S. Ivakhnenkov, S. Droniuk

INTERNATIONAL FINANCIAL REPORTING STANDARDS VS. UKRAINIAN NATIONAL ACCOUNTING STANDARDS: THE COMPARISON OF FINANCIAL RATIOS CASE STUDY

The purpose of the paper is to determine the differences in financial ratios analysis under International financial reporting standards (IFRS) and Ukrainian national accounting standards. The comparative case study analysis of financial ratios under both standards is performed. The results confirm differences in such ratios as: profitability ratios, market to book value ratio, dividend pay-out ratio (increased under IFRS); assets utilization ratios, price to earnings ratio and price to book value per share ratio (decreased under IFRS).

Keywords: International financial reporting standards (IFRS); financial ratios; financial statement analysis; Ukrainian national accounting standards; comparative case study.

Background. Financial statement analysis (FSA) has always been a vital part of financial science and practice. Today it becomes far more important for Ukraine due to the close connections of Ukrainian economy to world markets. The 2008 financial crises showed that it is important to be able to evaluate company's financial performance and activities properly and objectively in order to estimate business risks. The differences in the methodologies of FSA restrict companies and their investors from performing the analysis correctly. The crisis deterred companies' financial positions and the results of their business activities. It increased the demand for the fair and transparent financial statement reporting and analysis methodologies. As the result, in 2011 Ukrainian government adopted a resolution on obligatory disclosure of financial statements (FS) under the International financial reporting standards (IFRS) for publicly traded companies, banks and insurance companies [4]. It aimed to provide more trustful financial data and, consequently, more reliable FSA results. Now Ukraine confronts a unique situation: two different accounting standards are in force and the question of their influence on FSA is in place.

The purpose of the research. The research objective is to compare results of financial ratios analysis under IFRS and Ukrainian national accounting standards (P(S)BO) in Ukraine in order to determine whether differences in ratio values exist. The following tasks were established: to study international methodology of evaluating differences in FSA results under different accounting standards; to analyze and summarize the influence of IFRS adoption on FSA results in other countries; to evaluate changes in ratios caused by switch

from P(S)BO to IFRS in case of OJSC Myronivsky Hliboproduct (Ukraine); to provide recommendations and potential outcomes of IFRS implementation on FSA results in Ukraine.

Analysis of the contemporary sources and publications. The diversity of FSA has been widely discussed in international literature [3, 5, 6, 7, 8; 9; 12]. Most authors conclude that differences in the FSA are influenced by such factors as: 1) nature of business ownership and financing system, 2) stage of economic development, 3) legal systems and business environment, 3) taxation rules, 5) culture, 6) history, age and size of accountancy profession, 7) language. It is also highlighted in the literature that diversity of FSA results may be caused by the discrepancies in financial statement data due to application of different accounting standards and principles. This topic has become crucial in the time of adoption of IFRS in Europe. It has given a rise to both theoretical and empirical research of impact of such transition on FSA. Despite the fact that Ukraine commenced IFRS adoption couple years ago, its impact on FSA has not been researched. Ukrainian authors primarily concentrate on necessity of such adoption and its macro- and micro-level-outcomes [1; 2].

Explanation of the basic material. FSA results are strongly influenced by application of specific accounting standards and principles. That is, if a company discloses FS under different accounting standards, there is a high possibility that the numbers in some similar items in FS will differ. Using both of these items separately in ratio or other type of FSA would lead to distinct results, and, consequently, to different decisions of FS users (investors, creditors, owners, etc.).

Nevertheless, there are some factors that facilitate unification of reporting standards as well as FSA. First of all, it is functioning of various international institutions, such as the United Nations, the International Financial Reporting Council, the European Commission, etc. The second factor is the globalization of capital markets and the need for investors to choose foreign companies to invest based on the results of FSA. Last but not least, more and more countries interact and cooperate on international level [3, p. 107]. These leads to the harmonization – the process aimed at facilitating and enhancing the comparability of FS produced under different accounting standards [12, p. 519]. This facilitates the identification of the differences between accounting standards as well as their comparability and helps to understand how these standards affect financial performance measures. Consequently, IFRS are being presently adopted worldwide to fulfill everything mentioned above.

Many foreign researchers, especially from countries that have just adopted IFRS or that are going to do so in the nearest future, studied the impact of IFRS adoption on FSA and showed evidence of differences in FSA due to different accounting principles.

We have considered examples of such research on the works of the following authors: A-M. Lantto and P. Sahlström (comparison of Finland domestic accounting standards and IFRS) [8, p. 341–361], O. Duangploy and D. Gray (Japanese-GAAP and US-GAAP) [5, p. 225–230], and G. Iatridis (the UK GAAP and IFRS) [7, p. 165–172]. The main aim of these studies was to analyze the differences between financial ratios calculated before and after conversion from domestic accounting standards to IFRS; to test statistical significances of such differences and to provide explanations for them.

The following methodology was used by the authors. First, they tested the null-hypothesis that there are no significant differences between the domestic accounting standards and IFRS. As the second step, a comprehensive database of FS information prepared under both standards was created (both for the same year). The number of companies represented in the works depended on the ability to find appropriate set of FS. For example, A-M. Lantto and P. Sahlström had a sample of 91 firms; G. Iatridis – 241; and due to the limited data access in Japan O. Duangploy and D. Gray used FS of only 11 firms [5, p. 225; 7, p. 165–172; 8, p. 341– 361]. The researchers applied various techniques to evaluate the transition to IFRS on financial ratios. For instance, A-M. Lantto and P. Sahlström

prepared the sign test and the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, which were used to determine the existence of the difference before and after the conversion to IFRS. G. Iatridis implemented logistic regression analysis of dummy dependent variable with two values: 1 – for firms reporting IFRS-restated FS and 0 – for the same set of firms reporting accounting figures under the UK GAAP [7, p. 165–172]. The simplest tool – descriptive statistics – was applied by O. Duangploy and D. Gray due to small sample [5, p. 225–230].

As it can be seen after literature analysis, one of the difficulties that might occur is a lack of an appropriate data. In our research, we faced the same problem as O. Duangploy and D. Gray [5] – there were insufficient number of firms to analyze. In order to test IFRS adoption on FSA in Ukraine, we had two possibilities: to choose the data either from companies that are obliged to present FS under IFRS since 2012 or from the ones that conducted a voluntary switch to IFRS. The former were restricted to publicly traded companies (banks and insurance companies involve special type of FSA), only one year of available observation and absence of comparative statements under P(S)BO. That is why our choice fell on early voluntary IFRS adopters. However, there we faced the limitedness on the number of representative firms for conduction of econometric analysis and decided to research an impact of IFRS adoption on FSA in Ukraine in the form of case-study.

For this purpose OJSC Myronivsky Hliboproduct (MHP) was chosen. The company prepares its FS under IFRS since 2008 – the year that it started to trade its shares at London Stock Exchange and was obliged to present its FS under IFRS [10]. What is more, MHP FS under P(S)BO were simultaneously disclosed by State Institution 'Stock Market Infrastructure Development Agency of Ukraine' (till mandatory disclosure under IFRS) [11]. The principal business activities of MHP are poultry, grain growing and other agricultural operations (meat processing, cultivation and selling, etc.). We started with comparison of MHP FS items in statement of financial position and statement of comprehensive income under both standards. IFRS and P(S)BO gave almost the same numbers in the balance sheet (table 1); however, IFRS tend to show lower revenue, operating profit and EBITDA amounts, while increasing other earnings items.

Then we conducted ratio analysis under both standards. We reached the following results: almost all liquidity ratios are higher under IFRS, except of accounts receivables turnover. What is more, it is highly expected that cash ratio and

d IFRS	
\sim	
_	
IFR	
_	
_	
_=	
an	
60	
0	
\simeq	
м	
P(S)BO	
\sim	
Ъ	
under	
<u> </u>	
=	
=	
=	
Ħ	
1	
=	
=	
بو	
Items	
Ħ	
묽	
<u> </u>	
Ξ	
63	
*	
ੋ	
ï	
S	
ial	
.==	
ğ	
ਕ	
- ==	
Ę,	
垤	
Jain	
-=	
ű	
\sim	
t]	
÷	
n	
=	
ρ	
_	
Ξ	
<u> </u>	
ndc	
opr	
bopr	
bopr	
bopr	
<u> </u>	
cy Hlibopr	
cy Hlibopr	
cy Hlibopr	
vsky Hlibopr	
vsky Hlibopr	
vsky Hlibopr	
vsky Hlibopr	
vsky Hlibopr	
vsky Hlibopr	
Ayronivsky Hlibopr	
Myronivsky Hlibopr	
Myronivsky Hlibopr	
C Myronivsky Hlibopr	
SC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
JSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
JSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
on of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
on of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
on of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
arison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
arison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
parison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
arison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
parison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
parison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
parison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
. Comparison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
. Comparison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
le 1. Comparison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	
. Comparison of OJSC Myronivsky Hlibopr	

		2008	80			20	2009			20	2010	
$\frac{PSB}{L}$	BO, 000′ UAH	PSBO, 000' IFRS, 000' delta, 000 UAH UAH UAH	delta, 000' UAH	delta, %	PSBO, 000' UAH	IFRS, 000′ UAH	delta, 000' UAH	delta, %	PSBO, 000' UAH	PSBO, 000' IFRS, 000' delta, 000' UAH UAH UAH	delta, 000' UAH	delta, %
_				Items from	Items from Statement of Financial Position	Financial P	osition					
Non-current assets 451	4519363	4519361	-2	00'0	5601311	9929295	75449	1,35	6783399	6806672	23273	0,34
Current assets 28 ²	2840412	2599759	-240653	-8,47	3409416	3409411	φ.	0,00	5715210	5725115	5066	0,17
26:	2650348	2665871	15523	0,59	3588601	3947848	359247	10,01	5172382	5337269	164887	3,19
Total non-current liabilities 276	2763456	2763461	3	0,00	3089749	2857951	-231798	-7,50	5260302	5264300	3998	80'0
Total current liabilities 192	1945971	1689788	-256183	-13,16	2332377	2280372	-52005	-2,23	2065925	1930219	-135706	-6,57
73:	7359775	7119120	-240655	-3,27	9010727	9086171	75444	0,84	12498609	12531787	33178	0,27
			Earning	gs Items from	m Statement	of Compreh	ings Items from Statement of Comprehensive Income	ره ا				
42.	4233218	4230774	-2444	-0,06	5825262	5539859	-285403	-5,15	7719355	7492558	-226797	-3,03
Operating profit 157	1572982	1283106	-289876	-22,59	1708699	1698413	-10286	-0,61	2044562	2037658	-6904	-0,34
26	260366	271053	10687	3,94	1561537	1562286	749	0,05	2126193	2118376	-7817	-0,37
62	620888	573479	-47409	-8,27	2010428	1964932	-45496	-2,32	2672900	2657199	-15701	-0,59
Profit for the year from 15	19730	78592	58862	74,90	1245121	1246679	1558	0,13	1699635	1709645	10010	65,0
Total comprehensive income 19	19730	-1179259	-1198989	101,67	1153865	1196416	42551	3,56	1620858	1715755	94897	5,53

accounts payable turnover would increase if the company discloses its FS under IFRS. To continue, there is a strong trend of equity to total assets and times interest earned ratios to grow when IFRS is implemented; and debt ratio, total debt to equity and long-term debt to equity ratios tend to decline. Return on invested capital ratios are higher under IFRS, although there is no exact tendency in these ratios. Only earnings per share have positive difference throughout all the years, while return on equity seems to be lower under IFRS than under PSBO. Differences in profitability ratios and assets utilization ratios are ambiguous because results from year 2008 are extremely different from the results in 2009-2010. As stated earlier differences in earnings items used for calculation of profitability ratios and assets utilization ratios have been significant in all years. That is why the underlying reasons for such diversity should be further examined. If differences were caused by external factors (such as 2008 crisis) then the results of 2009–2010 years should be analyzed. On the contrary, if such differences were caused by internal factors including migration to IFRS, then analysts may expect unpredictable changes in FSA results. In general, profitability ratios were higher under IFRS in 2009–2010, while assets utilization ratios were lower. Market measure ratios had similar tendencies throughout 2008-2010. For instance, price to earnings and price to book ratios were lower under IFRS, while earnings yield and book value per share were higher.

The results of ratio analysis under both standards and differences between them are shown in the table 2. First of all, it can be seen that significant differences exist between the ratios computed under P(S)BO and IFRS. Most of the differences lie in the range of -5 % till 5 % of the ratio. Extreme variances of results can be observed in 2008, while they are more consistent in 2009 and 2010. This may be explained by the assumption that MHP has been harmonizing its P(S)BO and IFRS statements every year on since 2008.

Finally, we wanted to compare the obtained results on MHP with some general results summarized from the foreign research papers [5, p. 225–230; 7, p. 165–172; 8, p. 341–361]. Taking into account all of the information, we tried to foresee some expected impact of changes in FSA due to the IFRS adoption in Ukraine.

To start, international experience suggests that liquidity ratios do not differ significantly under both standards or become slightly lower under IFRS. Our MHP analysis demonstrated that in most cases IFRS showed higher liquidity ratios and their differences

Table 2. Comparison of OJSC Myronivsky Hilboproduct Main Financial Ratios under PSBO and IFRS

		2008	80			2009	60		7.7	2010	10	
Kallo	P(S)BO	IFRS	delta	delta, %	P(S)BO	IFRS	delta	delta, %	P(S)BO	IFRS	delta	delta, %
Current ratio	1,460	1,539	6200	5,40	1,462	1,495	0,033	2,28	2,766	2,966	0,200	7,22
Quick ratio	608'0	787,0	-0,023	-2,80	0,532	0,545	0,012	2,28	1,368	1,470	0,101	7,41
Cash ratio	0,214	0,246	0,032	15,16	0,076	870,0	0,002	2,28	0,139	0,162	0,023	16,35
Accounts receivable turnover	(1 -	-	-	-	19,775	18,806	696'0-	4,90	20,012	19,424	-0,588	-2,94
Accounts payable turnover	1	1	1	1	7,735	10,390	2,655	34,33	689,01	14,811	4,123	38,57
Debt ratio	0,640	0,626	-0,014	-2,24	0,602	0,566	-0,036	-6,02	0,586	0,574	-0,012	-2,06
Equity to total assets	098'0	0,374	0,014	3,99	0,398	0,434	0,036	9,10	0,414	0,426	0,012	2,91
Total debt to equity	$LLL^{*}1$	1,670	-0,106	-5,99	1,511	1,302	-0,209	-13,86	1,416	1,348	-0,068	-4,83
Long-term debt to equity	1,043	1,037	900'0-	-0,58	0,861	0,724	-0,137	-15,92	1,017	986'0	-0,031	-3,02
Times interest earned	0,964	966'0	0,032	3,29	3,938	3,946	800'0	0,21	4,087	4,241	0,154	3,78
Return on assets (NI)	72,0	(2 -	1	-	14,10	14,77	0,007	4,74	15,07	15,87	0,008	5,32
Return on assets (EBIT)	3,54	3,81	0,003	7,62	19,08	19,28	0,002	1,07	19,77	19,60	-0,002	-0,87
Return on equity	0,74	1	-	-	36,99	36,18	800'0-	-2,19	37,00	36,96	0,000	-0,12
Earnings per share	0,1781			1	10,4168	10,8009	0,384	3,69	15,0281	15,9080	0.880	5,85
Gross profit margin	33,25	29,58	-0,037	-11,03	33,02	34,75	0,017	5,24	30,05	30,99	0,009	3,13
Operating profit margin	31,16	30,33	890'0-	-18,38	29,33	30,66	0,013	4,52	26,49	27,20	0,007	2,68
Net income (Profit) margin	74,0	0,65	0,002	38,77	21,37	22,50	0,011	5,28	22,02	22,82	0,008	3,63
Fixed assets turnover	756,0	0,936	-0,001	90,0-	1,151	1,087	-0,065	-5,60	1,247	1,200	-0,046	-3,71
Total assets tumover	575,0	0,594	0,019	3,32	0,712	0,684	-0,028	-3,93	0,718	0,693	-0,025	-3,43
Current assets turnover	1,490	1,627	0,137	9,19	1,864	1,844	-0,020	-1,09	1,692	1,640	-0,051	-3,04
Price to earnings ratio	308,555	-	1	1	4,825	4,653	-0,172	-3,56	7,128	6,734	-0,394	-5,53
Earnings yield	0,003			-	0,207	0,215	800'0	3,69	0,140	0,148	0,008	5,85
Price to book ratio	596'0	096'0	900'0-	-0,58	2,440	2,218	-0,222	-9,10	2,839	2,751	-0,088	-3,09
Book value per share, \$	3,107	3,126	0,018	0,59	4,057	4,463	0,406	10,01	6,023	6,215	0,192	3,19
The calculations could not be performed (1) due to absence of IFRS financial statements in earlier periods or (2) due to losses in 2008 under IFRS	formed (1) du	te to absence	e of IFRS fin	ancial statem	ents in earlie	r periods or (.	due to los	ses in 2008 u	nder IFRS			

volatile throughout the years. Due to inconsistency in expected and observed results we assume that some further analysis of IFRS adoption should be made based on the wider sample of Ukrainian companies.

Foreign researchers state that capital structure and solvency ratios showing debt amounts (e.g. debt ratio or total debt to equity ratios increase) under IFRS, while the ones for equity such as equity to total assets decrease. MHP ratios contradict it: debt ratios decreased under IFRS, while equity ratios increased. For analysts it is important to remember that companies under IFRS are able to capitalize some amounts of interest, so it may decrease debt ratio. On the other hand, retained earnings generally are higher under IFRS though increasing equity ratios. So the results of these types of ratios may be volatile due to the company's accounting policies and its managers' decisions.

Furthermore, MHP exhibited higher earnings per share under IFRS, similar to the companies examined in the foreign literature. Return on invested capital ratios were not a case for research in earlier works, providing no benchmark. Overall, MHP return on invested capital ratios are higher under IFRS. Nevertheless, it is hard to predict changes from IFRS adoption for Ukrainian companies, because both numerator and denominator of these ratios are highly influenced by changes in accounting principles.

After conversion to IFRS the profitability ratios in other countries increased, while asset utilization ratios tended to decrease. Except for one year, MHP showed higher profitability and lower asset utilization ratios under IFRS. As the result, we can conclude that profitability ratios

are highly expected to grow, while assets utilization ratios – to decrease.

The fair value orientation of IFRS has led to a higher market to book value ratio under IFRS. Ratios involving dividends are higher due to the higher profitability that is reported under IFRS enabling firms to distribute higher dividends. Price to earnings decrease because of higher profit in the denominator. Our MHP results confirm these general assumptions. Consequently, we could assume that under IFRS market to book, dividend pay-out and other similar ratios are going to increase, and price to earnings and price to book ratio are expected to decrease after IFRS adoption in Ukraine.

Conclusions and perspectives for the future research. Our case study of MHP financial ratio analysis under IFRS and P(S)BO confirmed the

general assumption that ratio values may vary due to implementation of different accounting standards. As the result, simultaneous usage of IFRS and P(S)BO in Ukraine can lead to distortion of FSA and incomparability of its results from company to company. Although our results are limited by the usage of only one company for research, some of the IFRS adoption trends that took place in other countries are confirmed by our case study. They are: all profitability ratios (gross profit, operating profit and net income margins), market to book value ratio, dividend pay-out ratio and other similar ratios are likely to grow; while assets utilization ratios, price to earnings and price to book value per share ratios are expected to decrease under IFRS usage in Ukraine. All other ratios are subject to further analysis.

References

- Діділовський О. М. Проблеми та перспективи застосування Міжнародних стандартів фінансової звітності в Україні / О. М. Діділовський // Міжнародний збірник наукових праць. – 2011. – Вин. 1 (19). – С. 142–146.
- Лиса О. В. Доцільність формування фінансової звітності підприємств відповідно до вимог МСФЗ / О. В. Лиса, Р. П. Андрушко // Інноваційна економіка: всеукраїнський науково-виробничий журнал. – 2011. – № 26. – С. 110–112
- Маккензі В. Посібник Financial times з аналізу та використання фінансової звітності / В. Маккензі ; пер. з англ. Р. А. Семків. – К. : Всеувито ; Наукова думка, 2003. – 283 с.
- Постанова Кабінету Міністрів України про «Порядок подання фінансової звітності» від 28 лютого 2000 р. № 419 [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://zakon4.rada. gov.ua/laws/show/419-2000-%D0%BF
- Duangploy O. International Accounting Harmonization Impact Compared: Illustration of United States and Japan Financial Statement Ratio Analysis / O. Duangploy, D. Gray // The Journal of American Academy of Business, Cambridge. – March, 2005. – Vol. 6, № 1. – P. 225–230.

- Haskins M. E. International financial reporting and analysis: a contextual emphasis / M. E. Haskins, K. R. Ferris, Th. I. Selling. – 2th ed. – Mc-Graw-Hill Higher Education, 2000. – 557 p.
- Iatridis G. IFRS Adoption and Financial Statement Effects: The UK Case / G. Iatridis // International Research Journal of Finance and Economics. – 2010. – Issue 38. – P. 165–172.
- Lantto A-M. Impact of International Financial Reporting Standard adoption on key financial ratios / A-M. Lantto, P. Sahlström // Accounting and Finance. – 2009. – № 49. – P. 341–361.
- Nobes Ch. Towards a General Model of the Reasons for International Differences in Financial Reporting / Ch. Nobes // ABACUS. – 1998. – Vol. 34. № 2. – P. 162–187.
- 10. OJSC "Myronivsky Hliboproduct": official website [Електронний ресурс]. Режим доступу: http://www.mhp.com.ua
- State Institution "Stock Market Infrastructure Development Agency of Ukraine": official website [Електронний ресурс]. – Режим доступу: http://smida.gov.ua/db/participant/25412361
- Temte A. Financial statement analysis / A. Tempte. Schweser Study Program, A Kaplan Professional Company, 2004. – 688 p.

Івахненков С. В., Дронюк С. А.

МІЖНАРОДНІ СТАНДАРТИ ФІНАНСОВОЇ ЗВІТНОСТІ ТА НАЦІОНАЛЬНІ СТАНДАРТИ (ПОЛОЖЕННЯ) БУХГАЛТЕРСЬКОГО ОБЛІКУ УКРАЇНИ: ПОРІВНЯННЯ ФІНАНСОВИХ КОЕФІЦІЄНТІВ

Метою цієї статті є визначення відмінностей у фінансових показниках, обчислених за даними Міжнародних стандартів фінансової звітності та національних стандартів (положень) бухгалтерського обліку. Проведено порівняльний аналіз фінансових показників за обома стандартами. Результати свідчать про розбіжність у таких фінансових коефіцієнтах, як прибутковість, ринкова та балансова вартість, виплата дивідендів (зростають за умови використання МСФЗ), використання основних засобів, ціна-прибуток та ціна-балансова вартість на акцію (знижуються за МСФЗ).

Ключові слова: міжнародні стандарти фінансової звітності (МСФЗ), фінансові показники, Україна, порівняльний аналіз.