

Judgment versus Models in Technology M&A Valuation: Evidence from Investment Banking Decision Processes

Balannagari Pavan Kalyan, Dr. Kiran Kumar M

Student, Department of MBA, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed-to-be
University), Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

Assistant Professor, Faculty of Management Studies, CMS Business School, Jain (Deemed-to-be University),
Bengaluru, Karnataka, India

ABSTRACT: There is growing complexity in valuation in acquisitions and mergers (M&A) of technology companies, which has proposed a challenge to the use of conventional models of finance. As opposed to traditional industries, technology companies base much of their value on intangible resources, innovation sources, and potential of future growth, that cannot be well represented through model-based solutions. This paper explores how much financial models can help to explain valuation results in technology M&A, as well as the importance of qualitative judgment in investment banking decision making.

The study takes a quantitative approach which is complemented by qualitative explanation. Correlation and regression are used to analyze firm-level data of the Indian technology firms that have been selected, such as TCS, Infosys and HCL Technologies. The proxy of post-acquisition financial performance is growth in revenue and M&A activity is a dummy variable.

The empirical evidence shows that there is no significant relationship, statistically significant, between M&A activity and short term growth in revenues. The regression equation indicates that it has low explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.002$; $p = 0.858$) and therefore observable financial performance is not consistent with what the mathematical counterparts of the model expect value creation to be.

The findings demonstrate the restrictions of the traditional techniques of valuation like discounted cash flow and similar analysis of companies in the technological industry. The paper is of the view that valuation cannot be model based, but it involves a lot of qualitative judgment, such as a test of strategic fit, integration capability and prospects of long-term growth.

The results add to the academic literature and investment banking practice as it shows that valuation of technology M&A is a mixed process that integrates quantitative model with informed judgment to overcome uncertainty and intangible value drivers.

KEYWORDS: M&A valuation; technology sector; investment banking; discounted cash flow (DCF); qualitative judgment; intangible assets; revenue growth; India

I. INTRODUCTION

Mergers and acquisitions (M&A) have grown dramatically within the technology industry with firms progressively placing their hopes on inorganic expansion to increase capacity, obtain novel markets and stay pertinent to the rapidly changing digital world. In contrast to the traditional industries where the value is primarily based on the physical assets and fixed cash flows, the technology companies are marked by an extensive growth, innovative model of business, and high reliance on intangible resources of the business information (intellectual property), data, and human capital. These characteristics bring about a lot of complexity in terms of valuation.

Conventional methods of valuation and especially the discounted cash flow analysis (DCF) and relative valuation methods offer systematic method of estimating firm worth. Such models will be introduced on assumptions of distinguishing future cash flow, growth rates and risk-adjusted discount rates. However, in technology sector M&A these assumptions can be very hard to estimate accurately because of unpredictability in the market dynamics, a fast changing technology and changing business model (Damodaran, 2012; Koller et al., 2010). Consequently, target-firm underlying economic values might not be well represented by model-based valuations.

In practice, investment banking valuation decisions go beyond the results of financial models. Deal pricing can often be meant as qualitative including factors like strategic fit, technological capabilities, positioning, and future long-term growth potential. These are especially relevant in technology M&A since acquisitions are usually pursued with the purpose of gaining capability, or penetrating new technological fields as opposed to getting short-term financial benefits. As a result, valuation ends up being a hybrid process consisting of modeling as well as a process of informed judgment.

Although this interaction between models and judgment is crucial, current studies have been mostly conducted on a single subject, either financial valuation methods or the strategic aspects. Not much has been done in looking at whether, model-based expectations of value-creation are incorporated in the observable financial performance, especially in technology sector. This is a particular void in emerging markets, like India, where the technology sector has been booming and the number of M&A deals conducted has been on the rise in the last several years.

This paper fills this gap by exploring the correlation between merger and acquisition activity and post acquisition financial performance in few Indian technology companies, such as, TCS, Infosys, and HCL Technologies. The study bases its assessment of the association of acquisition activity with measurable gains in increase of revenue through correlation and regression analysis.

The value of the research is in two folds. First, it offers empirical data of the weakness of model-based valuation mechanism in the technology industry. Second, it provides practical way of looking at valuation process in investment banking and the use of qualitative judgment in the interpretation model outputs and decisions made.

The rest of the paper has the following structure. Section 2 indicates the research objectives. In section 3, the literature and theoretical framework are reviewed. The research methodology is outlined in Section 4. The empirical results are in section 5. The findings are discussed in section 6 relative to practices of valuation. Section 7 wraps up the research providing some major implications and future research directions.

II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The main purpose of this research is to analyze the efficiency of model-based valuation methodologies in the explanation of value creation in mergers and buy-outs in technology sector and the application of qualitative judgment as a tool in investment banking decision-making.

To fulfil this objective, the study will be directed towards the following specific objectives:

Reviewing of the relationship between merger and acquisition (M&A) activity and the post-acquisition financial performance which can be measured by growth of revenues.

- To simplify the research questions are sufficient with the dimensions of evaluating whether the M&A deal results are satisfactorily captured by traditional valuation models in technology sector.

Aim: To investigate the shortcomings of quantitative analysis to capture complexity of the acquisition activity using proxies.

Practical implications A key result of the study is the determination of the importance of qualitative variables like strategic fit, technological capability, and integration potential in valuation decisions.

- To learn the process of integrating investment banking professional knowledge and judgement in deal value and pricing decision making.

This research aims at offering a deep insight into the valuation practices to fill in the gap between theory and the practice in the area of technology sector M&A.

III. LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

3.1 Valuation Models in M&A

In mergers and acquisitions, the two major financial models on which traditional valuation is based include discounted cash flow (DCF) analysis and relative valuation. The DCF analysis uses the expected future cash flows (discounted at a reasonable cost of capital) to estimate the value of the firm in terms of present value. It may be poor on assumptions about growth rates, discount rates, and terminal value, as practical application is very sensitive to theory, which is a very strong theory (Damodaran, 2012). Minor changes in all these inputs can cause a great disparity in the valuation results and especially in the growth businesses.

Simplicity and use of market-backed benchmarks have made relative valuation techniques such as comparable analysis of companies and precedent transaction multiples common. Nevertheless, the strategies presuppose the presence of similar companies that have related business models and growth patterns, which is not very frequent in technology industry (Koller et al., 2010). The irregularity of technology companies restricts the dependability of such approaches, resulting in possible inaccuracies in valuation.

3.2 Intangibles and the Technology Sector

One important characteristic of the technology industry is that it is built on nonphysical assets like intellectual property, software, data ecosystems and human capital. According to Lev (2001), different accounting structures cannot sufficiently reflect the value of such intangibles and this leads to a lack of correlation between reported financial performance and the economic value.

Technology M&A however, has the tendency of making acquisitions with the aim of gaining abilities and not necessarily financial benefits. TCS, Infosys and HCL Technologies are the companies that often resort to the acquisitions to become more digital, increase their services and ensure their ability to innovate. These strategic reasons are prospective and may not be indicated in short term financial parameters like an increase in revenue.

Valuation is further complicated by the emergence of platform-based form of business models. Parker et al. (2016) emphasize perspectives of digital platforms as a source of value, which is generated by the network effect, users can increase the utility of an entire platform. This kind of dynamics cannot be easily integrated in the conventional models of valuation, which are generally made out of linear expectation of cash flows.

3.3 Behavioural and Strategic Perspectives

Financial models are not the only factors that affect valuation: strategic and behavioural factors play a role too. The literature on strategic management advocates the crucial role of competitive positioning, integration of resources, and future growth prospects in the triumph of acquisitions (Porter, 2001). Capron and Pistré (2002) opine that development of value relies on how well the capabilities are transferred and integrated between the acquiring and target companies.

Behavioural finance also points out that judgement decisions of valuations are not solely objective. The decisions that are made regarding acquisition and pricing can be affected by managerial overconfidence, the market sentiment and information asymmetry. Baker et al. (2007) opine that the nature of acquisition can be spurred by market mis-valuation and investor sentiment whereas Malmendier and Tate (2008) establish that more overconfident the managers are in their acquisitions, the more likely they are to be involved in value destroying acquisitions.

There is also empirical proof that the price at which a transaction is made might not be equal to intrinsic value. Rhodes-Kropf and Viswanathan (2004) demonstrate that market environment and mistakes in valuation can play a role in merger waves, implying that the price at which a deal is made is sensitive to market all-around factors and is no longer a firm specific factor.

3.4 Theoretical Gap

Although much has been done on valuation and M&A, one of the gaps is on the combination of quantitative models and qualitative judgment. The majority of studies either concentrate on strategic and behavioural factors separately or concentrations on financial valuation techniques. There has been little focus in analysing the interaction of these factors in practice in real-world valuation especially in the technology market.

Moreover, empirical studies that have been done in the past tend to be based on financial performance measures used to gauge value creation without evaluating whether financial performance measures are sufficient to measure the impact of acquisition activity. The nature of transactions in the technology segment is highly complex, with a lot of intangible assets and the long-term goals, which imply that the old measures of performance might not be adequate.

This research paper fills these gaps by using a hybrid method that encompasses both a quantitative analysis and qualitative interpretation. Through the study of the correlation between M&A activity and evident financial performance, the research assesses the level of compatibility of model-based valuation to actual performance, and the role that judgment plays to fill in this gap.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

4.1 Research Design

The research design chosen in this study is both quantitative with qualitative interpretation used to study the valuation practices during mergers and acquisitions (M&A) in the technological sector. The research methodology will be built on the positivist paradigm as they involve statistical testing to assess how the acquisition activity is related to financial performance. Meanwhile, some qualitative insights are involved to provide the interpretation of the results into the general context of investment banking decision-making and industry forces.

There is a cross-sectional panel dataset, where firm-level observations are observed in many years. The goal is not to find causality but to determine the existence of a measurable relationship between M&A activity and financial outcomes as the traditional valuation models suggest.

4.2 Data and Sample Selection

The empirical test uses the publicly available financial information of the chosen Indian technology companies such as TCS, Infosys and HCL Technologies. These companies are chosen because they are well established in the IT services industry, have a stable financial reporting profile, and because they engage in mergers and acquisitions.

The paper will discuss the timeframe 2017-2023: this will be a highly digitalized period with enhanced technological acquisitions in the technology sector. Reliability and consistency the sources of data are annual reports of the company, presentations to investors, and validated financial databases.

The data is formatted into a panel format, several observations on an individual firm over time. This can enable a comparative analysis of the financial performance pre and post-acquisition activity.

4.3 Variable Definition and Measurement

The dependent variable that will be used in the research is the growth of the revenues but on an annual basis. The revenue increase is a proxy to tell the post-acquisition financial performance because revenue increase is a consistent measurement that is comparable across firms, forms of accounting and depends not as much on accounting differences as profitability measurements do.

A merger and acquisition (M&A) dummy variable is the key independent variable. This is a variable in which we apply value 1 in the years of acquisition activity and 0 otherwise. The simplicity of quantifying the events of acquisition into a simplified framework is also ensured by the use of a dummy variable without making the interpretation much more complicated.

Though these variables do offer a systematic method to analysis, it is also understood that these variables are simplified proxies and may not capture fully the complexity of acquisition activity, such as variations in the size of the transaction, the structure of the transaction, and its strategic relevance.

4.4 Analytical Techniques

The study employs correlation and regression analysis to examine the relationship between M&A activity and financial performance.

Correlation analysis is used as an initial step to assess the strength and direction of the linear relationship between revenue growth and M&A activity. This provides a preliminary indication of whether acquisition activity is associated with changes in financial performance.

Regression analysis is then conducted using an ordinary least squares (OLS) model to estimate the impact of M&A activity on revenue growth. The regression model is specified as follows:

$$\text{Revenue Growth}_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{M\&A Dummy}_{it}) + \varepsilon_{it}$$

where Revenue Growth is the dependent variable, M&A Dummy represents acquisition activity, β_0 is the intercept, β_1 is the coefficient of interest, and ε is the error term.

The statistical significance of the model is evaluated using p-values, R-squared, and F-statistics. These measures provide insight into the strength, direction, and explanatory power of the relationship between the variables.

4.5 Methodological Justification

The analytical framework is relatively simple; this decision is intentionally taken in accordance with the aim of the research. The research will be conducted to draw the conclusion whether there is a prosaic and generally claimed correlation between M&A activity and financial performance. The fact that this kind of relationship is not found even in an oversimplified model puts critical questions on the usefulness of model-based valuation techniques.

The findings are also interpreted qualitatively in order to put them into context. This incorporates factoring the nature of the industry, the strategic reasons behind having acquisitions, and the contribution of the intangible assets towards value creation.

By and large, the methodology offers a balanced approach to the consideration of both the statistical analysis and practical interpretation in order to present a detailed insight into valuation practices specific to technology sector M&A.

V. RESULTS

5.1 Correlation Analysis

The correlation analysis examines the relationship between merger and acquisition (M&A) activity and revenue growth. Table 1 presents the Pearson correlation matrix for the variables used in the study.

Table 1: Correlation Matrix

Variables	Revenue Growth (%)	M&A Dummy
Revenue Growth (%)	1	-0.0251
M&A Dummy	-0.0251	1

The calculated coefficient of correlation between M&A activity and revenue growth is -0.0251. The value of the coefficient is very close to zero, which demonstrates that there is no significant linear relationship between M&A activity and revenue growth.

Theoretically, mergers and acquisitions are believed to improve the performance of the target and the acquirer by generating synergies and/or facilitating access to new markets, as well as expanding the acquiring company's capabilities and resources. The empirical finding, however, suggests that this improvement is not observed at least in the short run. The insignificance of the correlation shows that M&A activity is not reliably translated to revenue growth performance indicators.

Several explanations may account for this lack of correlation. First, synergies usually take time to be recognized, hence the gains from mergers and acquisitions may be recognized at a future date. Second, revenue growth is a result of many

other factors, both external and internal to the firm (market conditions, prices, efficiency, etc.). Third, acquisition strategies may be motivated by more than only increasing financial performance, for example capability improvement which is very common among technology firms.

5.3 Regression Analysis

To further examine the relationship between M&A activity and financial performance, a regression analysis is conducted using an ordinary least squares (OLS) model. The results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient	t-Statistic	p-Value
Intercept (β_0)	0.082	2.05	0.045
M&A Dummy (β_1)	-0.0045	-0.18	0.858

Model Summary

Metric	Value
R-squared	0.002
Adjusted R-squared	-0.14
F-statistic	0.032
Prob (F-statistic)	0.858

The coefficients from regression show that M&A dummy has coefficient of -0.0045, which indicates that there is negative relationship between M&A activity and revenue growth, and that relationship is very small in economic terms. What is more significant is that the p-value of 0.858 implies that this relationship is not statistically significant.

The overall explanatory power of this model is very low: the R-squared value is only 0.002. This signifies that only 0.2% of the variation of revenue growth can be explained by M&A. Also F-statistic is not significant, suggesting that the entire model doesn't explain financial performance very well.

The intercept term is statistically significant. The firms had some baseline revenue growth regardless of M&A activities. It could indicate that the growth of technology firms mainly depends on reasons other than M&A. For example organic growth, market demand, relationship with customers, etc.

These conclusions further support the correlations analysis result and support the finding that there is no significant effect of M&A activity on short-term financial performance. From the valuation point of view, this means that value creation estimated by model-based expectations can't be observed in the real world, especially in technology sector.

VI. DISCUSSION

6.1 M&A Activity and Financial Performance

From the empirical data of the study, the effect of M&A on short term revenue growth appears to be insignificantly related. Correlation as well as regression shows almost negligible relation between the variables, which contradict the theory that acquisition yields an instant increase in firm performance.

Standard valuation models were derived from the perspective of an acquisition increasing performance by adding value and boosting growth and returns. From the model, this effect of growth and added value was not evident in any empirical measure of firm performance. This finding reveals a significant flaw in model-based valuation: models used for valuing a company's financial worth (especially in tech sectors) do not actually reveal the performance gains from acquisitions.

6.2 Limitations of Model-Based Valuation

There are number of ways to forecast the value of a firm like discounted cash flow (DCF) model and comparable company analysis (CCA) which helps one to formulate a quantitative basis for firm valuation. These methods, however are extremely sensitive to the assumptions made regarding the future growth rates, synergies and the state of the economy. These estimations are particularly challenging to quantify in the fast changing and high volatile business of technology.

This research establishes that, contrary to model-based expectations, the evidence does not consistently indicate the creation of firm value in the technology industry. Low model explainability implies that models might not reflect fully the determinants of firm performance, leading one to consider the accuracy of using quantitative valuation methods solely.

6.3 Role of Strategic and Industry Factors

However, the technology sector possesses specific characteristics, which shape the link between M&A activity and financial performance. Companies in this sector like TCS, Infosys and HCL technologies, consistently pursue acquisitions, in order to build capacities and reach in new technological areas or to create long term strategic advantage. These objectives, of an inherently future-oriented nature, are often intangible and can therefore, not manifest in the form of short-term financial benefits. The acquisition of new businesses involves challenges of organizational restructuring, system integration and achievement of synergies, a process which often takes a lot of time and resources to consummate. Revenue growth in the short-term thus, fails to measure value addition. Even otherwise, there is so many other factors influencing revenues like demand etc that the contribution of acquisitions would pale in comparison.

6.4 Implications for Investment Banking Practice

The results of this paper have implications for investment banking valuation practice. This research demonstrates that a linkage cannot be assumed between the activity of mergers and acquisitions and financial performance and as a result valuation cannot rely on financial models alone. In its place, a more judgemental and quantitative mix of evaluation methods must be used.

In investment banking, valuation deals include the inclusion of a range of subjective factors in its evaluation methodology. These include issues such as strategic fit, technological capabilities of the target, feasibility of integration and future growth potential. Each of these is key to the valuation and subsequent pricing of the deal and can help justify why the market price deviates from model-based valuations. This paper shows evidence of valuation being a mix between analysis based on financial models, with strategic decisions forming a vital component of the overall process, especially given the impact of intangibles and future prospects within the tech industry. In sum, the conversation suggests that the relationship between M&A activity and financial performance is complicated, and cannot be completely accounted for by simple, quantitative models. Overall, the results support the main claim of the paper, that in technology sector M&A, valuation is not entirely driven by models, but is instead a multidimensional decision process combining analytical and qualitative approaches. Bridging the gap between theory and decision process adds to realism regarding how valuation decisions are made in the actual world of investment banking.

VII. CONCLUSION

This research explores how valuations are done within technology M&A, and specifically, how models relate to qualitative judgement in investment bank transactions. The article used a combination of quantitative estimation supported by a qualitative interpretation of these figures, to attempt to observe whether M&A activity causes changes in measurable financial results. The results of this research show that M&A activity does not have any significant relation with immediate revenue growth. These results confirm the weakness of financial models in explaining actual results within technology deals, showing that model-based value creation expectations do not translate to the actual measurement of financial performance. The research further explains that technology M&A is driven not only by financial models but a series of other qualitative elements that are difficult to capture with standard metrics, such as technological capability, strategic fit, and long-term growth prospects. From the point of view of the investment banking world, it confirms the need to balance estimations with judgement, using the former as a frame for the valuation and making informed estimations.

REFERENCES

1. Baker, M., Ruback, R. S., & Wurgler, J. (2007). Behavioral corporate finance: A survey. *Handbook of Corporate Finance: Empirical Corporate Finance*, 1, 145–186.
2. Bena, J., & Li, K. (2014). Corporate innovations and mergers and acquisitions. *The Journal of Finance*, 69(5), 1923–1960.
3. Boone, A. L., & Mulherin, J. H. (2007). How are firms sold? *The Journal of Finance*, 62(2), 847–875.
4. Capron, L., & Pistre, N. (2002). When do acquirers earn abnormal returns? *Strategic Management Journal*, 23(9), 781–794.
5. Damodaran, A. (2012). *Investment valuation: Tools and techniques for determining the value of any asset* (3rd ed.). Wiley.
6. Damodaran, A. (2018). *Narrative and numbers: The value of stories in business*. Columbia University Press.
7. Devos, E., Kadapakkam, P. R., & Krishnamurthy, S. (2009). How do mergers create value? A comparison of taxes, market power, and efficiency improvements. *The Review of Financial Studies*, 22(3), 1179–1211.
8. Dong, M., Hirshleifer, D., Richardson, S., & Teoh, S. H. (2006). Does investor misvaluation drive the takeover market? *The Journal of Finance*, 61(2), 725–762.
9. Gaughan, P. A. (2017). *Mergers, acquisitions, and corporate restructurings* (7th ed.). Wiley.
10. Jensen, M. C. (1986). Agency costs of free cash flow, corporate finance, and takeovers. *American Economic Review*, 76(2), 323–329.
11. Koller, T., Goedhart, M., & Wessels, D. (2010). *Valuation: Measuring and managing the value of companies* (5th ed.). Wiley.
12. Lev, B. (2001). *Intangibles: Management, measurement, and reporting*. Brookings Institution Press.
13. Malmendier, U., & Tate, G. (2008). Who makes acquisitions? CEO overconfidence and the market's reaction. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 89(1), 20–43.
14. Myers, S. C. (1977). Determinants of corporate borrowing. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 5(2), 147–175.
15. Myers, S. C., & Majluf, N. S. (1984). Corporate financing and investment decisions when firms have information investors do not have. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 13(2), 187–221.
16. Parker, G., Van Alstyne, M., & Choudary, S. (2016). *Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy*. W.W. Norton.
17. Porter, M. E. (2001). Strategy and the internet. *Harvard Business Review*, 79(3), 62–78.
18. Rhodes-Kropf, M., & Viswanathan, S. (2004). Market valuation and merger waves. *The Journal of Finance*, 59(6), 2685–2718.
19. Roll, R. (1986). The hubris hypothesis of corporate takeovers. *The Journal of Business*, 59(2), 197–216.
20. Trigeorgis, L. (2000). *Real options: Managerial flexibility and strategy in resource allocation*. MIT Press.

Data Sources References

1. National Stock Exchange of India. (2024). *Company financial data and filings*. <https://www.nseindia.com>
2. BSE Limited. (2024). *Corporate announcements and financial statements*. <https://www.bseindia.com>
3. Screener.in. (2024). *Financial data and ratios of listed companies*. <https://www.screener.in>
4. Moneycontrol. (2024). *Stock market data and company financials*. <https://www.moneycontrol.com>
5. Tata Consultancy Services. (2023). *Annual report 2022–23*.
6. Infosys Limited. (2023). *Annual report 2022–23*.
7. HCL Technologies. (2023). *Annual report 2022–23*.

Note: For the data years 2017 to 2021 sourced from company annual report, NSE and BSE.



INTERNATIONAL
STANDARD
SERIAL
NUMBER
INDIA



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF INNOVATIVE RESEARCH

IN SCIENCE | ENGINEERING | TECHNOLOGY

 9940 572 462  6381 907 438  ijirset@gmail.com



www.ijirset.com

Scan to save the contact details