## SOLUTIONS MANUAL



## Chapter 2: Financial Statement and Cash Flow Analysis

## Answers to End of Chapter Questions

2-1. Financial statement analysis provides information about the company's financial health, and its strengths and weaknesses. Using standardized GAAP rules does add validity by making comparisons between companies easier.

2-2. The Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (SOX) established the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (PCAOB), which effectively gives the SEC authority to oversee the accounting profession's activities. Possible shortcomings of relying solely on financial statement analysis include:

- If a company is in multiple lines of business it may be difficult to make comparisons.
- The accounting data may not be accurate.
- Average performance may not be a good measure, especially if the industry is in a slump.
- It is possible to manipulate accounting numbers.

2-3. Data on a company's performance over a reporting period: income statement, statement of cash flows, statement of retained earnings (how much additional retained earnings will be added to existing retained earnings). Data about the company's current position: balance sheet. Notes to the financial statements contain details about the composition and cost of the company's debt, any liabilities such as lawsuits that are still pending, revenue recognition, taxes, significant clients, detailed breakdowns of fixed asset accounts, executive compensation, and descriptions of employee benefit plans. An example of a situation in which the notes would be essential to valuation would be a company that relied on a few clients, rather than a wide base of clients. The notes would detail current and expected revenue from those clients and how that revenue would be recognized. An analyst would need this information to develop a set of cash flows for the company which would provide the basis of a company valuation.

2-4. An analyst looking at granting a loan request would be most interested in the company's balance sheet, which he or she could use to compute liquidity ratios (current and quick ratios) and debt ratios. A credit analyst would also want an income statement with EBIT and interest in order to compute times interest earned. Times interest earned is a measure of how well a company can pay its interest obligations, while liquidity and debt ratios show what assets are available to repay debt.

2-5. The two definitions are different because the new definition will be less than the textbook definition by interest expense*tax rate (i.e., the tax break generated by interest). Should the firm not have any debt, the two definitions are equal because the tax break from debt is zero.

2-6. This has a positive effect on free cash flow because $\Delta \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{P}$ is more likely to be larger than the change in inventory which is a component of $\Delta \mathrm{CA}$.

2-7. Yes, it is credible that Firm Q takes a large amount of depreciation making its times interest earned ratio relatively low. The gross profit margin ratio is not revealing because gross profit is not affected by depreciation expense.

2-8. This has no effect on operating cash flow but has a positive effect on free cash flow.
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2-9. One would expect the times interest earned ratio to be high, the debt-to-equity ratio to be low, and the equity multiplier to be low.

2-10. The DuPont system is useful in breaking down ROE and ROA into its component parts. If ROE is increasing (decreasing), a manager can see if the cause is a higher (lower) profit margin, a higher (lower) asset turnover or a higher (lower) equity multiplier. Then if one of the components is improving (declining) the firm can take steps to pay attention to that area of the business. ROE is equal to ROA times the equity multiplier. It would be possible to raise ROE by choosing to finance the firm more aggressively, even if ROA remained the same.

## Solutions to End of Chapter Problems

2-1. Answers to parts (a) through (j):
a. $\$ 400,000$, or $\$ 140,000$ in Cash plus $\$ 260,000$ in Marketable Securities
b. $\$ 3,780,000$
c. $\$ 2,620,000$, or $\$ 1,060,000$ in current liabilities plus $\$ 1,560,000$ in Total long-term debt
d. $\$ 480,000$
e. $\$ 6,900,000$
f. $\$ 1,610,000$, of the sum of the Common stock (at par), Paid-in capital in excess of par and Retained Earnings balances
g. $\$ 600,000$
h. $\$ 355,000$
i. $\quad \$ 85,800$
j. 124,615 , or $\$ 178,200 \div \$ 1.43$

2-2. Internet exercise
2-3. The answers to parts (a) through (d):
a) $\quad$ Tax rate $=1,300 /(1,300+2,400)=35.135 \%$

NOPAT $=$ EBIT $(1-\mathrm{T})=\$ 4,500(1-0.35135)=\$ 2,919$
b) Operating cash flow $(\mathrm{OCF})=$ NOPAT + depreciation

$$
=\$ 2,919+\$ 1,600=\$ 4,519
$$

c) $\quad$ Free cash flow (FCF) $=$ OCF $-\Delta \mathrm{FA}-(\Delta \mathrm{CA}-\Delta \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{P}-\Delta$ accruals $)$
$=\$ 4,519-(\$ 31,500-\$ 30,100)-$
$[(\$ 16,200-\$ 14,800)-(\$ 3,600-\$ 3,500)-(\$ 1,200-\$ 1,300)]$
$=\$ 4,519-\$ 1,400-[\$ 1,400-\$ 100-(-\$ 100)]$
$=\$ 4,519-\$ 1,400-\$ 1,400$
$=\$ 1,719$
d) Operating cash flow is higher than NOPAT because OCF adds back depreciation (a noncash expense), which is subtracted when calculating profitability measures such as EBIT and NOPAT. FCF not only looks at operations, but also whether a company has added assets or reduced liabilities (outflows of cash) or reduced assets and increased liabilities (inflows of cash).

2-4. Cash +600 (O)
Accounts payable $-1,200$ (O)
Notes payable +800 (I)
Long-term debt -2,500 (O)
Inventory +400 (O)
Fixed assets $+600(\mathrm{O})$

Accounts receivable -900 (I)
Net profits +700 (I)
Depreciation +200 (I)
Repurchase of stock +500 (O)
Cash dividends +300 (O)
Sale of stock $+1,300$ (I)
2.5. Current Ratio $=$ Current Assets/Current Liabilities $\rightarrow$

CA $=$ Current Ratio $* \mathrm{CL}=2.0 * \$ 10,000.00=\$ 20,000.00$
Quick Ratio $=(\mathrm{CA}-$ Inventory $) / \mathrm{CL}$ :
$1.0=(\$ 20,000-$ Inventory $) / \$ 10,000 \rightarrow$
$\$ 10,000=\$ 20,000$ - Inventory $\rightarrow$
Inventory $=\$ 10,000$

### 2.6 Income Statement for Aluminum Industries

|  | Common Size $\%$ |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Sales | $\$ 30,000,000$ | $100.00 \%$ |
| Less: Cost of goods sold | $21,000,000$ | 70.00 |
| Gross Profit | $\$ 9,000,000$ | $30.00 \%$ |
| $\quad$ Selling expense | $\$ 3,000,000$ | $10.00 \%$ |
| $\quad$ G\&A expense | $1,800,000$ | 6.00 |
| $\quad$ Lease expense | 200,000 | 0.67 |
| $\quad$ Depreciation | $1,000,000$ | $3.33 \%$ |
| $\quad$ Total operating expense | $\$ 6,000,000$ | 20.00 |
| Operating Profit | $\$ 3,000,000$ | $10.00 \%$ |
| Less: Interest Expense | $1,000,000$ | 3.33 |
| Net Profit before taxes | $\$ 2,000,000$ | $6.67 \%$ |
| Less: Taxes (rate $=40 \%)$ | 800,000 | 2.67 |
| Net Profit after taxes | $\$ 1,200,000$ | $4.00 \%$ |

Sales have declined from $\$ 35$ million to $\$ 30$ million and cost of goods sold has increased as a percentage of sales (from $65.9 \%$ in 2009 to $70 \%$ in 2010), probably due to a loss of productive efficiency. Total operating expenses have decreased as a percent of sales (from $23.2 \%$ in 2009 to $20.0 \%$ in 2010); this appears favorable unless this decline has contributed toward the fall in sales. Interest as a percentage of sales has increased significantly (from $1.5 \%$ in 2009 to $3.33 \%$ in 2010); this is likely attributable to the firm's relatively high debt levels in 2010. Further analysis should therefore focus on the firm's increased cost of goods sold and its high level of debt. Converting the 2009 common-size income statement to dollar values is helpful in this regard.

| Sales | $\$ 35,000,000$ <br> Cost of goods sold <br> Gross Profit |
| :--- | ---: |
| Selling expense | $\$ 11,065,000$ |
| GA expense | $\$ 4,45,000$ |
| Lease expense | $2,205,000$ |
|  | 210,000 |


| Depreciation | $1,260,000$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Total operating expense | $\$ 8,120,000$ |
| Operating Profits | $\$ 3,815,000$ |
| Interest Expense | 525,000 |
| Net Profit before taxes | $\$ 3,290,000$ |
| Taxes | $1,330,000$ |
| Net Profit after taxes | $\$ 1,960,000$ |

2.7. The average age of inventory is 81.11 days $(365 \div 4.5)$, which is added to the average collection period of 90 days to yield 171.11 days. 171.11 days is the time it takes to receive the inventory and then collect payment for selling the inventory on average.
2.8 The equity multiplier is 1.5 (i.e., $\mathrm{ROE} \div \mathrm{ROA}$ ). Consequently, the debt ratio is $1-1 /($ equity multiplier) $=1-1 / 1.5=0.3333$ or $1 / 3$.
2.9. For this problem, it is useful to note that $\mathrm{ROE}=\mathrm{ROA} \times \mathrm{EM}$. The fact that Firm B has the same ROE as Firm A, but only half the ROA, means that its equity multiplier must be twice as large. Since Firm A is entirely equity-financed, its equity multiplier (Assets/Equity) must equal 1. Therefore, Firm B's equity multiplier must be 2 , so its debt ratio must be $50 \%$ (or 0.5 ), and its debt-to-equity ratio must be 1.0 .
2.10. Total Asset Turnover $=$ Sales $\div$ Total Assets $\Rightarrow 2=\$ 4,800,000 \div$ Total Assets $\Rightarrow$ Total Assets $=$ \$2,400,000

Gross Profit Margin $=$ Gross Profit $\div$ Sales $\Rightarrow 0.4=$ Gross Profit $\div \$ 4,800,000 \Rightarrow$ Gross Profit $=$ \$1,920,000

Cost of Goods Sold (COGS) $=\$ 4,800,000-\$ 1,920,000=\$ 2,880,000$
Inventory Turnover $=$ COGS $\div$ Inventory $\Rightarrow 10=\$ 2,880,000 \div$ Inventory $\Rightarrow$ Inventory $=$ \$288,000

Total Current Assets $=$ Cash + Marketable Securities + Accounts Receivable + Inventories $=$ $\$ 52,000+\$ 60,000+\$ 200,000+\$ 288,000=\$ 600,000$

Total Assets $=$ Total Current Assets + Fixed Assets (gross) - Accumulated Depreciation $\Rightarrow$ $\$ 2,400,000=\$ 600,000+$ Fixed Assets (gross) $-\$ 240,000 \Rightarrow$ Fixed Assets (gross) $=\$ 2,040,000$

Net Fixed Assets $=$ Fixed Assets (gross) - Accumulated Depreciation $\Rightarrow$ \$2,040,000 - \$240,000 $=\$ 1,800,000$

EBIT $=$ Gross Profit - Total operating expenses $=\$ 1,920,000-\$ 1,560,000=\$ 360,000$
Current Ratio $=$ Current Assets $\div$ Current Liabilities $\Rightarrow 1.6=\$ 600,000 \div$ Current Liabilities $\Rightarrow$ Current Liabilities $=\$ 375,000$

Notes Payable $=$ Total Current Liabilities - Accounts Payable - Accruals $=\$ 375,000-\$ 150,000$ $-\$ 80,000=\$ 145,000$

Total Liabilities $=$ Long-term debt + Total Current Liabilities $\Rightarrow \$ 425,000+\$ 375,000=$ \$800,000

Total Equity $=$ Total Assets - Total Liabilities $=\$ 2,400,000-\$ 800,000=\$ 1,600,000$
Total Liabilities and Stockholders' Equity $=$ Total Assets $=\$ 2,400,000$
Net Profit Margin $=$ Net Income $\div$ Sales $\Rightarrow 0.0375=$ Net Income $\div \$ 4,800,000 \Rightarrow$ Net Income $=$ \$180,000

EBT - Taxes $=$ Net Income $\Rightarrow \$ 325,000-$ Taxes $=\$ 180,000 \Rightarrow$ Taxes $=\$ 145,000$
Earnings Available to Common Stockholders $($ EACS $)=$ Net Income - Preferred Dividend $=$ $\$ 180,000-\$ 15,000=\$ 165,000$

To Retained Earnings $=$ EACS - Dividend $=\$ 165,000-\$ 60,000=\$ 105,000$
Return on Common Equity $=$ EACS $\div$ Common Equity $\Rightarrow 0.125=\$ 165,000 \div$ Common Equity $\Rightarrow$ Common Equity $=\$ 1,320,000$

Paid-in Capital in excess of par $=$ Common Equity - Common Stock (at par) - Retained Earnings $\Rightarrow \$ 1,320,000-\$ 150,000-\$ 390,000=\$ 780,000$

Preferred Stock $=$ Total Stockholders' Equity - Common Equity $=\$ 1,600,000-\$ 1,320,000=$ \$280,000
2.12. ROA before the reduction in the asset base is $1.2 \%$, or $\$ 15,000,000 \div \$ 1,250,000,000$. ROE before the adjustment is $\$ 15,000,000 \div \$ 75,000,000$, or $20 \%$. After the adjustment, ROE does not change, as neither earnings nor equity changes. However, ROA increases as the denominator falls. The new ROA would be $1.5 \%$, or $\$ 15,000,000 \div \$ 1,000,000,000$.
2.11. Answers to parts (a) through (d):
a. ROE $=$ Net Profit Margin (NPM) $\times$ Total Asset Turnover (TAT) $\times$ Equity multiplier (A/E)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \operatorname{ROE}_{\text {HMM }}=(\$ 4,200,000 \div \$ 75,000,000) \times(\$ 75,000,000 \div \$ 100,000,000) \times(\$ 100,000,000 \div \\
& \$ 40,000,000)=0.056 \times 0.75 \times 2.50=10.5 \% \\
& \operatorname{ROE}_{\text {MS }}=(\$ 4,200,000 \div \$ 50,000,000) \times(\$ 50,000,000 \div \$ 80,000,000) \times(\$ 80,000,000 \div \\
& \$ 30,000,000)=0.084 \times 0.625 \times 2.67=14 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

Metallic Stamping (MS) has an ROE of $14 \%$ as compared to $10.5 \%$ for Heavy Metal (HMM). While Heavy Metal utilizes its assets more efficiently (TAT= 0.75 vs. 0.625 for Metallic Stamping), Metallic converts a greater percentage of sales into net income ( $\mathrm{NPM}=0.084$ vs. 0.056 for Heavy Metal) and makes greater use of financial leverage, given its slightly higher financial leverage multiplier ( 2.67 vs. 2.50 for Heavy Metal).
b. $\quad \operatorname{ROE}_{\text {HTS }}=(\$ 24,000,000 \div \$ 100,000,000) \times(\$ 100,000,000 \div \$ 100,000,000) \times(\$ 100,000,000$ $\div \$ 00,000,000)=0.24 \times 1 \times 1.11=10.5 \%$
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c. Heavy Metal has a lower ROA ( $0.056 \times 0.75=0.042$ vs. $0.24 \times 1=0.24$ for HTS $)$ and a higher financial leverage multiplier ( 2.50 vs. 1.11 for HTS) than High Tech Software, Inc. Similarly, Metallic Stamping has a lower ROA $(0.084 \times 0.625=0.053$ vs. $0.24 \times 1=0.24$ for HTS) and a higher financial leverage multiplier ( 2.67 vs. 1.11 for HTS).
d. Because the average values of the three ROE components are industry-specific, DuPont analysis across industries is not very meaningful.
2.13. Balance Sheet Items

| Balance Sheet Item | Currently | Debt Financing | Stock Financing |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Current Assets | $\$ 250,000$ | $\$ 250,000$ | $\$ 250,000$ |
| Fixed Assets | 750,000 | $3,750,000$ | $3,750,000$ |
| Total Assets | $\$ 1,000,000$ | $\$ 4,000,000$ | $\$ 4,000,000$ |
|  |  |  |  |
| Current Liabilities | $\$ 300,000$ | $\$ 300,000$ | $\$ 300,000$ |
| Long-Term Debt | 0 | $3,000,000$ | 0 |
| Total Liabilities | $\$ 300,000$ | $\$ 3,300,000$ | $\$ 300,000$ |
| Common Equity | $\$ 700,000$ | $\$ 700,000$ | $\$ 3,700,000$ |
| Total Liabilities \& Equity | $\$ 1,000,000$ | $\$ 4,000,000$ | $\$ 4,000,000$ |

Income Statement Items
Sales
Expenses @ 40\%
EBIT
Interest Expense ( $0.10 \times$ L-T Debt)
Net Profit Before Taxes
Taxes @ 40\%
Net Income (NI)
ROE $=\mathrm{NI} \div$ Stockholders' Equity

| $\$ 500,000$ | $\$ 1,500,000$ | $\$ 1,500,000$ |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 200,000 | 600,000 | 600,000 |  |
| $\$ 300,000$ | $\$$ | 900,000 | 900,000 |
| 0 | 300,000 | 0 |  |
| $\$ 300,000$ | $\$$ | 600,000 | $\$$ |
| 120,000 |  | 940,000 | 360,000 |
| $\$ 180,000$ | $\$$ | 360,000 | $\$ 540,000$ |
| $\underline{\underline{25.71 \%}}$ | $\underline{\underline{51.43 \%}}$ | $\underline{\underline{14.59 \%}}$ |  |

All else remaining the same, Tracey should expand her operations using debt financing because this strategy will double her firm's ROE.
2.14. The ratios for Aluminum Industries are provided in the table below.

| Ratio | Definition | Calculation | Aluminum | Industry <br> Avg. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Debt | $\frac{\text { Debt }}{\text { Total Assets }}$ | $\frac{\$ 36,500,000}{\$ 50,000,000}$ | 0.73 | .51 |
| Debt-Equity | $\frac{\text { Long-Term Debt }}{\text { Equity }}$ | $\frac{\$ 20,000,000}{\$ 13,500,000}$ | 1.48 | 1.07 |


| Times Interest <br> Earned | $\frac{\text { EBIT }}{\text { Interest }}$ | $\frac{\$ 3,000,000}{\$ 1,000,000}$ | 3.00 | 7.30 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Because Aluminum Industries, Inc. has a much higher degree of indebtedness and much lower ability to service debt than the average firm in the industry, the loan should be rejected.
2.15. EPS equals $\$ 45$ million divided by 27 million shares: $\$ 1.67$ EPS. P-to-E multiplied by EPS generates the stock price: $\$ 1.67 \times 20.0=\$ 33.33$.

2-16. Internet exercise
2-17. Answers to (a) and (b):
a. Financial Statement Analysis

## Access Corporation Ratio Analysis

|  | Industry <br> Average | Actual <br> 2009 | Actual <br> 2010 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Current ratio | 1.80 | 1.84 | 1.04 |
| Quick (acid-test) ratio | 0.70 | 0.78 | 0.38 |
| Inventory turnover | 2.50 | 2.59 | 2.33 |
| Average collection period | 37 days | 36 days | 57 days |
| Average payment period | 72 days | 78 days | 101 days |
| Debt-to-equity ratio | $50 \%$ | $51 \%$ | $40 \%$ |
| Times interest earned ratio | 3.8 | 4.0 | 2.8 |
| Gross profit margin | $38 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $34 \%$ |
| Net profit margin | $3.5 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $4.1 \%$ |
| Return on total assets (ROA) | $4.0 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $4.4 \%$ |
| Return on common equity (ROE) | $9.5 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ |
| Market/book (M/B) ratio | 1.1 | 1.2 | 1.3 |

b (1). Liquidity: Access Corporation's liquidity position has deteriorated from 2009 to 2010 and is inferior to the industry average. The firm may not be able to satisfy short-term obligations as they come due.
b (2). Activity: Access' ability to convert assets into cash has deteriorated from 2009 to 2010. Examination into the cause of the 21-day increase in the average collection period is warranted. Inventory turnover has also decreased for the period under review and is OK when compared to the industry. The firm may be holding slightly excessive inventory. The average payment period increased significantly and needs attention; the firm is taking 23 days longer to pay its accounts payable in 2010 than it did in 2009 and its average payment period is well above the industry average.
b (3). Debt: Access' long-term debt position has improved since 2009 and is significantly below the industry average. Access Corp.'s ability to service interest payments has deteriorated and is well below the industry average; it needs attention.
b (4). Profitability: Although the company's gross profit margin is below its industry average, indicating high cost of goods sold, the firm has a superior net profit margin in comparison to the industry average. The firm has lower than average operating expenses. The firm
has a superior return on investment and return on equity in comparison to the industry and shows an upward trend.
b (5). Market: The firm's increasing and above-industry-average market/book ratio indicates that investors are willing to pay an increasing and above-industry-average amount for each dollar of book value. Clearly investors have positive expectations of the firm's future success.

Overall, the firm maintains superior profitability at the risk of illiquidity. Investigation into the management of accounts receivable and inventory is warranted. It appears that the firm's significant decline in liquidity may be driven by increasing current liabilities that may have been substituted for long-term debt financing between 2009 and 2010. Regardless, investors appear to feel positively about the firm's future prospects.

2-18.
a. Net Profit Margin $=\$ 180,000 \div \$ 4,000,000=0.045=\underline{4.5 \%}$

Total Asset Turnover $=\$ 4,000,000 \div \$ 2,000,000=\underline{\underline{2.00}}$
Assets-to-Equity Ratio $=\$ 2,000,000 \div \$ 1,000,000=\underline{\underline{2.00}}$
Return on Total Assets $($ ROA $)=$ Net Profit Margin $\times$ Total Asset Turnover $=0.045 \times 2.00=$ $0.09=\underline{\underline{9 \%}}$

Return on Equity $($ ROE $)=$ Return on Total Assets $\times$ Assets-to-Equity Ratio $=0.09 \times 2.00=$ $0.18=\underline{\underline{18 \%}}$
b.

| Sales |  | 6,000,000 | Current Assets | \$ 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expenses ( $.90 \times \$ 6,000,000$ ) |  | 5,400,000 | Fixed Assets | \$3,000,000 |
| EBIT | \$ | 600,000 | Total Assets | \$3,000,000 |
| Interest ( $.10 \times \$ 2,000,000)$ |  | 200,000 |  |  |
| EBT | \$ | 400,000 | Current Liabilities | \$ 0 |
| Taxes @ 40\% |  | 160,000 | Long-Term Debt @ 10\% | 2,000,000 |
| Net Income | \$ | 240,000 | Total Liabilities | \$2,000,000 |
|  |  |  | Common Equity | \$1,000,000 |
|  |  |  | Total Liab. \& S/H Equity | \$3,000,000 |

Net Profit Margin $=\quad \$ 240,000 \div \$ 6,000,000=0.04=\underline{4 \%}$
Total Asset Turnover $=\$ 6,000,000 \div \$ 3,000,000=\underline{\underline{2.00}}$
Assets-to-Equity Ratio $=\$ 3,000,000 \div \$ 1,000,000=\underline{\underline{2.00}}$
Return on Total Assets $($ ROA $)=4 \% \times 2.00=\underline{\underline{8 \%}}$
Return on Equity (ROE) $=8 \% \times 3.00=\underline{\underline{24 \%}}$

As measured by ROE, which increases from $18 \%$ to $24 \%$, the purchase of the assets is a good investment.
c.

| Sales |  | 4,500,000 | Current Assets | \$ 0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Expenses ( $.90 \times \$ 4,500,000)$ |  | 4,050,000 | Fixed Assets | 3,000,000 |
| EBIT | \$ | 450,000 | Total Assets | \$3,000,000 |
| Interest ( $.10 \times \$ 2,000,000)$ |  | 200,000 |  |  |
| EBT | \$ | 250,000 | Current Liabilities | \$ 0 |
| Taxes @ 40\% |  | 100,000 | Long-Term Debt | 2,000,000 |
| Net Income | \$ | 150,000 | Total Liabilities | \$2,000,000 |
|  |  |  | Common Equity | 1,000,000 |
|  |  |  | Total Liab. \& S/H Equity | \$3,000,000 |

Net Profit Margin $=\frac{\$ 150,000}{\$ 4,500,000}=0.0333=3.33 \%$
Total Asset Turnover $=\frac{\$ 4,500,000}{\$ 3,000,000}=1.5$
Assets-to-Equity Ratio $=\frac{\$ 3,000,000}{\$ 1,000,000}=3.00$
Return on Total Assets $($ ROA $)=3.33 \% \times 1.50=\underline{\underline{5 \%}}$
Return on Equity $($ ROE $)=5 \% \times 3.00=\underline{\underline{15 \%}}$
In this case, the acquisition of assets lowers ROE (from $18 \%$ to $15 \%$ ) and therefore is not a good investment.
d. The assets-to-equity ratio is not affected by a change in sales, but is affected only by the financing decision. This implies that ROE can be enhanced by an increase in financial leverage only if the assets purchased with the debt are utilized at least as efficiently as existing assets in generating sales and in earning net income on those sales.

2-19. Complete Ratio Analysis

## MBA Company Ratio Analysis

| Ratio | Actual <br> 2008 | Actual <br> 2009 | Actual <br> 2010 | Industry <br> 2010 | Time Series (TS) <br> Cross-Sectional (CS) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| Current ratio | 1.40 | 1.55 | 1.67 | 1.85 | TS: Improving <br> CS: Fair |
| Quick (acid-test) ratio | 1.00 | 0.92 | 0.88 | 1.05 | TS: Deteriorating <br> CS: Poor |
| Inventory turnover | 9.52 | 9.21 | 7.89 | 8.60 | TS: Deteriorating <br> CS: Fair |
| Average collection period <br> (in days) | 45.0 | 36.4 | 29.2 | 35.0 | TS: Improving |
| Average payment period (in | 58.5 | 60.8 | 53.0 | 45.8 | TS: Improd |
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| days) |  |  |  |  | CS: Good |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fixed asset turnover | 1.08 | 1.05 | 1.11 | 1.07 | TS: Stable CS: Good |
| Total asset turnover | 0.74 | 0.80 | 0.83 | 0.74 | TS: Improving CS: Good |
| Debt ratio | 0.20 | 0.20 | 0.35 | 0.30 | TS: Increasing CS: Fair |
| Debt-to-equity ratio | 0.25 | 0.27 | 0.38 | 0.39 | TS: Increasing CS: Good |
| Times interest earned ratio | 8.2 | 7.3 | 6.5 | 8.0 | TS: Deteriorating <br> CS: Poor |
| Gross profit margin | 0.30 | 0.27 | 0.25 | 0.25 | TS: Deteriorating CS: Good |
| Operating profit margin | 0.12 | 0.12 | 0.13 | 0.10 | TS: Improving CS: Good |
| Net profit margin | 0.067 | 0.067 | 0.061 | 0.058 | TS: Stable <br> CS: Good |
| Return on total assets | 0.049 | 0.054 | 0.051 | 0.043 | TS: Improving CS: Good |
| Return on common equity | 0.066 | 0.073 | 0.090 | 0.072 | TS: Improving CS: Good |
| Earnings per share | \$1.75 | \$2.20 | \$3.05 | \$1.50 | TS: Improving CS: Good |
| Price/earnings ratio | 12.0 | 10.5 | 9.0 | 11.2 | TS: Deteriorating CS: Poor |
| Market/book ratio | 1.2 | 1.05 | 0.81 | 1.10 | TS: Deteriorating <br> CS: Poor |

Liquidity: MBA Company's overall liquidity as reflected by the current ratio and quick ratio appears to have remained relatively stable but both are below the industry average. The quick ratio is particularly poor.
Activity: The activity of accounts receivable has improved, but inventory turnover has deteriorated and is currently below the industry average. It has brought its long payables down, but the average payment period is still above the industry average.
Debt: The firm's debt ratios have increased and are very close to the industry averages, indicating currently acceptable values but an undesirable trend.
Profitability: The firm's gross profit margin, while in line with the industry average, has declined, probably due to higher cost of goods sold. The operating and net profit margins have been relatively stable and are also in the range of the industry averages. Both the return on total assets and return on common equity appear to have improved slightly and are well above the industry averages. Earnings per share made a significant increase in 2009 and 2010.
Market: The price/earnings ( $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{E}$ ) ratio indicates a declining level of investor confidence in the firm's future earnings potential, perhaps due to the firm's increased debt load and higher servicing requirements. The market/book (M/B) ratio also reflects declining and below-industryaverage investor confidence in the firm in 2010.

In summary, the firm needs to attend to inventory and should not incur added debts until their leverage and interest coverage ratios are improved. Investor confidence appears to be declining.

Other than these indicators, the firm appears to be doing well-particularly in generating returns on sales.

2-20. Answer differs based upon students' choices.
2-21. Thomson One Business School Edition Problem
2-22. Thomson One Business School Edition Problem

Financial Statement and Cash Flow Analysis
Answer to mini-case:
Financial Statements for 2010:
Jaedan Industries
Income Statement
For the year ending December 31, 2010

| Sales | $\$ 42,000,000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Cost of Goods Sold | $\$ 26,460,000$ |
| Gross Profit | $\$ 15,540,000$ |
| Operating Expenses: | $\$ 1,621,000$ |
| Selling, General and Administrative | $\$ 800,000$ |
| $\quad$ Depreciation | $\$ 13,119,000$ |
| Earnings before interest and taxes | $\$ 375,200$ |
| Interest Expense | $\$ 12,743,800$ |
| Earnings before taxes | $\$ 4,332,892$ |
| Taxes | $\$ 8,410,908$ |
| Net Income | $\$ 2,102,727$ |
| Dividends paid | $\$ 6,308,181$ |

Jaedan Industries
Statement of Retained Earnings
For the year ending December 31, 2010
Retained Earnings balance from beginning of year $\$ 1,628,819$
Plus: Net Income for $2010 \quad \$ 8,410,908$
Less: Cash dividends paid during 2010
Preferred Stock \$8,000
Common Stock \$2,102,727
Total dividends paid
Retained earnings balance (December 31, 2010)
\$2,110,727
\$7,929,000

## Jaedan Industries

Balance Sheet
December 31, 2010
Assets

| Cash | $\$ 3,689,000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Marketable Securities | $\$ 1,836,000$ |
| Accounts Receivable | $\$ 5,423,000$ |
| Inventory | $\$ 4,118,000$ |
| $\quad$ Total Current Assets | $\$ 15,066,000$ |
| Fixed Assets | $\$ 14,811,000$ |
| Less: Accumulated Depreciation | $\$ 5,960,000$ |
| Net Fixed Assets | $\$ 8,851,000$ |
| $\quad$ Total Assets | $\boxed{23,917,000}$ |

Liabilities and Equity
Accounts Payable

| $\$ 3,136,000$ |
| ---: |
| $\$ 706,000$ |
| $\$ 500,000$ |
| $\$ 4,342,000$ |
| $\$ 3,046,000$ |
| $\$ 100,000$ |
| $\$ 4,000,000$ |
| $\$ 4,500,000$ |
| $\$ 7,929,000$ |
| $\$ 23,917,000$ |

Jaedan Industries
Statement of Cash Flows
For the year ended December 31, 2010
Cash flow from operating activities:
Net income \$8,410,908
Depreciation
Increase in Accounts Receivable
Increase in Inventory
\$800,000

Increase in Accounts Payable
(\$2,555,500)
(\$908,000)
Increase in Accruals
Cash provided by operating activities
$\$ 150,000$
$6,087,408$
Notes Payable
\$706,000
Accruals
Total Current Liabilities
Long-Term Bonds
Preferred Stock
Common Stock (at par)
Paid-in capital in excess of par
\$4,500,000
Retained Earnings
\$23,917,000
Total Liabilities and Equity

Cash flow from investment activities
Increase in gross fixed assets
Cash provided (consumed) by investing activities
Cash flow from financing activities

| Increase in notes payable | $\$ 22,000$ |
| :--- | ---: |
| Dividends paid: | $(\$ 8,000)$ |
| $\quad$ Preferred | $(\$ 2,102,727)$ |
| $\quad$ Common | $(\$ 2,088,727)$ |
| Cash provided by financing activities |  |

Net increase in cash and marketable securities
\$ 1,066,681.00
Free Cash Flow:
$\mathrm{OCF}=[\$ 13,119,000 \times(1-0.34)]+\$ 800,000=\$ 9,458,540$
Change in Fixed Assets $=\$ 2,932,000$
Change in Current assets $=\$ 4,530,181$
Change in Accounts Payable $=\$ 190,000$
Change in Accruals $=\$ 150,000$
FCF $=\$ 9,458,540-\$ 2,932,000-(\$ 4,530,181-\$ 190,000-\$ 150,000)=\$ 2,336,359$

Ratios:

|  | Jaedan |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | 2009 | Industry |  |  |
|  | Liquidity Ratios | 2010 | 2009 |  |$\quad 2010$

Analysis of Financial Ratios:
Liquidity Ratios: Jaedan has improved its Current Ratio to above the industry average from 2009 to 2010. Its Quick Ratio is a fair bit higher than the industry average. While it is possible to have liquidity ratios that are "too" high, suggesting that the firm should consider investing more in long-term assets, Jaedan does not appear to be in this situation.

Activity Ratios: Jaedan's Inventory Turnover was substantially higher than the Industry in 2009 but it is now slightly lower than the industry average. This suggests that is now keeping its inventory for few days more each year and it is more in line with the industry at this point. One serious problem for Jaedan is its Average Collection Period (ACP). The firm has not changed its terms of trade that it is offering its customers; however, its ACP has almost doubled. It is now substantially above the 35 days that it allows its customer before payment is due and is considerably higher than the industry average. Perhaps the firm has lowered its credit standards. At any rate, Jaedan should work on improving this situation. Additionally, Jaedan is now taking longer to pay its suppliers as the Average Payment Period has increased by approximately 4.5 days. Jaedan's suppliers offer Jaedan 45 days to pay its Accounts Payable-on average Jaedan is taking almost two weeks longer than that to pay (in 2010). This may have already resulted in a lower credit rating for the company. With respect to the turnover ratios, Jaedan has experienced a reduction. This is due, in part to the fact that Fixed Assets increased by almost $\$ 3,000,000$ to handle the increase in sales. Regardless, each dollar invested in an asset is not generating as much in revenue in 2010 as it was in 2009. Jaedan is now below the industry average for 2010.

Debt Ratios: Jaedan's Debt Ratio has decreased significantly from 2009's value; however, this is not due to the fact that the firm has significantly reduced its debt, but rather to the fact that the firm's Total Assets are substantially higher. As shown on the Statement of Cash Flows, we can see that the bulk of the firm's investment in Fixed Assets was financed with proceeds from operations rather than from financing activities. The firm's Assets-to-Equity ratio has dropped a great deal, because the firm has experienced a larger rate of growth in its Retained Earnings (due to a large Net Profit Margin and the same retention rate) than in its Total Assets. Debt-to-equity has dropped substantially from 2009 due mainly to the increase in equity from Retained Earnings. Times Interest Earned has increased due to the increased EBIT coupled with the almost negligible change in Interest Expense from 2009 to 2010. Generally speaking, Jaedan Industries is a better position with debt ratios than the industry.

Profitability Ratios: With respect to all three profit margins, Jaedan has improved in 2010 over 2009, as has the industry. Jaedan is consistently outperforming the industry in converting its sales dollars to profit. The firm's EPS has experienced a hefty increase, again due to the large increase in Net Income. Return on total assets has decreased slightly because the increase in Net Income was not as large as the increase in Total Assets. The same situation applies to Jaedan's Return on Common Equity. The opposite has occurred with the Industry.

Market Ratios: Jaedan’s stock price has risen from $\$ 42.89$ to $\$ 56.82$ from 2009 to 2010. However, both Jaedan's P/E ratio and Market/Book ratio have dropped. This suggests that the market is not willing to pay as high of a multiple over earnings or book value as they have been willing to pay in the past. Jaedan is still higher than the industry with respect to the $\mathrm{P} / \mathrm{E}$ ratio but it is now lower than the industry with respect to Market/book value.

DuPont Analysis: DuPont analysis allows us the ability to isolate why the firm's Return on Assets (ROA) changed. In Jaedan's case, ROA dropped from $36.29 \%$ to $35.13 \%$ from 2009 to 2010. As you can see from the calculations below, this is due to the lower Total Asset Turnover (TATO), as the firm's Net Profit Margin (NPM) actually increased.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{ROA}= & \text { NPM } \times \text { TATO } \\
& 2009: 0.1625 \times 2.24=36.4 \% \\
& 2010: 0.2003 \times 1.76=35.25 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

DuPont analysis also lets us determine why the firm's Return on Equity (ROE) changed. Jaedan's ROE dropped from $61.81 \%$ to $51.15 \%$. This change was mainly due to the lower assets-to-equity ratio. The firm's maintenance of approximately the same level of debt to the absolute increase in equity in a period of increasing profitability has resulted in lower ROE.

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{ROE}= & \mathrm{ROA} \times \mathrm{A} / \mathrm{E} \\
& 2009: 0.3629 \times 1.7035=61.82 \% \\
& 2010: 0.3513 \times 1.4558=51.14 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

