGRO   | .069                | <b>-.128</b><br>** | -.055               | <b>.212</b><br>***  | <b>.136</b><br>**   | <b>.131</b><br>**   | <b>.025</b>         | 1.000              |                     |                     |              |                    |                    |       | 1.14 |
| INT    | .055                | -.029              | -.029               | <b>-.159</b><br>*** | <b>.236</b><br>***  | <b>-.502</b><br>*** | <b>-.338</b><br>*** | -.042              | 1.000               |                     |              |                    |                    |       | 1.96 |
| PROF   | <b>-.162</b><br>*** | -.049              | -.042               | <b>.164</b><br>***  | <b>.561</b><br>***  | -.046               | -.012               | <b>.208</b><br>*** | <b>.361</b><br>***  | 1.000               |              |                    |                    |       | 1.92 |
| BSIZE  | .049                | .018               | <b>.203</b><br>***  | .036                | <b>.183</b><br>***  | <b>-.298</b><br>*** | -.051               | .015               | <b>.158</b><br>***  | <b>.117</b><br>**   | 1.000        |                    |                    |       | 1.24 |
| INSTIT | -.008               | <b>.063</b><br>*** | <b>.170</b><br>***  | <b>-.292</b><br>*** | <b>-.182</b><br>*** | <b>.344</b><br>***  | <b>.314</b><br>***  | .013               | <b>-.187</b><br>*** | <b>-.201</b><br>*** | -.153<br>*** | 1.000              |                    |       | 1.69 |
| BIND   | <b>.164</b><br>***  | <b>.430</b><br>*** | .078                | .062                | -.028               | -.031               | <b>.108</b><br>**   | -.028              | -.101<br>*          | -.090<br>*          | -.062        | <b>.236</b><br>*** | 1.000              |       | 1.87 |
| Dual   | -.005<br>.468       | <b>.300</b><br>*** | .090<br>*           | .061                | .032                | -.104               | -.097<br>*          | -.042              | -.009               | .048                | .045         | -.050              | <b>.538</b><br>*** | 1.000 | 1.56 |

**Note:** \*\*\* significant at 1%, \*\* significant at 5%; \* significant at 10%

---

---

Table (5) shows a positive correlation between LLRT and IFRS 9, the results also show a positive correlation between LLRT and each of CAP, AQ, and BIND, while, there is a negative correlation between LLRT and each of LINT and PROF and no correlation between LLRT and each of SIZE, EBLLP, LGRO, INT, BSIZE, INSTIT, and Dual, also, table (5) indicates that the values of VIF (variance inflation factor) of independent variables did not exceed 10, and therefore there is no multicollinearity (Pallant, 2010).

### *5.3. Regression analysis and testing hypotheses*

The research hypotheses were tested with the panel data methodology, according to Hausman test (Prob > chi2 = 0.0919) Random-Effects model was used first to examine the research hypotheses, the Wooldridge test for autocorrelation in panel data indicates a problem of autocorrelation (Prob > F = 0.0000), also, the results reveal a problem of heteroscedasticity (Prob > chi2 = 0.0000), to solve these problems the Panel Corrected Standards Errors (PCSE) method was used, PCSE assumes that the disturbances are by default heteroscedasticity and contemporaneously correlated across the panel.

To achieve the objectives of the research, seven regression models were designed, model (1) is the basic model for testing the effect of ECL model under IFRS 9 on LLRT, and the other models are dedicated to examining the impact of the moderating variables on the relation between ECL model and LLRT, It is clear from the table (6) that the seventh regression model has the top explanation power of LLRT variance, as the value of R square amounted .279, this model is considered the highest model from the remainder of the models, followed by the third model, then the fifth model.

The first regression model indicates a significant positive effect of applying the ECL model under IFRS 9 on LLRT, so the first hypothesis is accepted, also, the results show a positive effect for each of SIZE, CAP, INT, BIND, and AQ on LLRT, conversely, there is a negative effect for each of LINT, PROF, and Dual on LLRT, in addition to that, the results exhibit no effect for each of EBLLP, LGRO, BSIZE and INSTIT on LLRT.

Concerning the effect of BSIZE, BIND, INSTIT, DUAL, and AQ as moderating variables on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, model (2) and model (7) reveal an insignificant effect of BSIZE\*IFRS9 on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, Hence, H2A is rejected, model (3) and model (7) show a significant positive effect of BIND\*IFRS 9 on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, it means that the positive effect of IFRS9 on LLRT is more marked when the bank board members are independent, hence, H2b is accepted, model (4) and model (7) show an insignificant effect of INSTIT\*IFRS9 on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, so H2C is rejected, model (5) and model (7) reveal a significant negative effect of Dual\*IFRS9 on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, it means that the positive effect of IFRS 9 on LLRT is attenuated by CEO duality hence, H2D is accepted, finally, model (6) and model (7) show an insignificant effect of AQ\*IFRS9 on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, so H2E is rejected.

**Table (6): Regression analysis**

|              | Model 1 |              | Model 2 |              | Model 3 |              | Model 4 |              | Model 5 |              | Model 6 |              | Model 7 |              |
|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|---------|--------------|
|              | Coef    | Z            |
| Constant     | -1.38   | -3.81<br>*** | -1.35   | -3.91<br>*** | -1.28   | -3.74<br>*** | -1.33   | -3.42<br>*** | -1.69   | -4.06<br>*** | -1.44   | -4.09<br>*** | -1.75   | -3.82<br>*** |
| IFRS9        | .143    | 3.06<br>***  | .061    | 0.44         | .457    | 10.65<br>*** | .061    | 0.65         | .254    | 2.81<br>***  | .206    | 2.00**       | .925    | 3.11<br>***  |
| SIZE         | .061    | 5.82<br>***  | .061    | 5.95<br>***  | .065    | 5.95<br>***  | .059    | 6.16<br>***  | .061    | 5.78<br>***  | .061    | 5.82<br>***  | .069    | 5.91<br>***  |
| CAP          | 3.71    | 7.23<br>***  | 3.73    | 7.53         | 3.50    | 7.12<br>***  | 3.66    | 7.41<br>***  | 3.39    | 7.56<br>***  | 3.76    | 6.79<br>***  | 3.17    | 6.56<br>***  |
| EBLLP        | .013    | 0.02         | -.038   | -0.06        | -.152   | -0.26        | .002    | 0.00         | -.004   | -0.01        | -.087   | -0.14        | -.193   | -0.28        |
| LINT         | -.681   | -7.96<br>*** | -.684   | -7.87<br>*** | -.719   | -8.44<br>*** | -.692   | -7.71<br>*** | -.664   | -8.87<br>*** | -.703   | -6.85<br>*** | -.691   | -7.73        |
| LGRO         | 1.24    | 1.32         | 1.25    | 1.34         | 1.13    | 1.29         | 1.21    | 1.32         | 1.07    | 1.23         | 1.25    | 1.33         | .941    | 1.16         |
| INT          | 10.5    | 3.62<br>***  | 10.4    | 3.58<br>***  | 9.34    | 2.85<br>***  | 10.3    | 3.47<br>***  | 9.80    | 3.63<br>***  | 10.3    | 3.54<br>***  | 8.39    | 2.76<br>***  |
| PROF         | -3.30   | -4.53<br>*** | -3.28   | -4.37<br>*** | -3.03   | -4.22<br>*** | -3.29   | -4.57<br>*** | -2.99   | -4.54<br>*** | -3.20   | -4.72<br>*** | -2.59   | -4.26<br>*** |
| BSIZE        | .013    | 2.19<br>**   | .008    | 1.12         | .011    | 2.78<br>***  | .012    | 2.16<br>**   | .012    | 2.26<br>**   | .013    | 2.15**       | .015    | 1.79*        |
| BIND         | .972    | 1.86*        | .985    | 1.86*        | .929    | 1.77*        | .971    | 1.84*        | 1.28    | 2.44**       | .998    | 1.98**       | 1.29    | 2.40**       |
| INSTIT       | -.059   | -1.11        | -.060   | -1.15        | -.077   | -1.53        | -.075   | -1.32        | -.137   | -2.10<br>**  | -.049   | -0.83        | -.140   | -2.05<br>**  |
| Dual         | -.169   | -4.62<br>*** | -.173   | -4.74<br>*** | -.154   | -4.23<br>*** | -.173   | -4.28        | -.326   | -2.64<br>*** | -.181   | -3.82<br>*** | -.333   | -2.63<br>*** |
| AQ           | .220    | 4.56<br>***  | .218    | 4.22<br>***  | .211    | 3.61<br>***  | .219    | 4.46<br>***  | .260    | 4.46         | .252    | 3.96<br>***  | .272    | 3.09<br>***  |
| BSIZE*IFRS9  |         |              | .008    | 0.73         |         |              |         |              |         |              |         |              | -.005   | -0.41        |
| BIND*IFRS9   |         |              |         |              | .413    | 7.03<br>***  |         |              |         |              |         |              | .528    | 4.52<br>***  |
| INSTIT*IFRS9 |         |              |         |              |         |              | .096    | 0.75         |         |              |         |              | -.201   | -1.30        |
| Dual*IFRS9   |         |              |         |              |         |              |         |              | -.268   | -1.70<br>*   |         |              | -.327   | -1.99<br>**  |
| AQ*IFRS9     |         |              |         |              |         |              |         |              |         |              | -.077   | -0.95        | -.023   | -0.24        |
| N            | 240     |              | 240     |              | 240     |              | 240     |              | 240     |              | 240     |              | 240     |              |
| R square     | 0.239   |              | .239    |              | .258    |              | .240    |              | .253    |              | .240    |              | .279    |              |
| Model sig    | .000    |              | .000    |              | .000    |              | .000    |              | .000    |              | .000    |              | .000    |              |

Note: \*\*\* significant at 1%, \*\* significant at 5%; \* significant at 10%

## **6. Discussion**

This research aims to introduce early evidence of the effect of ECL model under IFRS 9 on LLRT of the Egyptian banks, and also to examine the impact of CG on this relation, the dimensions of CG that have tested include; BSIZE, BIND, INSTIT, Dual, and AQ, regarding the first objective, I predicted that IFRS 9 will increase LLRT, table (6) reveals that the coefficient of IFRS 9 is positive and significant, which means that, applying the ECL model increases LLRT, this can be clarified that the new model leads the Egyptian banks to consider reasonable and supportable future forecasts of economic conditions, which will result in providing the users with timelier and forward-looking information, this result also in line with Kim et al, (2020).

About the moderating impact of CG dimensions, table (6) shows that BIND has a positive effect on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT as the coefficient is positive and the effect is significant, this can be clarified that BIND is important to increase the board efficiency and decreasing the opportunistic accounting behaviour that may be conducted by managers when applying IFRS 9, the results also reveal that DUAL has a negative effect, as the coefficient is negative and the effect is significant, this means that the separation of chairman and CEO positions improves the control environment in the bank and leads to avoiding the interest conflict, this result is consistent with the decision of the Egyptian FRA No. 47 in April 2020 as mentioned before, the results indicate that there is no effect for each of BSIZE, INSTIT, and AQ on the relation between IFRS 9 and LLRT, these results (especially the non-significant) may vary if the variables are tested again over a larger period.

Concerning the control variables effect on LLRT, the results show a positive effect of SIZE on LLRT which is consistent with Kim et al, (2020), and also, there is a positive effect for each of CAP and INT on LLRT which is consistent with Balakrishnan and Ertan, (2019), conversely, there is a negative effect for each of LINT and PROF on LLRT which also is consistent with Balakrishnan and Ertan, (2019), in addition to that, the results exhibit no effect for each of EBLLP and LGRO on LLRT, this result is different from Kim et al, (2020) who found a positive effect of EBLLP on LLRT.

## **7. Conclusion**

There is a debate around the efficiency of applying ECL model under IFRS 9, whether it will better reflect the general pattern of deteriorations and improvements in the credit quality of financial instruments or it will lead to an opportunistic behaviour of the management because of the subjectivity allowed from the new model, this research aims to investigate the impact of applying the ECL model on LLRT of the Egyptian banks which is considered as an important indicator for bank failure, and also, testing the moderating effect of CG efficiency, five dimensions of CG have tested (BSIZE, BIND, INSTIT, DUAL, and AQ), in addition to some control variables (Size, Cap, EBLLP, LINT, LGROW, INT, and PROF).

The sample size includes 30 Egyptian banks for 2018 and 2019 with total observations of 240, the results reveal that ECL model affects the LLRT of the Egyptian banks positively, BIND has a positive effect on the relation between ECL model and LLRT, in the opposite, DUAL has a negative effect, while BSIZE, INSTIT, and AQ do not affect, concerning the control variables, the results expose a positive impact for each of SIZE, CAP, and INT on LLRT, conversely, there is a negative effect for each of LINT and PROF on LLRT, in addition to that, the results exhibit no effect for each of EBLLP and LGRO on LLRT.

The research introduces three contributions: (1) as far as I know, this is the first research in Egypt that provides early empirical evidence about the impact of ECL model under IFRS 9 on LLRT which is considered as an important indicator for bank stability; (2) the research provides evidence that the impact of applying the ECL model on LLRT varies from a bank to another based on some moderating variables, this impact is more pronounced for banks that have boards characterized by high independence and no CEO duality; (3) the research results are important for regulators and investors, as these results provide empirical evidence to confirm the efficiency of applying the ECL model in banks.

The research is limited by the sample size which is relatively small owing to the limited sample period after adopting IFRS 9, for future studies, I suggest to investigate the standard's long-term effect on LLRT by extending the sample period to more than one year after adoption, and also to test the impact of IFRS 9 on other dimensions of bank procedures and performance.

### **References**

- Akins, B. Dou, Y. Ng, J. (2017). Corruption in Bank Lending: The role of timely loan loss recognition, *Journal of Accounting and Economics*. Volume 63, Issues 2–3, April–May 2017, 454-478
- AL-Magharem, A. Mohd, H., Hafiza, A., and Shahnaz, I. (2019). Corporate governance and loan loss provisions: A Review. *Journal of Sustainability Science and Management*. Volume 14 Number 4, 228-241
- Alali, F. Romero, S. (2013). Characteristics of failed U.S. commercial banks: an exploratory study. *Accounting and Finance*, 53(4), 1149-1174.
- Albian, A. (2019) loan loss provisioning and market discipline: evidence from the IFRS9 Adoption. Available at SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3488058> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3488058>
- Bushman, R, M. Williams, C, D. (2015). Delayed expected loss recognition and the risk profile of banks. *J. Account. Res.* 53 (3), 511–553.
- Bushman, R. (2014). Thoughts on financial accounting and the banking industry. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 58, 384-395.
- Bushman, R, M. Williams, C, D. (2012). Accounting discretion, loan loss provisioning, and discipline of banks' risk-taking. *J. Account. Econ.* 54 (1), 1–18.

- Beatty, A. Liao, S. (2011). Do delays in expected loss recognition affect banks' willingness to lend? *J. Account. Econ.* 52(1), 1–20.
- Bhat, G. Ryan, S. G. Vyas, D. (2018). The implications of credit risk modelling for banks' loan loss provision timeliness and loan origination pro-cyclicality. New York University. Working Paper.
- Bradbury, M. Mak, Y. Tan, S. (2006), Board characteristics, audit committee characteristics and abnormal accruals. *Pacific Accounting Review*, Vol. 18, N. 2, p.p. 47-68.
- The central bank of Egypt (CBE). (2019). Periodical Book No. 42 issued on February 26, 2019, regarding the instructions of implementing the IFRS 9, Available at [www.cbe.org.eg](http://www.cbe.org.eg).
- Camfferman, K. (2015). The Emergence of the 'Incurred-Loss' Model for Credit Losses in IAS 39. *Accounting in Europe.* 12(1), 1-35.
- Connelly, J, T. Limpaphayom, P. (2004). Board characteristics and firm performance: evidence from the life insurance industry in Thailand. *Chulalongkorn Journal of Economics* 16 (2), 101-124.
- Cheng, E. Courtenay, S, M. (2006). Board composition, regulatory regime and voluntary disclosure. *The International Journal of Accounting.* Volume, 41. PP 260-272.
- Choi, D. (2018). The effect of bank audit committee financial experts on loan loss provision timeliness. PhD dissertation. The Ohio State University.
- Dehaene. A. De Vuyst. V. Ooghe, H. (2001). Corporate performance and board structure in Belgian companies. *Long Range Planning*, 34, 383-398.
- Epps, R, W. Ismail, T, H. (2009), Board of directors' governance challenges and earnings management. *Journal of Accounting and Organizational Change.* Vol. 5. N 3. P.p. 390 – 416.
- Eastburn, R, W. Sharland, A. (2017). Risk management and managerial mindset. *The Journal of Risk Finance*, 18(1), 21-47.

---

---

Egyptian financial regulatory authority (EFRA). (2019). the Egyptian Ministerial Resolution No. 69 of 2019.

Available at  
[https://www.fra.gov.eg/content/efsa\\_ar/audit\\_pages/efsa\\_account.htm](https://www.fra.gov.eg/content/efsa_ar/audit_pages/efsa_account.htm)

---

\_\_\_\_\_ (2020). Egyptian Financial Regulatory Authority. Resolution No. 47 in April 2020.

Available at  
[http://www.fra.gov.eg/content/efsa\\_ar/efsa\\_news/efsa\\_876.htm](http://www.fra.gov.eg/content/efsa_ar/efsa_news/efsa_876.htm)

Feldmann, D, A. Scharzkopf, A, L. (2003). The Effect of institutional ownership on the board and audit committee composition. Review of Accounting and Finance. Vol. 2 Issue 4.

Federal Reserve Board. (2017). Commercial bank examination manual. [https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/supervision\\_cbem.htm](https://www.federalreserve.gov/publications/supervision_cbem.htm)

Gomaa, M. Kanagaretnam, K. Mestelman, S. Shehata, M. (2019). Testing the efficacy of replacing the incurred credit loss model with the expected credit loss model. Eur. Account Rev. 28 (2). 309–334.

Gebhardt, G. (2016). Impairments of Greek government bonds under IAS 39 and IFRS 9: A Case Study. Accounting in Europe, 13(2), 169–196.

Goodstein, J. Gautum, K. Boeker, W. (1994). The effect of board size and diversity on strategic change. Strategic Management Journal 15, 241-250.

Halilbegovic, S, A. Emir, Š. Adisa, A. Nedim, C. (2019). Implementation effects of “IFRS 9 impairment modelling for financial instruments” on regulatory capital banks in federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina. European Journal of Economic Studies.8 (2).

Ibrahim, N, A. (2018). The challenges facing Egyptian banks when applying IFRS 9 standard and its implications from the perspective

of the adequacy of the regular capital: an applied study. Egyptian Journal of Business Studies. Mansoura University. Volume 42, No. 2.

IASB. (2001) International accounting standard no 39 financial instruments: recognition and measurement. IAS 39 implementation Guidance.

———. (2014). IFRS 9, Financial Instruments. <https://www.ifrs.org/issued-standards/list-of-standards/ifrs-9-financial-instruments>.

Kim, J. Ng, J. Wang, C. (2020). The effect of the shift to the expected credit loss model on the timeliness of loan loss recognition.

Available at  
SSRN: <https://ssrn.com/abstract=3490600> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3490600>

Kolsi, M, C. Grassa, R. (2017). Did corporate governance mechanisms affect earnings management? Further Evidence from GCC Islamic Banks. International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management. 10(1). 2-23.

Kanagaretnam, K. Lim, C.Y. Lobo, G, J. (2010). Auditor reputation and earnings management: international evidence from the banking industry. Journal of Banking & Finance. Vol. 34 No. 10, pp. 2318-2327.

Liu, J. (2012). Board monitoring, management contracting and earnings management: an evidence from ASX listed companies. International Journal of Economics and Finance. Vol. 4. N 12. pp. 121-136.

Lim, C, Y. Yong, K.O. Goh, C. Alfre, d, J. (2018). ACCA Singapore has collaborated with leading universities in the city-state and mainland China to gather industry perspectives on working with IFRS. <https://www.accaglobal.com/in/en/member/member/accountingbusiness/2018/09/insights/ifrs-9.html>

- Leventis, S, Dimitropoulos, P. Owusu-ansah, S. (2013). Corporate governance and accounting conservatism: Evidence from the banking industry. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 21(3), 264-286.
- Mersni, H. Ben Othman, H. (2016). The impact of corporate governance mechanisms on earnings management in Islamic banks in the Middle East region. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 7(4), 318-348.
- Oyewole O, S. Olusanmi, O. Owolabi F. (2015). Role of Corporate Governance in the financial crisis; evidence from Nigerian banks. *Journal of Accounting and Auditing: Research & Practice*. Vol. 2015, Article ID 367443, 14 pages.
- Ozili, P, K. (2017). Bank earnings smoothing, audit quality, and pro-cyclicality in Africa: the case of loan loss provisions. *Review of Accounting and Finance*. Vol. 16, NO 2.
- Office of the Comptroller of the Currency (OCC). 2012. Allowance for loan and lease losses: Comptroller's Handbook. <https://www.occ.gov/publications/publications-by-type/comptrollers->
- Ratings, Fitch. (2009). A universal spreadsheet for bank analysis. *Global Special Report*.
- Rechner, P. L. Dalton, D. R. (1991). CEO duality and organizational performance: a longitudinal analysis. *Strategic Management Journal*. Vol. 12, N 2. P.p. 155–160.
- Rahman, R. Haniffa, R, M. (2005). The effect of role duality on corporate performance in Malaysia. *Corporate Ownership and Control*, Vol. 2. N2. P.p. 40-47.
- Shleifer, A. Vishny, R, W. (1986). Large shareholders and corporate control. *The Journal of Political Economy*. Vol. 94. No, 3. PP461-488.

- Shan, Y, G. Xu, L. (2012). Bad debt provisions of financial institutions. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*. 8(4). 344- 364.
- Shehata, M, M, A. (2019). The implications of the accounting evaluation of credit losses in light of the compatibility between the IFRS9 standard Basel III decisions on the classification of bank loan portfolio: an applied study on Egyptian commercial banks. *Scientific Journal of Accounting Studies*. Suez Canal University. Egypt. Volume, 1.
- Tanna, S. Fotios, P. Matthias, N. (2011).The effect of board size and composition on the efficiency of UK banks. *International Journal of the Economics of Business* 18(2):441-462.
- Van den Heuvel, S. (2009). The bank capital channel of monetary policy. Working paper. Federal Reserve board of governors.
- Novotny-Farkas, Z. (2016). The Interaction of the IFRS 9 Expected Loss Approach with Supervisory Rules and Implications for Financial Stability. *Accounting in Europe*, 13(2), 197-227.
- Pallant, J. (2010). *Survival manual, a step by step guide to data analysis using SPSS for windows*. Third edition. ligare book printer SYDNEY.
- Yermack, D. (1996). Higher market valuation of companies with a small board of directors. *Journal of Financial Economics* 40, 185-211.
- Zagorchev, A. and Gao, L. (2015). Corporate governance and performance of financial institutions. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 82, 17-41.

**تأثير نموذج خسائر الائتمان المتوقعة بموجب المعيار الدولي للتقارير المالية رقم (٩)  
على توقيت الاعتراف بخسائر القروض: دليل مبكر من البنوك المصرية**

كريم منصور علي حسوبة

مدرس بقسم المحاسبة – كلية التجارة – جامعة القاهرة

karimmansour@foc.cu.edu.eg

**المستخلص**

ألزم البنك المركزي المصري البنوك المصرية اعتباراً من عام ٢٠١٩ بتطبيق المعيار الدولي للتقارير المالية رقم ٩، وذلك بهدف تقديم معلومات في الوقت المناسب حول الخسائر الائتمانية المتوقعة، ومع ذلك، فإن تطبيق هذا المعيار بشأن الخسائر الائتمانية المتوقعة يتطلب أحكاماً ذاتية قد تؤدي إلى سلوك محاسبي انتهازي. يهدف هذا البحث إلى دراسة أثر تطبيق نموذج خسائر الائتمان المتوقعة بموجب المعيار الدولي للتقارير المالية رقم ٩ على توقيت الاعتراف بخسائر القروض في البنوك المصرية، كما يهدف البحث إلى اختبار أثر فعالية الحوكمة (حجم مجلس الإدارة، واستقلالية مجلس الإدارة، والملكية المؤسسية، وازدواجية دور الرئيس التنفيذي، وجودة المراجعة) على العلاقة بين تطبيق النموذج وتوقيت الاعتراف بخسائر القروض. وقد تم إجراء هذا البحث باستخدام بيانات مستخرجة من التقارير المالية ربع السنوية لعينة من البنوك المصرية خلال الفترة من ٢٠١٨ إلى ٢٠١٩. توصلت نتائج هذا البحث بالاعتماد على نموذج انحدار Prais-Winsten (PCSE) إلى وجود علاقة موجبة معنوية بين تطبيق نموذج خسائر الائتمان المتوقعة وتوقيت الاعتراف بخسائر القروض، كما أظهرت النتائج أن استقلالية مجلس الإدارة تؤثر إيجاباً على هذه العلاقة، على العكس من ذلك، هناك تأثير سلبي لازدواجية دور المدير التنفيذي، بينما لا يوجد تأثير لكل من حجم مجلس الإدارة والملكية المؤسسية وجودة المراجعة. تتمثل أهمية هذا البحث في أنه يقدم أدلة تجريبية مبكرة من الأسواق الناشئة حول الآثار المترتبة على تطبيق نموذج الخسائر الائتمانية المتوقعة بموجب المعيار الدولي للتقارير المالية رقم ٩، وتعتبر نتائج البحث مهمة للجهات التنظيمية والمستثمرين لأنها تدعم فعالية النموذج الجديد، كما أن النتائج مهمة لبرامج الإصلاح المستقبلية في مصر، علاوة على ذلك، يضيف البحث إلى الدراسات السابقة التي تناولت محددات توقيت الاعتراف بخسائر القروض، من خلال تقديم دليل بشأن تأثير تطبيق نموذج الخسائر الائتمانية المتوقعة.

**الكلمات المفتاحية:** توقيت الاعتراف بخسائر القروض، المعيار الدولي للتقارير المالية رقم ٩، نموذج خسائر الائتمان المتوقعة، حوكمة الشركات.