

**Can Mandated XBRL data be Used to Predict Earnings Direction and Create a  
Profitable Investment Strategy?**

**Industry Analysis**

Amos Baranes

Peres Academic Center

8 HaNeviim St., POB 328, Rehovot, Israel 76120

Tel: 972-54-427-9186 E-mail: [amos@drbaranes.com](mailto:amos@drbaranes.com)

Rimona Palas

Accounting Department, School of Business, College of Law and Business

#24 Ben Gurion St., Ramat Gan, Israel 5110801

Tel: 972-50-779-6793 E-mail: [rimona@clb.ac.il](mailto:rimona@clb.ac.il)

## **ABSTRACT**

The newly SEC mandated XBRL filing data provides immediate availability and easy accessibility for both researchers and investors, especially small investors, for predicting movement of future earnings and implementing investment strategies based on these predictions. The objective of this study is to examine whether the XBRL database (standardized financial reporting system) can be used with models developed in previous studies (Ou & Penman, 1989) predicting the direction of movement of earnings, and developing investment strategies. The study does not attempt to examine the validity of these models, only the ability to use the data in the analysis of financial statements based on these models.

The study analyzes NYSE companies' XBRL quarterly data, from 2011 to 2015, using a two-step Logit regression model. The model is then used to arrive at the probability of the directional movement of earnings between current quarter and subsequent quarter, adjusted for a drift. Additional models are created by dividing the sample into industry membership (based on SIC codes).

The results classified the companies as ones that would realize an increase in earnings or a decrease in earnings. The final model indicated a significant ability to predict subsequent earnings changes. The predictions appear to be correct on average about 70.7% of the time, for the entire model and 72.3% when the models are created based on industry classification (higher than those of previous studies based on COMPUSTAT).

The investment strategy created a quarterly return of 3.0% for the entire sample and 4.0% when the investment portfolio was divided into different industries.

These results suggest that XBRL data can be used as a means for forecasting movements in earnings, and creating a profitable investment strategy.

**Key words:** accounting information, earnings prediction, investment strategy, XBRL, industry analysis

## **INTRODUCTION**

The ability to predict earnings based on past performance has been recognized as a measure of earnings quality (Penman and Zhang 2002) and while Ball and Shivakumar (2008) conclude that earnings announcements provide only a modest amount of new information to the share market, Bloomfield, Libby and Nelson (2003) show that investors over rely on old earnings performance when predicting future earnings performance.

These studies highlight the necessity to develop a tool to better predict future earnings and help develop various investment strategies.

This study does not attempt to provide better or newer financial statement analysis tools or investment strategies than previous studies, but rather examine the use of a new data base.

While most of the previous studies use data available on COMPUSTAT, this study uses data directly reported by companies in XBRL format, which is freely available immediately after reporting to the SEC.

Many research papers have concentrated on the importance of earnings announcements and forecasts in the determination of investment decisions. While earlier research has only been able to show relatively low informativeness of earnings (Ball and Brown 1968; Beaver, 1968; Foster, Olsen and Shevlin 1984; and Bernard and Thomas 1990) later studies were able to show the incremental information content of specific components of the financial statements. For example, Finger (1994) shows that earnings provide information for future earnings and cash flows. Ou (1990) and Ou and Penman (1989) predict sign changes in the earnings per

share using forecasting models developed from various income statement and balance sheet components. Shroff (1999) assesses the predictive ability of a "composite" model, which forecasts as a function of current earnings and current security prices, against three univariate benchmarks: a random walk model, a random walk with drift model, and a first order autoregressive/moving average (ARIMA) model. The findings indicate that the composite model obtains significantly lower forecast errors relative to the benchmark models.

Roychowdhury and Sletten (2012) find that earnings informativeness is higher in bad-news periods than in good-news periods. Alam and Brown (2006) were able to show that disaggregated earnings data were better able to predict next period's earnings in the banking industry.

Ou and Penman (1989) were the first researchers to focus on the usefulness of accounting information to predict the direction of movement of earnings relative to trend adjusted current earnings. The study is important because it evaluates whether accounting information can consequently be used as the basis for a profitable investment strategy. Given investors' reliance on earnings this could be a valuable tool for a profitable investment strategy. The authors found that financial statement analysis can provide a measure that is an indicator of future earnings which in turn is used as a successful investment strategy. However, the evidence from subsequent studies (Holthausen and Larker 1992; Bernard et al. 1997; Stober 1992; Setiono and Strong 1998; and Bird, Gerlach and Hall 2001) has been mixed.

Holthausen and Larker (1992) suggest that a better strategy, yielding higher returns would be one that is based on an economic concept, such as the industry the company is traded in. Lee (1985) proposes that statistical inferences from financial data depend on the ability to normalize the information and indicates that a major control factor is industry membership.

One objective of this study is to repeat the original Ou and Penman (1989) study over a more recent time period, and based on industry membership, examining its use as a tool for

investment decisions. However, the main objective is to examine the methodology using, not the original COMPUSAT database, but the XBRL database. XBRL (eXtensible Business Reporting Language) is a freely available and global standard for exchanging business information. XBRL allows the expression of semantic meaning commonly required in business reporting. One use of XBRL is to define and exchange financial information, such as financial statements.

The SEC has created the XBRL U.S. GAAP Financial Reporting Taxonomy. This taxonomy is a collection of accounting data concepts and rules that enables companies to present their financial reports electronically. The SEC's deployment was launched in 2008 in phases, and all public U.S. GAAP companies were required to file their financial reports using the XBRL reporting technology starting from June 15, 2011.

Despite the fact that COMPUSTAT has been a popular source of financial information for both academics and practitioners, it is costly while XBRL filings are freely available. XBRL filings also have a time advantage, although they are published concurrently with the related PDF versions, it takes an average of 14 weekdays from the time a company files with the SEC for that data to appear in COMPUSTAT (D'Souza, Ramesh, and Shen. 2010), XBRL data is immediately available. In addition, the reliability of COMPUSTAT has also been questioned, prior studies have shown that COMPUSTAT data may differ from the original corporate financial data (San Miguel 1977; Kinney and Swanson 1993; Tallapally, Luehlfiing, and Motha 2011) and data found in other accounting databases (Rosenberg and Houglet 1974; Yang, Vasarhelyi and Liu 2003).

However, while there is still not enough research regarding the reliability of XBRL data, studies up to date seem positive: Boritz and No (2013) find that when examining the quality of interactive data XBRL tagged information it is the most complete and most accurate source of company data compared with COMPUSTAT, Yahoo Finance and Google Finance; Chychyla

and Kogan (2015), although did not attempt to compare COMPUSTAT and XBRL 10-K reports, found that COPUSTAT significantly alters numbers reported on the 10-K filings; and Heselmann, Heselmann, Ditter and Scherr (2015) suggest that XBRL analysis is a useful tool in assessing irregularities in accounting data.

Vasarhelyi, Chan and Krahel (2012) made suggestions for new research opportunities as a result of the evolving XBRL technology. Their suggestion was to examine whether findings from prior research that relied on private vendor databases (such as COMPUSTAT), if replicated, will still hold using XBRL database. This paper is an attempt to follow their suggestion, and examine the ability of earnings to indicate future earnings.

Recently there have been studies attempting to assess the usefulness of XBRL filing data in predicting future earnings (Williamsm 2015, Baranes and Palas, 2017) however, their database was limited as were the results. The current study is an attempt to utilize the XBRL database in financial analysis, prediction of future earnings, on a much larger scale which is more representative of the market. The XBRL data, filed by all NYSE traded companies, is used to replicate the same methodology used by Ou and Penman (1989).

These studies suggest that not only can XBRL data be an important tool for researchers, but may also be a more efficient tool for investors, given the timeliness of the data, and especially smaller investors, given the low cost.

The paper is organized as follows, the second section reviews academic literature evaluating Ou and Penman (1989) and subsequent studies and examining research conducted on the validity of XBRL as a means for data. The third section outlines the method employed and the data used. Section four presents and discusses the results for the model developed to forecast future movements in earnings, in terms of accuracy, for both the entire sample and based on industry disaggregation. The fifth sections develops and presents the results of the investment

and strategy based on the models developed in section four. The last section concludes the paper.

## **ACADEMIC RESEARCH**

In this section will be presented a review of relevant literature on two issues: the validity of XBRL as a means for data comparison and an evaluation of the Ou and Penman (1989) study and subsequent studies on earnings prediction. The two issues will be examined separately.

### **Validity of XBRL**

Extensible Business Reporting Language (XBRL) is a business and financial reporting technology that is being implemented to enhance internal and external reporting, electronic filing, and sharing of information.

Beginning in 2009 the SEC requires that all publicly traded companies must submit financial reports in a standardized structure using XBRL to the Electronic Data Gathering, Analysis, and Retrieval (EDGAR) system under a three-year phase-in schedule. In the first phase, as of June 15, 2009 large accelerated filers that have a worldwide public common equity float above \$5 billion as of the end of the second fiscal quarter of the most recently completed fiscal year, and who prepare their financial statements according to U.S. GAAP (Generally Accepted Accounting Principles), are subject to XBRL quarterly filings. In the second phase, as of June 15, 2010 all other large accelerated filers are required to comply. In the last phase, which started on June 15, 2011, all remaining filers, including smaller reporting companies, are required to file XBRL quarterly reports as an exhibit to the traditional filings (SEC 2009).

The novelty of the XBRL structured financial reports is that the reporting content is marked up with standardized elements (XBRL tags) from a publicized list of pre-defined items (XBRL taxonomy). For example, the 2013 U.S. GAAP taxonomy contain approximately 19,000 XBRL tags that allow the user to easily extract the desired information for analysis purposes.

Literature suggests that there are several advantages of using SEC XBRL filings both for the adopting companies as well as the capital markets and research:

The XBRL structure enables unique identification and reliable extraction of accounting numbers from the financial reports – additional information comes tagged and there are no distortions due to the use of different display formats (Henselmann et al, 2015).

There is no deviation from the expected digit distribution due to differences between varying database providers (Henselmann et al. 2015).

XBRL has the potential to streamline internal accounting practices leading to cost savings and improved efficiency and effectiveness in the accounting and finance function as well as enhanced internal control leading to cost savings and improved efficiency (Amrhein, Farewell and Pinsker 2010).

The aim of the SEC XBRL mandate is to decrease information asymmetry by improving the information processing capability of regulatory filings (SEC 2009). XBRL-structured SEC filings are expected to improve data gathering and analyses by reducing manual data entries, and bringing all filings to a "common ground". Although early research has found inconsistencies, errors, or unnecessary extensions in the XBRL filings (Debreceeny et al. 2011; Du, Vasarhelyi and Zheng 2013) more recent studies found XBRL data to be not only with less errors than other forms of data, but to also provide higher quality information.

Boritz and No (2013) compared XBRL data filed with the SEC with the data provided by three data aggregators: COMPUSTAT, Google Finance, and Yahoo Finance. Their results find a significant rate of omission of more than 50% in the financial statement items provided by the aggregators compared with the interactive SEC XBRL data. For items that are not omitted they find between 5-8% mismatches, with approximately 56% differences being greater than conventional materiality. The implications of their study is that XBRL information is the most complete and most accurate source of company data.



Chychyla and Kogan (2015) found that the values reported in COMPUSTAT significantly differ from the values reported in XBRL SEC filings. Although they do not attempt to compare COMPUSTAT and XBRL SEC filings they find that COMPUSTAT significantly alters numbers reported, specifically 17 (out of 30) variables reported by COMPUSTAT are differ from values reported by XBRL SEC filings. They were able to demonstrate how XBRL data can be utilized in an automated large-scale fashion to extract and process commonly used accounting numbers.

Liu and O'Farrel (2013) examine the ability of XBRL data in terms of improving transparency and quality of financial accounting information as proxiedby forecast accuracy. Their results found a significant improvement in analyst forecast accuracy since XBRL mandates.

Henselmann et. al (2015) state that the XBRL data may provide the SEC and investors a simple measure to flag financial reports carrying higher probability of human interaction. Their study, which was based on XBRL 10-K filings submitted to the SEC between July 2009 and March 2013, measured a firm-year-level of abnormal digit frequency and explored its association with earnings quality. Their findings are consistent with the underlying assumption that higher manipulation of earnings is reflected in higher irregularities in the frequency of digits in accounting numbers reported in the financial reports, which may indicate lower earnings quality.

Although XBRL data and its study is still at the early stage these studies suggest that XBRL data is a useful and accurate tool for financial statement analysis and may be used to predict the direction of future movement in earnings.

## **Evaluation of the Ou and Penman (1989) and Consequent Studies**

### **Ou and Penman (1989)**

Ou and Penman (1989) is considered a foundation paper in accounting research literature (cited 124 times according to PROQUEST) because they were the first to focus on the usefulness of accounting information to predict the direction of the movement of earnings relative to trend adjusted current earnings.

Using an extensive financial statement analysis (68 accounting variables) the study modeled the direction of movements (increase/ decrease) in earnings per share (EPS) one year out. The sample was obtained from the 1984 COMPUSTAT annual report files and the study was conducted in several stages. In the first stage a chi-squared test was applied to a univariate LOGIT estimation and conducted for 68 accounting variables using annual report data over the period 1965-1972 and then again over the period 1973-1977. In both periods 34 (50%) of the coefficients estimated had p-values less than 0.10. In the second stage a multivariate model was used, on the variables found in the first stage, using a step-wise procedure, deleting descriptors not significant at the 0.10 level with all other descriptors included. In this stage, stage two, additional descriptors were dropped resulting in a model with 16 explanatory variables (for the 1965-1972 period) and 18 variables (for the 1973-1977 period). The results of both time periods were then used to forecast the probability of a company's EPS lying above its trend-adjusted EPS in each of the years from 1973-1983. The companies were classified with a probability above 0.5 (the test was then repeated with  $p > 0.6$ ) as one that would realize an increase in EPS or a company with a probability below 0.5 (the test was then repeated with  $p < 0.4$ ) as one that would realize a decrease in EPS.

Although the two models only had 6 descriptors which appear in both time periods, many of the descriptors captured similar operating characteristics. For example, inventories, sales and

deflated earnings appear in more than one descriptor. The two models classified the firms consistently 78.7% of the time (for a classification of above or below 0.5).

The results of the final models' indicated a significant ability of the descriptors to jointly describe subsequent earnings changes. The  $\chi^2_1$  values from the 2X2 contingency table are highly significant and the predictions appear to be correct about 60% of the time for a probability cutoff of (0.5, 0.5) and 66% of the time for a (0.6, 0.4) cutoff.

Ou and Penman (1989) continued to develop a trading strategy based on these predictions. Stocks were assigned long and short investment positions based on their probability. They purchased an equally weighted portfolio of all stocks whose estimated probability was in excess of 0.6 (long position), and sold an equally weighted portfolio of all stocks whose probability was below 0.4 (short position). This strategy realized a return of 8.3% over a one year holding period, an incremental 5.7% in the second year, and 5.5% in the third year.

### **Replication of Ou and Penman (1989)**

There have been many replications of the Ou and Penman (1989) study over different time periods, different countries, different industries, in comparison with analysts' predictions, and with additional methodologies, with mixed results.

Holthausen and Larker (1992) reexamined Ou and Penman (1989) using a different time period (1978-1988), including Over-the-Counter firms, and using only 60 of the original 68 ratios.

The study estimated four different logit model (two exchanges: NYSE/AMEX and OTC, and two time periods: 1973-1977 and 1978-1982) which retained 15 ratios (the original Ou and Penman 1989 study had 18 ratios). The correlation in the probability scores between the 1973-1977 model and the 1978-1982 model for NYSE/AMEX (OTC) firms was 0.70 (0.58). The predictive ability of their models were qualitatively similar (to Ou and Penman, 1989), using a cut-off of 0.5 the overall accuracy is 60.1% (compared to 60%) and using cut-offs of 0.4 and

0.6 had an overall predictive accuracy of 65.0% (compared to 67%). However, the profitability of the trading strategy realized little value added over the period of their study; that is the Ou and Penman (1989) strategy worked well in the 1978-1982 period (a common period for both studies) regardless of exchange with an excess return varying from 6.9% to 10.3% (8.0% to 11.4% on OTC firms). However, the strategy performed poorly in the 1983-1988 period, where returns were negative (ranging from -4% to -5%) regardless of the exchange.

Bernard et. al (1997) replicated the Ou and Penman (1989) study using the same logit model to make predictions for the same years (1973-1977 and 1978-1983) and re-estimate logit model (using their approach over a previous estimation period) to produce probabilities for earnings increase for the 1984-1988 and 1989-1992 periods. The mean profitability of their investment strategies produced excess return of 4.74% in the first year and 1.24% in the second year.

Stober (1992) compared the Ou and Penman (1989) model prediction ability to that of analysts' forecasts of earnings. Using the same time period as Ou and Penman (1989) they found that the model accurately predicts the signs of one-year-ahead EPS 46% of the time, analysts' forecasts are correct about 54% of the time but a combined model correctly predicted the sign 78% of the time.

Setiono and Strong (1998) examined the Ou and Penman (1989) model using a UK sample over a period from 1980 to 1988 and found that a portfolio based on the forecasted probabilities realized abnormal returns.

Bird et al. (2001) extended the Ou and Penman (1989) model by covering a later time period (the years 1983-1997) and by encompassing the UK and Australian markets in addition to the US market. Their results found 12 variables (compared to Ou and Penman (1989) 18) and using a cut-off of 0.5 showed an accuracy of 57.5%- 62% (compared to 60%) and using cut-offs of 0.4 and 0.6 had an average predictive accuracy of 60.5%-66.5% (compared to 67%) depending on the country examined. Similar to the finding of Holthausen and Larker (1992) for

the period 1983-1988, their investment strategy, based on the Ou and Penman (1989) model yielded negative returns.

### **Earnings Prediction Based on Industry Analysis**

There is economic sense, and research evidence, that industry membership affects the way financial data represents the company's financial and operating activities. In practice, auditors compare client performance indicators as ratios industry standards to help evaluate risk (Winograd, Gerson and Berlin, 2000). Lee (1985) finds that controlling for industry is meaningful in financial statement comparisons, and Cairney and Fletcher (2009) suggest that companies grouped based on SIC codes display homogenous characteristics.

Examining the impact of industry on the ability to predict earnings is largely unaddressed in the literature. Jordan, Clark and Donald (2009) examined specific industries by applying a simple regression analysis to each of 25 of the variables used by Ou and Penman (1989) in order to explain variations in the E/P ratios of publicly traded oil and gas firms during the years 2005-2006. Their results showed that three independent variables were significant in relation to the E/P ratio when examined individually and remain statistically significant when combined in a multiple regression model. The model was able to explain almost 62% of the variation in firms' E/P ratios.

Alam and Brown (2006) examined the ability of disaggregated earnings to predict ROE in the banking industry. The results show that the mean adjusted R-square significantly increased from 0.576 to 0.623 with the progressive disaggregation of earnings during the years 1979-1996. The results also demonstrate that disaggregated components are better able to predict next period earnings than aggregated earnings.

All of these studies suggest that while there might be validity to using financial information to predicting earnings a more finely tuned and timely tool is necessary.

### **Replication of the Ou and Penman (1989) study using XBRL**

As stated, the study of XBRL is still in the early stages, however, there have been a couple of attempts to use XBRL data in replicating Ou and Penman (1989) and predict changes in earnings.

Williams (2015) investigated whether XBRL company filings, filed in the years 2007-2009 may be used in models attempting to predict future earnings. The study examined whether 70 accounting concepts, extracted from S&P 500 companies XBRL filings, provided adequate data needed to create earnings prediction models (Ou and Penman, 1989; Abarbanell and Bushee, 1998) and what modifications would make XBRL much more useful. The findings of the study were that XBRL filings, during the investigated period, could not be used to create earnings prediction models; however, adjusting the data, by populating any missing accounting concepts, was shown to be more useful.

Baranes and Palas (2017), reexamined the usefulness of XBRL S&P 500 company filings in the prediction of future earnings, in the years 2011-2015. Their results show that these filings, without any modifications, were not only useful in predicting future earnings changes, based on the Ou and Penman (1989) model, but provided better predictions than previous models using COMPUSTAT data.

These recent studies suggest that XBRL filings may be used in to predict future earnings changes.

The current study attempts to expand the above mentioned research by widening the data size and using a large scale data base of XBRL filings to examine its usefulness in predicting future earnings changes.

## **DATA AND METHOD**

### **XBRL**

XBRL uses meta information to describe data items and link them together through various relationships. In order for the data to be compared across companies the same taxonomy must be used by all filers. Therefore, the SEC has created the XBRL U.S. GAAP Financial Reporting Taxonomy. This taxonomy defines common rules on how to present standard accounting information in XBRL filings. For companies that wish to file information that is not standard (company specific filings) may do so through extensions. Extensions are an important part of XBRL filings that provide additional reporting flexibility, however Debreceeny et al. (2011) found that 40 percent of all extensions were unnecessary because the corresponding elements exist in the U.S. GAAP Financial Reporting Taxonomy.

The quarterly financial data was obtained using XBRL Analyst; an Excel plugin that allows users to access the company's XBRL tagged data from its XBRL SEC filing via the XBRL US database. Using this software not only allows for easy access and analysis of the data but also for the calculation of any missing balances. For example, the balance reported in each XBRL filing for total liabilities is not available on the original XBRL filing but is extracted and calculated on the XBRL Analyst. An accounting element may not be available due several reasons: the preparer erroneously marked the information, the SEC's taxonomy did not permit or require this balance.

### **Data**

The sample is of all companies traded on the NYSE on Q1, 2016 who filed with the SEC financial statements in XBRL format. Since all of these firms were required to report using XBRL by June 15, 2011 (see validity of XBRL), this ensured that the longest time frame could be used for the analysis. The data is from quarterly filings from 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2011 to 3<sup>rd</sup> quarter of 2016 (23 quarters).

Of the 2,785 tickers listed on the NYSE 394 tickers were for companies that had more than one security and were therefore eliminated from the sample. 538 companies did not have complete financial information in XBRL format. 197 companies were financial institutions (SIC codes 6000-6500, excluding SIC code 6324), because their disclosure and presentations standards differ from other types of companies, and similar to other studies (Williams, 2015), they were eliminated from the sample.

The final sample included 1,656 companies (59.5% of all tickers listed) that were traded on the NYSE on Q1, 2016. The final sample is compatible with previous research using XBRL, Williams (2015) sample included 296 companies (59.2%), and Baranes and Palas (2017) sample included 343 companies (68.6%) of the total population of S&P 500 companies. Table 1 lists descriptive data for these companies.

**Table 1 -** descriptive data for the study sample

		N	Frequency	Percent
Size (Revenues)	< \$100,000,000	1,656	435	26.25
	\$100,000,000-\$500,000,000	1,656	492	29.69
	\$500,000,000-\$1,000,000,000	1,656	258	15.57
	\$1,000,000,000-\$10,000,000,000	1,656	411	24.80
	\$10,000,000,000-\$100,000,000,000	1,656	59	3.56
	>\$100,000,000,000	1,656	1	0.06
Industry (SIC Code)	Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing (01-09)	1,656	3	0.18
	Mining (10-14)	1,656	142	8.57
	Construction (15-17)	1,656	38	2.29
	Manufacturing (20-39)	1,656	609	36.75
	Transportation, Communications, Electric, Gas and Sanitary Services (40-49)	1,656	207	12.49
	Wholesale Trade (50-51)	1,656	54	3.28
	Retail Trade (52-59)	1,656	113	6.82
	Real Estate (60-67)	1,656	231	13.94



	Services (70-89)	1,656	259	15.63
	Public Administration (91-99)	1,656	0	0.00

In the attempt to duplicate the Ou and Penman (1989) study as closely as possible 58 variables were at first used from the original 68 variables. The variables not included in the first elimination phase were those who were not available for a large number of companies (200 or more). In the second elimination phase, for each model, every company that had less than 35% of the variables missing was removed, and in the last elimination phase every variable which had more than 15% missing data points was eliminated. This left 45 variables for the entire sample (Appendix 1) and a different number of variables for each industry (Table 3).

## Method

Similar to the Ou and Penman (1989) method, a two-step approach was used to develop the model. In the first step a logistic regression univariate model was used to evaluate the significance of each explanatory variable. Only variables which were found to be associated significantly (at a 10% level) with the direction of earnings per share, above the drift, were maintained (Appendix 1). The drift term was estimated as the mean earnings per share change over the four prior quarters to the estimated quarter (see Ou and Penman, 1989).

In the second step, a stepwise logistic regression model was used to determine the variables to be included in the final model. A two-ways (backward and forward) process of adding and removing variables to minimize the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC) measure of goodness of fit was used and implemented with the R software version 3.2.2. As discussed in Burnham and Anderson (2004) the AIC measure has several advantages over the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC). The first part of the process (backwards) involved a cycle of including all the remaining variables in a single regression, and then progressively removing those that did not prove significant based on the AIC measure of goodness. The same process was repeated

(forward) by starting with one variable, measuring the AIC and then adding another variable. A variable was considered insignificant if the total AIC score of the model increased by adding another variable.

A different model was developed for each of the quarters for which a forecast was made, using quarterly data from the previous three years of observations – for example, the forecast period for Q3, 2015, is Q2, 2013 to Q2, 2015. This approach deviates from the method used by Ou and Penman (1989), who used the same model to arrive at a probability of the directional movement in EPS for all subsequent periods. The method adopted was the one used by Bird et al. (2001), who developed a different model for each of the periods the forecasts were made.

The logistic models, were then used to provide a forecast of the probability that the company's EPS for the next quarter will be above its current EPS. Based on these probabilities the stock can be classified. A company stock is assigned to a 'long' position (EPS are expected to increase) if the probability is greater than 0.6, and to a 'short' position (EPS are expected to decrease) if the probability is less 0.4.

The same methodology used for the total sample was then used for the industry analysis. The sample was divided into ten industries based on SIC codes (Table 1). Two industries, Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing (SIC codes 01-09), and Public Administration (SIC codes 91-99) were eliminated because of the small number of companies.

## MODELS FOR THE TOTAL SAMPLE

In the first run all 45 variables were used (see appendix 1), a list of the variables found significant in each model is presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Results of the logistic regressions for predicting Q2 2015 through Q1 2016

Variables	Q3/2015	Q4/2015	Q1/2016	Q2/2016
Change Net Profit Margin	-0.005419	-0.005450	-0.003452	-0.022687

Change in Working Capital / Total Assets	-0.003015	-0.003091	-0.002646	
Change Long Term Debt / Equity		-0.000135	-0.000125	-0.000146
Change Pre Tax Income/Sales			-0.007758	-0.001104
Change EBITDA/Sales			-0.000352	-0.003429
Sales / Accounts Receivables		0.000215		
Net Profit Margin	-0.001043			
Change in Capital Expenditure / Total Assets				-0.000056
Accuracy %	86.67%	66.67%	52.63%	76.92%

The number of variables found significant in the different models range from 3 to 5 (an average of 4.25) for each model, the total number of variables found significant for all models is 8. Ou and Penman (1989) found between 16-18 variables, Bird et al. (2001) found 12 to 18 variables, and Baranes and Palas (2017) found 3-9 variables. Only one of the variables (Change in Net Profit Margin) was common for all the models, two variables (Change in Working Capital to Total assets and Change in Long Term Debt to Equity) was common to three of the four models, two variables (Change in Pretax Income to Sales and Change in EBITDA to Sales) was common to two of the models, and the other three variables were specific to only one model.

While the variable common to all models, Change in Net Profit Margin, does not appear in either Ou and Penman (1989) model or Bird et al. (2001) models, the other prominent variables (variables which appear in more than one model), appear in some of the models described.

### **The Model Forecasts**

The accuracy of the forecasts are judged on the basis of the percentage of companies classified as 'long' that actually experienced an increase in EPS and those classified as 'short' that actually experience a decrease in EPS. The accuracy of the models (presented in Table 2) ranges between 53% - 87%, with an average of 70.7%. These results are better than those presented by

Ou and Penman (1989) which averaged 67% and those of Bird et al. (2001) which ranged between 60-67%.

### **MODELS BASED ON INDUSTRY**

For the Industry analysis a list of significant variables was found for each industry. Only those variables which were found significant for 3-4 of the quarterly models, are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: The significant variables in each industry

	Total Sample	Mining (10-14)	Construction (15-17)	Manufacturing (20-39)	Transportation, Communications, Electric, Gas and Sanitary Services (40-49)	Wholesale Trade (50-51)	Retail Trade (52-59)	Real Estate (60-67)	Services (70-89)
Number of variables in each industry	8	14	4	12	12	6	10	13	8
Sales / Total Assets								X	
Sales / Accounts Receivables	X								
Change in Gross Profit Margin				X					
Change in Operating Income/ Total Assets								X	
Net Profit Margin	X	X	X	X				X	X
Change Net Profit Margin	X				X	X			
ROA				X	X			X	
Pre Tax Income/Sales		X							
Change Pre Tax Income/Sales	X			X			X		X
Change EBITDA/Sales	X							X	X
ROCE		X	X					X	X
Change in ROCE								X	
Depreciation / PP&E						X	X		
Change Depreciation / PP&E					X				X
Change in Capital Expenditure / Total Assets	X								
Quicke Ratio									X
Working Capital/ Total Assets					X				
Change Working Capital							X		
Change in Working Capital / Total Assets	X								
Change Inventory				X			X		

Change Days in Accounts Recv									X
Change Long Term Debt / Equity	X								
Change Total Debt / Equity								X	
Change in Equity / Fixed Assets					X				
Accuracy %	70.72%	75.57%	73.50%	66.03%	69.47%	63.75%	73.45%	80.30%	76.14%

The total number of variables found significant in the different industries range from 4 to 13 for each industry, the total number of variables found significant for the entire sample is 8. Only two of the variables (ROA and Change in Pretax Income/Sales) are common to four industries, and only Change in Pretax Income/Sales is also common to the total sample.

These results suggest that different industries have very different characteristics which are represented in different model for each industry.

### **The Model Forecasts**

The average accuracy of the quarterly models for each industry (presented in Table 3) range between 64% and 80% with an average of 72.3%. These results are better than for the entire sample (an average of 70.7%) and are much better than those presented by Ou and Penman (1989) and those of Bird et al. (2001).

## **INVESTMENT STRATEGY**

Despite the fact that previous studies found mixed results as to the relationship between earnings prediction and return on investment, this study does attempt to examine whether earnings forecasts can be used as an investment strategy which will provide better returns than a price based strategy. The investment strategy was implemented as follows:

- i. For each of the four models Q3 2015-Q2 2016, stocks are assigned to investment positions 45 days after the end of the quarter for which the accounting ratios were reported (Table 2 for the entire sample and Table 3 for industry models). It is assumed that quarterly report information from XBRL is available at this time.
- ii. Stocks are purchased (long position) if the probability is greater than 0.6 and sold (short position) if the probability is less than or equal to 0.4, values between these cutoff points are ignored.

- iii. Stocks are held for a period of 1 quarter and mean return differences to the long and short positions are observed at the end of the quarter. Mean returns for the short position are adjusted to a positive return.

The return for each quarter for the entire sample (Return on investment strategy – Table 4) is calculated as the addition of mean returns for the long (Return on Long Strategy – Table 4) and short (Return on Short Strategy – Table 4) of the position.

The first run results yielded very high quarterly returns (some above 100%). After an examination of the original data it was concluded that because of the small size of the portfolios, companies with a very large increase in their price between one quarter and the next, had a very strong effect on the results. A second run was done, this time after the deletion of outliers, companies with an increase of more than 500% or a decrease of more than 80% in their share price between one quarter and the next. The results of the second run are presented in Tables 4 and 5.

The investment portfolios, based on the earnings prediction models for the whole sample (Table 4 – Return on Investment Strategy), yielded quarterly returns between negative 8.3% and positive 15.4% for all periods, with an average quarterly return of 3.0%. The long strategy (Table 4 – Return on Long Strategy) provided higher returns, an average of 4.5% than the short strategy (Table 4 – Return on Short Strategy) with an average of 2.6%. These quarterly return results have a very high variability, and while it should be noted that the volatility of the market at the time was higher than usual (see Appendix 1), the validity of these results should be examined further, in less volatile periods.

In order to examine the validity of the results two different benchmark investment strategies were used. The first strategy examined the average return on all companies used in the development of the different models (Table 4 – Return on all shares). The second strategy examines the average return for investing long on all companies in the portfolio (created by the



prediction models), all companies with a probability below 0.4 and above 0.6 (Table 4 – Return on Portfolio without strategy). These two strategies represent an investment portfolio without an investment strategy, or any attempt to look at the specific information of the companies. These two benchmark investment portfolios yielded lower average quarterly return 0.15% (Return on all shares) and negative 1.1% (Return on Portfolio without strategy), than the investment strategy based on the model.

Table 4: Returns from investment in stocks on the basis of estimated probability of an earnings change.

<b><u>0.4 &lt; Probability &lt; 0.6</u></b>									
Time Period	N	Return on all Shares	Portfolio Size	Return on Portfolio Without Strategy	N Long Strategy	Return on Long Strategy	N Short Strategy	Return on Short Strategy	Return on Investment Strategy
Q3 2015	1,524	-0.0608	15	-0.0916	9	-0.0885	6	0.0928	0.0043
Q4 2015	1,368	-0.1127	18	-0.2339	9	-0.2850	9	0.2017	-0.0833
Q1 2016	1,150	0.1471	19	0.2487	12	0.3269	7	-0.1733	0.1536
Q2 2016	1,432	0.0856	39	0.0342	18	0.0646	21	-0.0194	0.0452
Average	1,369	0.0148	23	-0.0107	12	0.0045	11	0.0255	0.0300

The results for the investment strategy based on the industry models is presented in Table 5.

These investment portfolios, yielded quarterly returns (Table 5 – Return on Investment Strategy), between negative 4.6% (in the Real Estate industry) and positive 34.6% (in the Wholesale Trade industry), with an average of 4.0 % (compared to 3.0% for the total sample). The long strategy provided higher returns (average of 6.0%) than the short strategy (average of negative 0.5%).

These results also incur high variability and should be examined during less volatile times.

Table 5: Returns from investment in stocks on the basis of estimated probability of an earnings change per industry

	Total Sample	Average Return for all industries	Mining (10-14)	Construction (15-17)	Manufacturing (20-39)	Transportation, Communication, Electric, Gas and Sanitary Services (40-49)	Wholesale Trade (50-51)	Retail Trade (52-59)	Real Estate (60-67)	Services (70-89)
Return on Long Investment Strategy	0.0045	0.0596	0.0123	0.0415	-0.0058	-0.0524	0.4695	0.0109	0.0204	-0.0195
Return on Short Investment Strategy	0.0255	-0.0055	0.0324	-0.0241	-0.0159	0.0165	-0.0086	0.0260	-0.0668	-0.0032
Return on Investment Strategy	0.0300	0.0397	0.0447	0.0174	-0.0216	-0.0360	0.3457	0.0369	-0.0464	-0.0227
Average Portfolio Size	23	41	45	17	164	39	5	42	39	12
Number of companies used in model	1369	168	110	30	514	169	48	99	117	213
Percentage of Portfolio size	1.68%	27.50%	41.14%	55.46%	31.81%	23.11%	9.90%	41.81%	33.26%	5.51%

It should also be noted that the benchmark investment strategies portfolios yielded lower quarterly return rates than those of the model based investment strategies.

Although analysis by industry did present an improvement in the predictive ability of the models and the profitability of the investment strategy, a more significant improvement could be viewed in the portfolio size created by each model. Percentage of companies that were assigned a probability position and created the industry specific investment portfolio, ranges between 5.5% and 55.5%, with an average of 27.5%, this percentage is much larger than the average portfolio in the total sample which is 1.68% (the largest portfolio in the total sample is 2.7%). The implication of this analysis is that models created per industry can classify a larger number of companies and predict for them the direction of earnings.

In conclusion, earnings prediction, based on XBRL filings data, provide a basis for a profitable investment strategy, adding industry analysis improves not only profitability but also the model's ability to classify more companies based on earnings prediction change.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

The focus of this study has been to examine previously researched earning prediction models utilizing the newly mandated accounting data format of XBRL (replicating the Ou and Penman,1989 study and the Bird et al. 2001 study). The use of XBRL allows not only easier and less costly access to the data but also the ability to adjust the models almost immediately as current information is posted, thus providing a much more relevant tool for investors, and especially small investors.

The findings of the study suggest that XBRL data can be used in a large scale financial statement analysis, for both research and investment, as viable data source. The models developed provided a higher accuracy rate than that of previous studies (Ou and Penman,1989; Bird et al.

2001, and others). This accuracy rate was further increased once the analysis was disseminated into industry portfolios.

The investment strategy (Ou and Penman, 1989), based on the prediction models, contributed a larger abnormal return than other investment strategies, not based on any prediction model. .

Since previous studies provide mixed results as to the effectiveness of the investment strategy (Holthausen and Larker, 1992), it is difficult to compare the results to other studies.

Disaggregating the portfolios, based on industry membership, not only improved quarterly profitability by 1%, it also improved the prediction accuracy of the models (from 70.7% to 72.3%) and it increased the number of companies which the model was able to classify (long and short position) from an average of 1.68% to an average of 27.5%.

This study contributes to previous research by expanding the scope of XBRL filings data used to NYSE company filings. The attempt of the study is not to examine the validity of the prediction and investment models presented, but to see if XBRL data filings may be used in this type of financial statement analysis. Although the results seem promising, there are still limitations which need to be further explored.

One limitation is the relatively short time period data (from 2011) of the SEC XBRL mandate. The short time period not only limits the amount of data available but may also cause other problems such as inconsistencies, errors, or unnecessary extensions in the XBRL filings (Debreceeny et al. 2011; Du et al. 2013). However, given that there are indications that XBRL quality increases over time (Du et al. 2013), the methodology may be tested again in the future.

Another limitation is the portfolio size of the final prediction model, although industry disaggregation increased portfolio size to an average of 27.5% companies classified, it is still a smaller number of companies than those classified by previous studies (Ou and Penman, 1989 were able to classify an average of 50% of companies examined). Although this is not

necessarily a problem for investors because, as suggested by Ou and Penman (1989), a smaller portfolio may yield higher returns, this might suggest that the ability of XBRL data to be used in financial statement analysis may be limited.

There are several possible extensions of this study among them increasing the data size, developing methods of populating missing components and implementing more advance methodologies for the ratio analysis. The passage of time, which will allow higher quality filings will also enhance the use of the XBRL data.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- barbanell, J. S. and B. J. Bushee. 1998. "Abnormal Returns to a Fundamental Analysis Strategy." *The Accounting Review* 73 (1): 19-45.
- Alam, P. and C. A. Brown. 2006. "Disaggregated Earnings and the Prediction of ROE and Stock Prices: A Case of the Banking Industry." *Review of Accounting & Finance* 5 (4): 443-463.
- Amrhein, D. G., S. Farewell, and R. Pinsker. 2009. "REA and XBRL GL: Synergies for the 21st Century Business Reporting System." *International Journal of Digital Accounting Research* 9: 127-152.
- Ball, R. and P. Brown. 1968. "An Empirical Evaluation of Accounting Income Numbers." *Journal of Accounting Research* 6, no. 2: 159-178.
- Ball, R. and L. Shivakumar. 2008. "How Much New Information Is There in Earnings?." *Journal of Accounting Research* 46, no. 5: 975-1016.
- BEAVER, W. H. 1968. "The Information Content of Annual Earnings Announcements." *Journal of Accounting Research* 6, no. 3: 67-92.
- Baranes, A. and R. Palas, 2017." The Prediction of Earnings Movements Using Accounting Data: Using XBRL", *International Journal of Accounting Research* 4, no. 2 (pending).
- Bernard, V.L. and Thomas, J.K. 1990, "Evidence That Stock Prices Do Not Fully Reflect the Implications of Current Earnings for Future Earnings", *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, vol. 13, no. 4, pp. 305.
- Bernard, V. L., and J. K. Thomas. 1990. "EVIDENCE THAT STOCK PRICES DO NOT FULLY REFLECT THE IMPLICATIONS OF CURRENT EARNINGS FOR FUTURE EARNINGS." *Journal Of Accounting & Economics* 13, no. 4: 305-340.

- Bird, R., R. Gerlach, and A.D. Hall. 2001. "The prediction of earnings movements using accounting data: An update and extension of Ou and Penman." *Journal Of Asset Management* 2, no. 2: 180.
- BLOOMFIELD, R. J., R. LIBBY, and M. W. NELSON. 2003. "Do Investors Overrely on Old Elements of the Earnings Time Series?." *Contemporary Accounting Research* 20, no. 1: 1-31.
- Boritz, J. E., and W.G No. 2008. "The SEC's XBRL Voluntary Filing Program on EDGAR: A Case for Quality Assurance." *Current Issues In Auditing* 2, no. 2: A36-A50.
- Boritz, J. E., and W.G No. 2013 "The Quality of Interactive Data: XBRL Versus COMPUSTAT, Yahoo Finance, and Google Finance". Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2253638> or <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2253638>
- Burnham, K. P. and D. R. Anderson. 2004. "Multimodel Inference: Understanding AIC and BIC in Model Selection." *Sociological Methods and Research* 33 (2): 261-304.
- Cairney, T and L.B. Fletcher. 2009. "Are NAICS Industries more Homogeneous than SIC Industries?" *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal* 13 (3): 27-44.
- Chychyla, R. and A. Kogan. 2015. "Using XBRL to Conduct a Large-Scale Study of Discrepancies between the Accounting Numbers in Compustat and SEC 10-K Filings." *Journal of Information Systems* 29 (1): 37.
- D'Souza, Julia,M., K. Ramesh, and Min Shen. 2010. "The Interdependence between Institutional Ownership and Information Dissemination by Data Aggregators." *The Accounting Review* 85 (1): 159-193.
- Debreceeny, R. S., S. M. Farewell, M. Piechocki, C. Felden, A. Gräning, and A. d'Eri. 2011. "Flex Or Break? Extensions in XBRL Disclosures to the SEC." *Accounting Horizons* 25 (4): 631-657.

- Du, H., M. A. Vasarhelyi, and X. Zheng. 2013. "XBRL Mandate: Thousands of Filing Errors and so what?" *Journal of Information Systems* 27 (1): 61.
- Finger, C. A. 1994. "The Ability of Earnings to Predict Future Earnings and Cash Flow." *Journal of Accounting Research* 32 (2): 210.
- Foster, G., C. Olsen, and T. Shevlin. 1984. "Earnings Releases, Anomalies, and the Behavior of Security Returns." *The Accounting Review* 59 (4): 574.
- Henselmann, K., D. Ditter, and E. Scherr. 2015. "Irregularities in Accounting Numbers and Earnings Management - A Novel Approach Based on SEC XBRL Filings." *Journal of Emerging Technologies in Accounting* 12 (1): 117.
- Holthausen, R. W. and D. F. Larcker. 1992. "The Prediction of Stock Returns using Financial Statement Information." *Journal of Accounting & Economics* 15 (2): 373.
- Jordan, C. E., S. J. Clark, and Mallory Donald. 2009. "USING FINANCIAL STATEMENT ANALYSIS TO EXPLAIN THE VARIATION IN FIRMS' EARNINGS-PRICE RATIOS." *Academy Of Accounting & Financial Studies Journal* 13, no. 1: 91-101.
- Kinney, M. R. and E. P. Swanson. 1993. "The Accuracy and Adequacy of Tax Data in COMPUSTAT." *The Journal of the American Taxation Association* 15 (1): 121.
- Lee, Chi-Wen Jevons. 1985. "Stochastic Properties of Cross-Sectional Financial Data." *Journal Of Accounting Research* 23, no. 1: 213-227
- Liu, C. and G. O'Farrell. 2013. "The Role of Accounting Values in the Relation between XBRL and Forecast Accuracy." *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management* 21 (4): 297-313.
- Ou, J. A. 1990. "The Information Content of Nonearnings Accounting Numbers as Earnings Predictors." *Journal of Accounting Research* 28 (1): 144.



- Ou, J. A. and S. H. Penman. 1989. "Financial Statement Analysis and the Prediction of Stock Returns." *Journal of Accounting & Economics* 11 (4): 295.
- Ou, J. A., S. H. Penman, and D. F. Larcker. 1989. "Accounting Measurement, Price-Earnings Ratio, and the Information Content of Security Prices; Discussion." *Journal of Accounting Research* 27: 111.
- Penman, S. H. 1992. "Return to Fundamentals." *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance* 7 (4): 465.
- Penman, S. H. and X. Zhang. 2002. "Accounting Conservatism, the Quality of Earnings, and Stock Returns." *The Accounting Review* 77 (2): 237-264.
- Rosenberg, B. and M. Houglet. 1974. "ERROR RATES IN CRSP AND COMPUSTAT DATA BASES AND THEIR IMPLICATIONS." *The Journal of Finance* 29 (4): 1303.
- Roychowdhury, S. and E. Sletten. 2012. "Voluntary Disclosure Incentives and Earnings Informativeness." *The Accounting Review* 87 (5): 1679-1708.
- San Miguel, J.G. 1977. "THE RELIABILITY OF R&D DATA IN COMPUSTAT AND 10-K REPORTS." *The Accounting Review* 52 (3): 638.
- Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). 2009. Interactive Data to Improve Financial Reporting. Release Nos. 33-9002, 34-59324; 39-2461; IC-28609. Washington, DC: SEC.
- Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC). 2011. Response of the Division of Corporation Finance; Response of the Office of the Chief Accountant. Division of Corporation Finance No-Action Letter.
- Setiono, B. and N. Strong. 1998. "Predicting Stock Returns using Financial Statement Information." *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting* 25 (5): 631-657.
- Shroff, P. K. 1999. "The Variability of Earnings and Non-Earnings Information and Earnings Prediction." *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting* 26 (7): 863-882.

- Stober, T. L. 1992. "Summary Financial Statement Measures and Analysts' Forecasts of Earnings." *Journal of Accounting & Economics* 15 (2): 347.
- Tallapally, P., M. S. Luehlfiging, and M. Motha. 2011. "The Partnership of EDGAR Online and XBRL - should Compustat Care?" *The Review of Business Information Systems* 15 (4): 39-46.
- Vasarhelyi, M. A., D. Y. Chan, and J. P. Krahel. 2012. "Consequences of XBRL Standardization on Financial Statement Data." *Journal of Information Systems* 26 (1): 155-167.
- Wahlen, J. M. and M. M. Wieland. 2011. "Can Financial Statement Analysis Beat Consensus Analysts' Recommendations?" *Review of Accounting Studies* 16 (1): 89-115.
- Williams, K. L., 2015. "The prediction of future earnings using financial statement information: Are XBRL company filings up to the task?" PHD dissertation, Patterson School of Accountancy The University of Mississippi.
- Winograd, B.N., J.S. Gerson and B.L. Berlin. 2000. "Audit Practices of PricewaterhouseCoopers." *Auditing: A Journal of Practice & Theory*, 19 (Fall): 175-182.
- Yang, D. C., M. A. Vasarhelyi, and C. Liu. 2003. "A Note on the using of Accounting Databases." *Industrial Management & Data Systems* 103 (3): 204-210.

**Appendix 1 - Univariate LOGIT estimation results for all accounting descriptors selected.**

No.	Accounting Descriptor	Q3/ 2015				Q4/ 2015				Q1/ 2016				Q2/ 2016			
		Coeff	Chi	p-val	Nobs	Coeff	Chi	p-val	Nobs	Coeff	Chi	p-val	Nobs	Coeff	Chi	p-val	Nobs
1	Current Ratio	0	0.04	0.851	15,439	0	0.1	0.755	15,652	0	0.09	0.759	15,815	0	0.07	0.796	16,016
2	Quick Ratio	0	0.85	0.356	15,495	0	0.82	0.366	15,708	0	0.79	0.375	15,865	0	0.85	0.355	16,067
3	Days Sales Accounts Recv.	0	0.77	0.379	16,197	0	0.31	0.579	16,425	0	0.18	0.673	16,580	0	0	0.945	16,797
4	Depreciation to PP&E	0	1.03	0.309	16,116	0	1.03	0.31	16,341	0	1.02	0.313	16,477	0	1.02	0.313	16,695
5	ROCE	0	1.33	0.248	16,931	0	1.33	0.248	17,170	0	1.33	0.249	17,328	0	1.36	0.244	17,554
6	Total Debt to Equity	0	1.32	0.251	14,774	0	1.31	0.252	14,998	0	1.32	0.251	15,192	0	1.33	0.25	15,416
7	Long Term Debt to Equity	0	1.32	0.251	16,346	0	1.32	0.251	16,597	0	1.31	0.251	16,739	0	1.32	0.25	16,982
8	Equity to Fixed Assets	0	0.48	0.49	16,300	0	1.81	0.178	16,522	0	2.82	0.093	16,658	0	2.97	0.085	16,878
9	Sales to Total Assets	0	0.95	0.33	16,900	0	0.85	0.358	17,140	0	0.85	0.358	17,245	0	0.86	0.354	17,471
10	ROA	0.001	2.63	0.105	16,984	0.001	2.58	0.108	17,223	0.001	2.61	0.106	17,388	0.001	2.57	0.109	17,614

11	ROCE	0	1.24	0.266	16,991	0	1.35	0.245	17,229	0	0.97	0.324	17,396	0	0.79	0.373	17,620
12	Gross Profit Margin	0	0.02	0.881	15,544	0	0.01	0.912	15,756	-0.001	0.39	0.534	15,897	-0.001	0.34	0.561	16,082
13	EBITDA to Sales	0	0.06	0.806	16,802	0	0.07	0.791	17,049	0	0.08	0.782	17,135	0	0.09	0.769	17,360
14	Pretax Income to Sales	0	0.26	0.612	16,972	0	0.96	0.328	17,213	0	0.74	0.389	17,327	0	1.49	0.222	17,552
15	Net Profit Margin	-0.002	9.6	0.002	16,969	-0.002	9.92	0.002	17,209	-0.001	6.23	0.013	17,324	-0.001	4.98	0.026	17,549
16	Sales to Total Cash	0	0	0.994	16,931	0	0.06	0.801	17,173	0	0.03	0.855	17,310	0	0.7	0.403	17,534
17	Sales to Total Accounts Recv.	0	2.22	0.136	16,197	0	3.75	0.053	16,425	0	2.27	0.132	16,580	0	1.1	0.294	16,797
18	Sales to Total Working Capital	0	3.18	0.075	16,880	0	3.82	0.051	17,120	0	3.78	0.052	17,177	0	2.1	0.147	17,404
19	Sales to Fixed Assets	0	1.3	0.253	16,281	0	0	0.99	16,504	0	0.05	0.816	16,596	0	0.07	0.786	16,816
20	Working Capital to Total Assets	0	1.83	0.176	16,813	0	1.7	0.192	17,052	0	1.7	0.193	17,133	0	1.69	0.193	17,360
21	Operating Income to Total Assets	0	0.3	0.585	16,876	0	0.74	0.39	17,115	0	0.74	0.389	17,214	0	0.74	0.391	17,439
22	$\Delta$ Working Capital	0	1.31	0.252	16,691	0	1.31	0.252	16,930	0	0.47	0.492	17,144	0	0.48	0.49	17,296

23	Δ Current Ratio	0.005	1.44	0.231	15,274	0.006	1.86	0.173	15,488	0.001	0.72	0.396	15,694	0.001	0.63	0.428	15,869
24	Δ Quick Ratio	0.001	0.87	0.35	15,332	0.001	0.77	0.38	15,544	0.001	0.92	0.338	15,750	0	0.06	0.812	15,921
25	Δ Days sales to Accounts Recv.	0	1.03	0.31	16,014	0	1.01	0.314	16,239	0	1	0.316	16,452	0	0.6	0.439	16,618
26	Δ Total Revenue	0	0.27	0.604	16,901	0	0.33	0.564	17,142	0	0.38	0.537	17,337	0	0.75	0.388	17,487
27	Δ Total Depreciation	0	0	0.982	15,571	0	0	0.983	15,768	0	0.01	0.916	15,952	0	0.01	0.944	16,134
28	Δ Dividend per share	0	1.13	0.289	15,910	0	1.14	0.286	16,134	0	1.52	0.218	16,352	0	0.91	0.339	16,497
29	Δ ROCE	0	0.24	0.624	16,734	0	0.24	0.624	16,972	0	0.24	0.624	17,175	0	0.24	0.623	17,351
30	Δ Capital Expenditures to Total Assets	0	2.06	0.151	16,454	0	2.21	0.137	16,685	0	1.92	0.166	16,902	0	2.8	0.094	17,010
31	Δ Total Debt to Equity	0	1.38	0.239	14,588	0	1.38	0.24	14,811	-0.001	4.41	0.036	15,011	-0.001	3.56	0.059	15,226
32	Δ Long Term Debt to Equity	0	1.39	0.238	16,164	0	6.04	0.014	16,413	0	6.02	0.014	16,639	0	4.77	0.029	16,807
33	Δ Equity to Fixed Assets	0	1.28	0.257	16,123	0	1.48	0.224	16,345	0	1.61	0.205	16,557	0	1.6	0.206	16,714
34	Δ Sales to Total Assets	0	0.84	0.358	16,711	0	0.83	0.361	16,951	0	0.81	0.37	17,161	0	1.22	0.269	17,271

35	Δ Gross Profit Margin	0.001	1.66	0.197	15,484	0.001	1.38	0.24	15,698	0	0.35	0.554	15,878	0	0.31	0.577	16,019
36	Δ EBITDA to Sales	-0.001	3.29	0.07	16,735	-0.001	3.39	0.065	16,983	-0.001	3.82	0.051	17,186	-0.006	20.45	0	17,277
37	Δ Pretax Income to Sales	0	0	0.984	16,920	0	0	0.976	17,164	-0.011	68.14	0	17,362	-0.009	57.1	0	17,485
38	Δ Net Profit Margin	-0.006	41.93	0	16,920	-0.008	53.47	0	17,164	-0.008	57.76	0	17,359	-0.028	200.97	0	17,483
39	Δ Sales to Working Capital	0	1.47	0.225	16,696	0	1.58	0.209	16,936	0	1.58	0.209	17,147	0	0.99	0.319	17,211
40	Δ Production	-0.001	0.65	0.421	16,558	0	0.52	0.472	16,796	-0.001	1.61	0.205	16,996	-0.001	0.75	0.386	17,141
41	Δ Total Assets	0	1.31	0.252	16,761	0	1.3	0.254	17,000	0	0.85	0.356	17,213	0	0.86	0.355	17,388
42	Δ Working Capital to Total Assets	-0.003	8.29	0.004	16,644	-0.003	9.3	0.002	16,883	-0.003	7.79	0.005	17,096	-0.002	5.39	0.02	17,196
43	Δ Operating Income to Total Assets	0	4.12	0.042	16,711	0	4.09	0.043	16,950	0	4.5	0.034	17,162	0	5.57	0.018	17,270
44	Δ Total Debt	0	0.24	0.622	13,954	0	0.03	0.862	14,159	-0.001	1.58	0.209	14,362	-0.001	2.3	0.129	14,603
45	Δ Capital Expenditures to Total Assets	0	0.85	0.356	16,276	0	0.84	0.36	16,516	0	0.83	0.363	16,722	0	0.81	0.368	16,956

## Appendix 2 – Fluctuations of leading market indexes over time (Yahoo Finance)

