



**UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA**

**PREDICTING CORPORATE FAILURE USING ACCOUNTING  
INFORMATION: THE MALAYSIAN EXPERIENCE**

**ZULKARNAIN BIN MUHAMAD SORI**

**FEP 2000 6**



**PREDICTING CORPORATE FAILURE USING ACCOUNTING  
INFORMATION: THE MALAYSIAN EXPERIENCE**

**By**

**ZULKARNAIN BIN MUHAMAD SORI**

**Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the degree of  
Master of Science in the Faculty of Economics and Management  
Universiti Putra Malaysia**

**June 2000**



## **DEDICATION**

This work is dedicated to three people who have been most important in my life. They are my mother, Haminah Amat, my late father, Allahyarham Muhamad Sori, and my wife, Siti Shahratulfazzah. This degree would not have become reality for me without caring, co-operation, understanding, support, motivation and love from my wife. She is my friend, my lover and motivator.



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in  
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science

**PREDICTING CORPORATE FAILURE USING ACCOUNTING  
INFORMATION: THE MALAYSIAN EXPERIENCE**

By

**ZULKARNAIN BIN MUHAMAD SORI**

**June 2000**

**Chairman : Mohamad Ali Abd Hamid, Ph. D.**

**Faculty : Economics and Management**

Financial ratios have long been used as predictor of important events in the financial markets. Researchers have formulated business failure prediction models utilising financial ratios. However, relatively few failure prediction studies on Malaysian firms have been documented. The objective of this study is to develop a model that can discriminate between Malaysian failed and non-failed firm. Also, this study investigates the distributional properties of the financial ratios of failed and non-failed listed firms. One-to-one sampling technique was utilised, where 33 failed and non-failed mixed industry sector firms, and 24 failed and non-failed industrial sector firms for the period from 1980 to 1996 were sampled. Using Kolgomorov-Smirnov test adjusted to Lillifors test, it was found that, only one financial ratio was normally distributed. Nine financial ratios were found to be lognormal in mixed industry



sector and the number increased to 18 in the industrial sector. In addition, 3 financial ratios were square root normal in mixed industry sector and 6 in industrial sector. It is found that the log transformation technique was the most effective procedure and the square transformation technique was the least effective to transform non-normally distribution data to the family of lognormal distribution. Finally, industry sector played an important role in determining the normality level, where focused into specific industry sector gave better results than mixed industry sector. However, it is found that the equality of variance covariance of the failed and non-failed firms was not observed. However, the impact of this inconsistency was minimal on the classification accuracy.

After the assumptions of discriminant analysis were satisfied, stepwise multiple discriminant analysis was utilised to develop failure prediction models. The mixed industry model correctly classified 86.2% and 91% of the original sample and holdout sample respectively. The model was further validated using leave-one-out classification or U-method (86.2% correct classification). The results remain robust and the failed and non-failed classification accuracy was found to be significantly better than chance. An alternative prediction model was developed based on accounting information, which outperformed the original model and correctly classified 88.1% of the original sample and 86.7% in U method. The models for industrial sector were equally accurate for the mixed industry, which correctly classified more than 80% of the failed and non-failed



firms and the original model outperformed the alternative model. The selected variables in the final model were a good proxy for the profit, cash flow, working capital and net worth variables.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia  
sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sains

**MERAMAL KEGAGALAN KORPORAT MENGGUNAKAN  
MAKLUMAT PERAKAUNAN: PENGALAMAN MALAYSIA**

Oleh

**ZULKARNAIN BIN MUHAMAD SORI**

**Jun 2000**

**Pengerusi : Dr Mohamad Ali Abd Hamid**

**Fakulti : Ekonomi dan Pengurusan**

Nisbah kewangan telah lama digunakan sebagai alat ramalan peristiwa penting dalam pasaran kewangan. Penyelidik-penyelidik telah merekabentuk model ramalan kegagalan korporat menggunakan nisbah kewangan. Walaubagaimanapun, penyelidikan ramalan kegagalan bagi firma-firma Malaysia sangat sedikit telah didokumenkan. Objektif kajian ini ialah membentuk model yang membezakan firma Malaysia yang gagal dan tidak gagal. Juga, kajian ini mengkaji sifat taburan nisbah kewangan firma gagal dan tidak gagal. Teknik pensampelan satu kepada satu digunakan, di mana 33 firma industri bercampur yang gagal dan tidak gagal, dan 24 firma bagi sektor industri yang gagal dan tidak gagal yang disenaraikan bagi tempoh dari 1980 ke 1996 digunakan. Dengan menggunakan ujian Kolgomorov Smirnov dilaraskan kepada ujian Lillifor, didapati hanya satu nisbah kewangan menurut taburan



normal. Sembilan nisbah kewangan didapati normal secara log bagi sektor industri bercampur dan bilangannya meningkat kepada 18 bagi sektor industri. Tiga nisbah kewangan ditemui normal secara punca kuasa dua bagi sektor industri bercampur dan 6 bagi sektor industri. Didapati, teknik penukaran secara log adalah prosidur paling efektif dan penukaran kuasa dua adalah prosidur paling tidak efektif bagi menukar taburan data yang tidak normal kepada keluarga taburan normal. Akhirnya, sektor sesuatu industri memainkan peranan penting dalam menentukan tahap normal, di mana fokus kepada sektor industri yang spesifik akan memberikan keputusan yang lebih baik dari sektor industri bercampur. Walau bagaimanapun, ditemui bahawa kesaksamaan varian-covarian data sampel tidak didapati, tetapi kesan ketidaksamaan varian-kovarian ini adalah minima.

Selepas andaian analisa discriminant dipenuhi, analisa 'stepwise multiple discriminant' telah digunakan bagi membentuk model ramalan kegagalan. Model bagi industri bercampur mengklasifikasikan dengan betul 86.2% sampel asal dan 91% sample diasingkan. Model ini seterusnya disahkan menggunakan kaedah U (86.2% betul klasifikasi). Keputusan kekal tepat dan ketepatan klasifikasi bagi gagal dan tidak gagal ditemui lebih baik dari peluang. Model ramalan alternatif dibentuk berasaskan hanya maklumat perakaunan, mengatasi model asal dan mengklasifikasi dengan tepat 88.1% sampel asal dan 86.7% kaedah U. Model bagi sektor industri adalah sama tepat seperti model industri bercampur, di mana mengklasifikasi dengan betul lebih dari 80% firma gagal



dan tidak gagal dan model asal mengatasi model alternatif. Pembolehkan yang terpilih di dalam model akhir adalah wakil terbaik bagi pembolehkan untung, aliran tunai, modal kerja dan nilai bersih.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisory committee comprising Associate Professor Dr Annuar Md Nassir, Associate Professor Dr Shamsheer Mohamad and Associate Professor Dr Zainal Abidin Mohamed, and special thanks to my committee chairperson, Dr Mohamad Ali Abdul Hamid.

Dr Mohamad Ali has been very helpful and has allowed me to utilise the facilities that are available in his office at any time. Dr Annuar, Dr Shamsheer and Dr Zainal have been able to resolve many complex problems that arise in many parts of the research process. Without all the committee members, this research would not have become a reality and come to a speedy end.

I am grateful to a friend, Mohd Rosnizam Mohd Deris for his assistance in data collection phase. Finally, I would like to take this opportunity to thank the Universiti Putra Malaysia that provides scholarship and research grant for this purpose.



I certify that an Examination Committee met on 30 June 2000 to conduct the final examination of Zulkarnain Bin Muhamad Sori on his Master of Science thesis entitled "Predicting Corporate Failure Using Accounting Information The Malaysian Experience" in accordance with Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Act 1980 and Universiti Pertanian Malaysia (Higher Degree) Regulation 1981. The committee recommends that the candidate be awarded the relevant degree. Members of the Examination Committee are as follows

Associate Professor Shaari Abd Hamid, DBA,  
Faculty of Economics and Management,  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Chairman)

Mohamad Ali Abd Hamid, Ph.D,  
Faculty of Economics and Management,  
Universiti Putra Malaysia.  
(Member)

Associate Professor Annuar Md Nasir, Ph.D,  
Head, Department of Accounting and Finance,  
Faculty of Economics and Management,  
Universiti Putra Malaysia.  
(Member)

Associate Professor Zainal Abidin Mohamed, Ph.D,  
Faculty of Agriculture,  
Universiti Putra Malaysia.  
(Member)

Associate Professor Shamsheer Mohamad, Ph.D,  
Faculty of Economics and Management,  
Universiti Putra Malaysia  
(Member)

---

MOHD GHAZALI MOHAYIDIN, Ph.D,  
Professor / Deputy Dean of Graduate School  
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ix
APPROVAL SHEETS	x
DECLARATION FORM	xii
LIST OF TABLES	xvi
LIST OF FIGURES	xviii
<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Definition of Corporate Distress	4
1.2.1 Business Failure	5
1.3 The Use of Ratios for Failure Prediction Models	7
1.4 Malaysian Insolvency Legal Framework	8
1.4.1 Receivership	8
1.4.2 Members' Voluntary Winding Up	9
1.4.3 Creditors' Voluntary Winding Up	10
1.4.4 Winding Up by the Court	10
1.4.5 Restructuring and Reorganisations	11
1.4.6 Compromise and Arrangement	13
1.5 Problem Statements	14
1.6 Objectives of the Study	16
1.7 Scope of the Study	16
1.8 Hypotheses	17
1.9 Significant of the Study	17
1.10 Organisation of the Study	18
<b>2.0 RELATED THEORY AND LITERATURE REVIEW</b>	<b>19</b>
2.1 Introduction	19
2.2 Related Theory	19
2.2.1 Commander Theory	19
2.2.2 Investor Theory	21
2.2.3 Solvency Theory	22
2.2.4 The Brunswik Lens Model	23
2.2.5 Altman's Z Score Model	27
2.2.6 Summary of Theories and Models	29
2.3 Review of Literature	30
2.3.1 History of Financial Ratio Analysis	30
2.3.2 Early Modern Study on Failure Prediction	32
2.3.3 Multivariate Studies – Small Firms	34
2.3.4 Multivariate Studies – Large Firms	37



	<b>Page</b>	
2.3.5	New Approach – Artificial Intelligence Systems	44
2.3.6	Critics of MDA Models	47
2.4	Normality Assumptions	49
2.4.1	Study on Normality in Failure Prediction	50
2.4.2	Distributional of Financial Ratios Studies	51
2.5	Criticisms of Failure Prediction Models	53
<b>3.0</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH DESIGN</b>	<b>54</b>
3.1	Introduction	54
3.2	Objectives (Stage 1)	55
3.3	Research Design (Stage 2)	56
3.3.1	Data	56
3.3.2	Sample	56
3.3.3	Selection of Sample of Failed Firms	59
3.3.4	Selection of Sample Non-failed Firms	60
3.3.5	Industry Sample	61
3.3.6	Division of Sample	61
3.3.7	Selection of Dependent Variables and Independent Variables	62
3.4	Choice of Univariate and Multivariate Methodologies	65
3.5	Background of Multiple Discriminant Analysis	66
3.6	Summary Statistics of Sample Companies	68
<b>4.0</b>	<b>ASSUMPTIONS OF DISCRIMINANT ANALYSIS AND DATA EXAMINATION</b>	<b>72</b>
4.1	Introduction	72
4.2	Two or More Groups Being Studied (Assumption 1)	74
4.3	At Least Two Cases per Group (Assumption 2)	74
4.4	Number of Discriminating Variables (Assumption 3)	75
4.5	Discriminating Variables are Measured at the Interval Level (Assumption 4)	75
4.6	Identifying and Understanding the Reasons on Missing Data	76
4.7	Multivariate Normal Distribution (Assumptions 7)	78
4.7.1	Normality Tests	78
4.7.2	Results of Normality Tests	80
4.7.3	Cause for Non-normality	85
4.7.4	Test of Outliers and Data Trimming	85
4.7.5	Data Transformation	88
4.7.6	Discussion on Normality Tests	91
4.7.7	Conclusion of Normality Tests	100
4.8	Linear Combination amongst Discriminating Variables (Assumption 5)	101
4.8.1	Focus of the Study	102
4.8.2	Results of Correlation Analysis	102

	<b>Page</b>
4.9 Equality in Variance Covariance Matrices (Assumption 6)	107
4.10 Conclusion of Multiple Discriminant Analysis Assumptions	109
<b>5.0 ESTIMATION OF DISCRIMINANT MODEL AND ASSESSING OVERALL FIT</b>	<b>111</b>
5.1 Estimation of Discriminant Model for Mixed Industry Sector	111
5.2 Assessing Overall Fit (Mixed Industry Sector)	119
5.3 Interpretation of the Results (Stage 5)	122
5.4 Validation of the Discriminant Results (Stage Six)	123
5.5 Exclusion of Market Based Variable (Mixed Industry)	124
5.6 Estimation of Discriminant Model for Industrial Sector	128
5.7 Assessing Overall Fit	130
5.8 Interpretation of the Results (Stage 5)	132
5.9 Validation of the Discriminant Results of Industrial Sectors (Stage Six)	133
5.10 Exclusion of Market Based Variable (Industrial Sector)	134
5.11 External Validation	138
5.12 Tests of Relationship Between the Final Variables in the Model, and Profit and Cash Flow Variables	140
5.13 Conclusion	145
<b>6.0 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS</b>	<b>146</b>
6.1 Assumptions of Discriminant Analysis	146
6.2 Contribution and Improvement of the Study	147
6.3 Practical Application of Failure Prediction Model	149
6.4 Limitations	152
6.4.1 Industry	152
6.4.2 Data	152
6.5 Suggestion for Future Research	153
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>155</b>
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>164</b>
<b>BIODATA</b>	<b>215</b>



## LIST OF TABLES

<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
1	Statistics of Malaysian Companies Winding Up	2
2	Altman's Z-Score Model	28
3	Prediction of the Mean Values of Failed and Non-failed Firms	33
4	Edmister's (1972) Small Firms MDA models	35
5	Variables Included in Altman et al. (1977) MDA Model	39
6	Bilderbeek's (1977) MDA Model	41
7	Altman et al. (1979) MDA Model	42
8	Odom and Sharda (1993) Variables	45
9	MDA and NN Results	45
10	Failed Criteria of the Sample Firms	58
11	List of Ratios Examined	63
12	Ratios Grouping	64
13	Summary Balance Sheet and Income Statement Items for Mixed Industry	69
14	Summary Balance Sheet and Income Statement Items for Industrial and Property Sector	70
15	Summary Balance Sheet and Income Statement Items for Industrial Sector	71
16	Summary of Observations	75
17	Reasons for Missing Data	77
18	Testing for Normality (Raw Data – Mixed Industry Sector)	82
19	Testing for Normality (Raw Data – Industrial and Property Sector)	83
20	Testing for Normality (Raw Data – Industrial Sector)	84
21	Percentage of Outliers in Data Sample	86
22	Outliers for Mixed Industry Sector	86
23	Outliers for Industrial and Property Sector	87
24	Outliers for Industrial Sector	87
25	Normal Variable Under Normality Tests (Sector: Mixed Industry)	90
26	Normal Variable Under Normality Tests (Sector - Industrial and Property)	90
27	Normal Variable Under Normality Tests (Sector: Industrial)	91
28	Statistics of Normal Variable under Normality Tests: Mixed Industry Sector (Untrimmed Vs Trimmed Outliers)	96
29	Statistics of Normal Variable Under Normality Tests: Industrial and Property Sector (Untrimmed Vs Trimmed Outliers)	97
30	Statistics of Normal Variable Under Normality Tests: Industrial Sector (Untrimmed Vs Trimmed Outliers)	98
31	Variables to be Tested in Correlation Analysis	103



<b>Table</b>		<b>Page</b>
32	Pearson Correlation for Mixed Industry	104
33	Pearson Correlation for Industrial Sector	105
34	Group of Variables Not Correlate (Mixed Industry Sector)	106
35	Group of Variables Not Correlate (Industrial Sector)	107
36	Box's M Tests	108
37	Stepwise Procedure to Select Variables	114
38	Variables in the Analysis	115
39	Stepwise Statistics	116
40	Summary of Canonical Discriminant Functions	117
41	Classification Results of Mixed Industry Sector	120
42	Summary of Interpretative Measures	122
43	Validation Results	123
44	Summary of Interpretative Measures for revised Z-Scores Model	125
45	Classification Results	126
46	A Comparison of Classification Accuracy of Analysis Sample	127
47	A Comparison of Classification Accuracy of Cross-Validated Procedures	127
48	A Comparison of Classification Accuracy of External Validation	128
49	Stepwise Statistics (Industrial Sector)	129
50	Summary of Canonical Discriminant Functions	129
51	Classification Results	131
52	Summary of Interpretative Measures	132
53	Validation Results	133
54	Summary of Interpretative Measures for revised Z-Scores Model	134
55	Classification Results	136
56	A Comparison of Classification Accuracy of Analysis Sample	136
57	A Comparison of Classification Accuracy of Cross-Validated Procedures	137
58	A Comparison of Classification Accuracy of External Validation	137
59	Results of External Validity – Original Model (Mixed Industry)	138
60	Results of External Validity – Alternative Model (Mixed Industry)	139
61	Results of External Validity – Original Model (Industrial Sector)	139
62	Results of External Validity – Alternative Model (Industrial Sector)	140
63	Pearson Correlation Test – Mixed Industry Sector	142
64	Pearson Correlation Test – Industrial Sector	143





# CHAPTER ONE

## INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 Introduction

In today's competitive business environment, corporate failure is a common occurrence among Malaysian corporations of all sizes and sectors. Corporate failure is generally defined when a firm seeks protection under section 176 of the Companies Act 1965. No business entities are immune to failure, which usually defaults in their outstanding indebtedness. The financial turbulence in late 1980s and 1990s highlighted the importance of developing an early warning system to mitigate the incidence of corporate failure among Malaysian business firms. Altman et al. (1979) mentioned that the corporate failure problems are not the sole province of developed countries and can be a relatively more serious problem in the less developed economic environments.

Incidence of corporate failures first received exposure during end of 1960s, followed by more corporate failures during the recession years of 1980 to 1982, and unprecedented amount of attention during the explosion of defaults and large firms bankruptcies in the period 1989 to 1992. However, these exposures were in the developed countries and there is a lack of documented literature on this issues in the less developed countries. The government authorities try to

review the problems without a proper research guideline to understand the reasons and consequences of this hectic situation. Most of the decisions made are believed based on trial and error basis.

Firms can experience financial difficulties at various levels. At one extreme, a firm's financial difficulties may lead to bankruptcy and results either in the liquidation of its assets or in reorganisation. In a less extreme come through, still quite serious, are various financial arrangements outside the jurisdiction of the courts that permit continuity of the firm's operations and the satisfaction of the claims of creditors.

Table 1: Statistics of Malaysian Companies Incorporated and Winding Up

Year	Total Incorporation	Liquidation	%*
1990	18,612	NA	NA
1991	21,102	NA	NA
1992	23,285	419	1.8
1993	30,988	392	1.3
1994	43,571	861	2.0
1995	43,238	487	1.1
1996	43,237	681	1.6
1997	40,720	5,615	13.8
1998	18,825	6,409	34.0

Note: NA: Not Available

\*Percentage of liquidated over total incorporation of firms.

Source: Registrar of Companies

The number of firms winding up increased since the last 10 years. According to the Registrar of Companies, the phenomenon is normal and not solely attributed to the economic downturn. Also, the crisis is not the real cause of the situation

because the problem might arise in the past and it takes a long process to wind up a company. Most companies included in table 1 are small companies that not listed on the KLSE. Usually, the big firms will apply to the court or relevant authorities for restructuring or reorganisation scheme.

According to the Securities Commission, thirty-three listed firms applied to restructure their organisations in the first half of 1999 with unimaginable amount of debts that an average of RM540 million debts per company (totaling to approximately RM18 billions). The total amounts of debts involved are extremely high and this indicates that the failure problem among Malaysian corporate is a serious and requires an immediate attention by the policy makers and relevant authorities.

These highly leveraged corporations suffered financial problem and had to resort to liquidation. They have to formulate survival options including proposal on strategies for corporate rescues and reconstruction. One option which has increasingly been served as a lifeline to Malaysian companies is a restructuring process based on a scheme of arrangement pursuant to section 176 of the Malaysian Companies Act 1965. This process is costly which involves various parties like consultant and lawyer. Even though it is considered as a big business to the legal practitioner, consultant and accounting professional which experienced busiest time than ever with a lot of profitable business restructuring

on complex scheme of arrangement, this problem becomes enigma to the government and nations.

Corporate failure is not a sudden event and it develops steadily over many years. Some of the symptoms of firms that will eventually fail are decline in profits, working capital, liquidity and asset quality. In Malaysia, not much documented literature on this issue is available. Business failure in Malaysia should be seriously researched due to the size of economy that can jeopardise business health at the time economic crisis and this will result in a great loss to the investors and creditors. This study hopes to provide some important input to policy makers and financial institutions. The ability to spot financial deterioration at an early stage is important because it contributes to both business and financial environment stability.

## **1.2 Definition of Corporate Distress**

Numerous definitions of corporate distress are explained in the literature. The four common terms used in literature are failure, insolvency, default and bankruptcy. It is important to note that there are fine differences in these terms, though they are used interchangeably in practice.

Economically, failure means that the realised rate of return on invested capital is significantly lower than prevailing rates on similar investment. This implies

insufficient revenues to cover costs or the average return on investment being below the firm's cost of capital. In the absence of legally enforceable debt, a firm that economically failed sometimes did not failed to meet its current obligation.

Insolvency is a term to show that the firm's total liabilities exceed a fair valuation of its total assets. Conclusively, it means the real net worth of the firm is negative. Another term associated to distress is defaults. Defaults could be in technical or legal form, and involved relationship between the firms and its creditors. When debtors firm contravenes a condition of an agreement with a creditor is said technical defaults, and can be ground for legal action.

Finally, the bankruptcy term refers to the net worth of the firm and involved formal declaration by the court, accompanied by a petition either to liquidate its asset or attempt a recovery programme.

### **1.2.1 Business Failure**

The harbingers of business failures are usually visible but unfortunately not taken seriously enough, especially in good economic times, until it is too late for any effective recovery measures to materialise. Among the visible signs are arrears interest and loan repayment, delay in payment to suppliers, the staffs and all other creditors, and implementation of some form of austerity measures. The

business failure problem can be financial and/or operational in nature  
Carmichael (1972) described the business failure problem as follows

*A. Financial business failures involves:*

- a Liquidity deficiency – the company’s current liabilities exceed its current assets, which result in difficulty in meeting current obligations
- b Equity deficiency – the company’s solvency is questionable because of a retained earnings deficit or, in more extreme cases, an excess of total liabilities over total assets (negative net growth).
- c. Debt default – the company has been unable to meet debt payment schedules or has violated one or more other conditions of its loan agreements
- d. Funds shortage – the company has either limited or no ability to obtain additional funds from various capital sources

*B. Operational business failures involves:*

- a Continued operating losses – no net profit has been earned for more than one past period
- b Prospective revenue doubtful – revenue is insufficient for day-to-day operating needs, or there have been cutbacks in operations, such as personnel reductions



- c. Ability to operate is jeopardised – legal proceedings related to operations may severely curtail operations, or suppliers of operating materials may refuse to transact with the company
- d. Poor control over operations – the company management has been unable to control operations, as evidenced by repetitive, uncorrected problems.

### **1.3 The Use of Ratios For Failure Prediction Models**

The investors and creditors need to know the financial health of the firms over time. It is a common practice among stakeholders to refer to the financial statements to assess firm's financial condition. The basic objective of financial statements is to provide useful information for making economic/investment decisions. Financial statements quantify information concerning the financial position of an entity and the results of its operations for a specified period of time. Ratio analysis has been the major tool used in the interpretation and evaluation of financial statements for investment decision making since the late 1800s (Lev, 1974). The main objective of ratio analysis is to facilitate the interpretation of financial statement, which is achieved through reducing the large number of financial statement items to a relatively small set of ratios. Such ratios relate to the absolute values of financial items to common bases allowing a meaningful comparison of financial data both over time and across firms for a given time period.