

# Impact of Inventory Management on Financial Performance of Listed Pharmaceutical Firms in Nigeria

Rashida Dakyes Usman<sup>1</sup>, Yusuf Ibrahim Karaye<sup>2</sup> and Abdulkadir Abubakar<sup>3</sup>  
[rashidadakyes43@gmail.com](mailto:rashidadakyes43@gmail.com)

<sup>123</sup> Department of Accounting, Bauchi State University, Gadau- Bauchi State, Nigeria

## Abstract

*This study examines the relationship between Inventory Management, specifically, the discrete components of inventory and firm Profitability for the Nigerian Pharmaceutical sector. The study is carried out based on the historical panel data analysis. To achieve the objective of this study, an ex-post factor research design was employed. Data was generated from secondary sources, specifically, the annual reports and accounts of listed pharmaceutical firms from 2009 to 2018 and the Nigerian Stock Exchange Fact book. Descriptive statistics, Pearson correlation as well as multivariate regression techniques were utilized as tools of analysis in this study. The study revealed that Inventory Management affects the profitability of Nigerian Pharmaceutical companies significantly. The significant relationships found among all the discrete components of Inventory and profitability, evidenced by lower p values and higher t values, implied good inventory turnover for the studied companies. The study recommends that pharmaceutical companies in Nigeria should sufficiently plan and control their operations as regard proper management of the different components of inventory and to utilize the services of professionals in complex business areas especially in the use of modern sophisticated inventory management techniques such as the Just-in-Time, Material Requirement Planning, and The ABC inventory categorization and so on in order to maintain the tempo and remain competitive both locally and internationally.*

**Keywords:** Inventory Management, Just in Time, Material Requirement Planning and Profitability

---

## 1.0 Introduction

Inventory represents one of the most important assets that most businesses possess, because the turnover of inventory represents one of the primary sources of revenue generation and subsequent earnings for the company's shareholders/owners. A business's inventory is one of its major assets and represents an investment that is tied up until the item is sold or used in the production of an item that is sold. In the cost structure of most of the manufacturing concerns, the cost of materials exceeds 50% of the total cost (Ramakrishna, 2005 cited in Monday, 2012). Such a large investment requires considerable planning and control of materials so as to minimize wastage which invariably affects the performance of organisations. According to Muller (2003), inventory brings with it a number of costs. These costs can include: Dollars/cash, Space, Labour to receive, check quality, put away, retrieve,

select, pack, ship, deterioration, damage, obsolescence, theft and so on. Thus, the management of these materials so as to reduce the costs associated with them is what the study refers to as Inventory Management.

In light of the expected benefits of inventory management, many studies have been conducted to examine the impact of inventory management on financial performance, but only a few have considered the separate impacts of the components of inventory, that is, raw material, work-in-process and finished goods inventories on profitability of Nigerian Manufacturing Industry. This paper fills the void in examining the impact of the discrete components of inventory on the profitability of firms in the Nigerian pharmaceutical industry.

## **2.0 Review of Related Literature**

Inventory Management encompasses all operations management functions from purchasing of raw materials through the production processes to the final delivery of the end products. It deals with the overseeing and controlling of the ordering, storage and use of components that a company will use in the production of the items it will sell as well as the overseeing and controlling of quantities of finished products for sale. Inventory Management is a tool to optimize performance in meeting customer service requirements at the same time adding to profitability by minimizing costs and making the best use of available resources. The basic objective of inventory Management as explained by Banjoko (2000) and Jacobs, Chase & Aquilano (2009) is to ensure that the right item is bought and made available to the manufacturing operations at the right time, at the right place and at the lowest possible cost.

Inventory management is the process of efficiently overseeing the constant flow of units into and out of an existing inventory. This process usually involves controlling the transfer in of units in order to prevent the inventory from becoming too high, or dwindling to levels that could put the operation of the company into jeopardy. It encompasses all operations management functions from the purchase of raw materials, through the production processes to the final delivery of finished products to end users.

Effective inventory management is essential in the operation of any business (Bassin, 1990). Inventory as an asset on the balance sheet of companies has taken on increased importance because many companies are applying the strategy of reducing their investment in fixed assets, like plants, warehouses, equipment and machinery, and so on, which even highlights the significance of reducing inventory (Coyle, Bardi & Langley 2003). Changes in inventory levels affect return on assets (ROA), which is an important financial parameter from an internal and external perspective. Reducing inventory usually improves ROA, and vice versa

if inventory goes up without offsetting increases in revenue (Coyle, Bardi & Langley 2003). Many studies have been conducted in respect of inventory management and financial performance, but few have been conducted in the Nigerian context and more specifically, in critical sectors such as the pharmaceutical industry. This research attempts to fill this gap.

### 3. Research Methodology

For the purpose of this research, data was collected mainly from secondary sources. This data was obtained primarily from the Fact-book maintained by the Nigerian Stock Exchange (NSE) and the published annual reports and accounts of the sampled Firms. Data collected from these sources is used for the computations of the ratios that were used to measure the Inventory Management and Profitability of the listed Nigerian Pharmaceutical companies. The data covered such items as turnover, cost of sales, profit before and after tax, total assets, trade debtor, trade creditor, stocks, fixed asset, current asset, current liability, and long-term liability.

The population of this study consist of all the seven listed pharmaceutical companies in the pharmaceutical industry namely: Evans Medical PLC, Fidson Healthcare PLC, Glaxo SmithKline Consumer (NIG) PLC, May and Baker Nig. PLC, Neimeth Intl Pharmaceuticals PLC, Nigeria-German Chemicals PLC and Pharma-Deko PLC as shown below.

**Table 1: Population of the Study**

| S/N | Name of Company                           | Year of Incorporation | Year Listed |
|-----|---|-----------------------|-------------|
| 1   | Evans Medical PLC                         | 23/04/1954            | 1979        |
| 2   | Fidson Health Care PLC                    | 13/03/1995            | 4/6/2008    |
| 3   | GlaxoSmithKline Consumer Nigeria PLC      | 23/06/1971            | 07/1977     |
| 4   | May & Baker Nigeria PLC                   | 04/09/1944            | 10/11/1994  |
| 5   | Neimeth International Pharmaceuticals PLC | 30/08/1957            | 21/09/1979  |
| 6   | Nigeria-German Chemicals PLC              | 10/01/1964            | 08/1979     |
| 7   | Pharma-Deko PLC                           | 18/12/1969            | 08/1979     |

**Source: NSE Fact book**

### 3.2 Sampling and Sample Size

For the purpose of this study, purposive sampling was used in the determination of the sample size. Of the total of seven (7) companies that made up the industry, five companies

were selected. Two criteria were used in the selection of the sample. For a company to be selected, it must have been quoted on or before January 1<sup>st</sup>, 2004 and must have its complete annual reports and accounts for ten year period from 2004 - 2013. Applying these two criteria, the following firms emerged as the working population.

**Table 2: Sample Size of the Study**

| S/N | Name of company                      |
|-----|--------------------------------------|
| 1   | Evans Medical Plc                    |
| 2   | GlaxoSmithKline Consumer Nigeria Plc |
| 3   | May and Baker Nig. Plc               |
| 4   | Neimeth International Pharm. Plc     |
| 5   | Pharma-Deko Plc                      |

**Source: NSE Fact book**

### 3.3 Variables and their Measurement

For the purpose of this study, the dependent variables and proxies for financial performance were measured by Return on Investment (ROI), Gross Profit Margin (GPM) and Net Profit Margin (NPM) while the independent variables and proxies for inventory management were measured by Inventory Days (I.D), otherwise known as the Inventory Turnover Period for the three major discrete components of inventory, i.e Raw Material inventory (RM), Work in Process inventory (WIP) and Finished Goods Inventory (FG). The control variables used are SIZE measured by logarithm of sales and LEV measured by DEBT. Table 3 provides the summary of the variables used and their respective measurement. Inventory Days (ID) or Days in Inventory (DII) or Inventory Turnover Period is an efficiency ratio that measures the average number of days the company holds its inventory before selling it. It is given by the formula:

$$I.D = \frac{\text{Average Inventory}}{\text{Cost of Goods Sold}} \times 365 \text{ days}$$

Hence, the lower the number of ID, the better the inventory management and this may cause better firm performance. This measure of inventory management has been used by many researchers such as Eroglu & Hofer (2011); Sahari, Tinggi & Kadri (2012); Fullerton, Mcwatters & Fawson (2003); Cannon (2008); Cachon & Fisher (2000) among others.

**Table 3: Variables and their Measurement**

| <b>THE DEPENDENT VARIABLES</b>                        |                                     |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| <b>Variable</b>                                       | <b>Measurement</b>                  |
| Return on Investment (ROI)                            | Net Profit After Tax / Total Assets |
| Gross Profit Margin (GPM)                             | Gross Profit / Sales * 100          |
| Net Profit Margin (NPM)                               | Net Profit After Tax / Sales * 100  |
| <b>The Independent Variables</b>                      |                                     |
| Raw Material Days (RMD)                               | Raw Material / (COGS/365 days)      |
| Work in Process Days (WIPD)                           | Work in Process / (COGS/365 days)   |
| Finished Goods Days (FGD)                             | Finished Goods / (COGS/365 days)    |
| Thus, $INV = RM + WIP + FG / (COGS/365 \text{ days})$ |                                     |
| <b>The Control Variables</b>                          |                                     |
| SIZE  | Natural logarithm of sales          |
| LEVERAGE  | Total Debt / Total Assets           |

### 3.4 Techniques of Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics, Pearson Correlation Coefficient as well as Multivariate Regressions were used in analysing the data.

### 3.5 Model of the Study

In order to evaluate the strength of the relationship between the inventory management measures on one hand, and Profitability on the other, the study adopts Return on Investment (ROI), Gross Profit Margin (GPM) and Net Profit Margin as proxies for Profitability. The dependent as well as the independent variables were derived from the Published Annual Reports and accounts of the companies under study. The control variables used are SIZE and LEVERAGE. Since other factors apart from the explanatory and identified control variables are likely to affect the companies' Profitability, the coefficient of determination ( $R^2$ ) is computed to explain the extent to which the independent variables explain the dependent variable. All other things that affect the Profitability score is incorporated into the

relationship by adding an error term,  $\varepsilon$ . The functional relationships among these variables are therefore defined as:

$$ROI_{it}, GPM_{it}, NPM_{it} = f(RMD, WIPD, FGD, SIZE, LEV)_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

From this general form of the regression equation, three models, each designed to test one hypothesis is developed. These models are consistent with the works of Sahari, Tinggi & Kadri (2012), Bavelde (2012), Padachi (2006), Garcia-Teruel and Martinez-Solano (2007), Falope & Ajilore (2009), Hayajne & Yassine (2011) among others.

$$ROI_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 RMD_{it} + \beta_2 WIPD_{it} + \beta_3 FGD_{it} + \beta_4 SIZE + \beta_5 LEV + \varepsilon_{it} \quad \text{Model 1}$$

$$GPM_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 RMD_{it} + \beta_2 WIPD_{it} + \beta_3 FGD_{it} + \beta_4 SIZE + \beta_5 LEV + \varepsilon_{it} \quad \text{Model 2}$$

$$NPM_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 RMD_{it} + \beta_2 WIPD_{it} + \beta_3 FGD_{it} + \beta_4 SIZE + \beta_5 LEV + \varepsilon_{it} \quad \text{Model 3}$$

WHERE:

ROI, GPM and NPM measure the firms' profitability, SIZE – stands for the company size measured by the natural logarithm of sales, LEV– Debt, RM – Raw Material, WIP – Work in Process, FG- Finished Goods,  $\beta_0$  – fixed intercept element,  $\beta_1$  – the ratio of change in any of the dependent variables to a unit change in RMD,  $\beta_2$  – the ratio of change in any of the dependent variables to change in WIPD,  $\beta_3$  – the ratio of change in any of the DVs to change in FGD,  $\beta_4$  – ratio of change in any of the DVs to change in SIZE,  $\beta_5$  – ratio of change in any of the DVs to change in LEV,  $i$  – number of companies in the panel data,  $t$  – time periods of the panel data and  $\varepsilon$  - error variable of the regression analyses.

## 4. Empirical Results

### 4.1 Descriptive Statistics of the Variables of Study

Table 4 provides summary of the descriptive statistics for the variables of the study. All the variables were computed from the relevant balance sheets and income statements of the sampled companies.

**Table 4: Descriptive Statistics of the Variables**

| Variable | Obs | Mean      | Std. Dev. | Min.     | Max.     |
|----------|-----|-----------|-----------|----------|----------|
| ROI      | 50  | 0.184357  | 0.2196116 | -0.37056 | 0.97427  |
| GPM      | 50  | 49.1794   | 19.89777  | 5.28549  | 94.18364 |
| NPM      | 50  | 0.169758  | 0.2065259 | -0.28387 | 0.79249  |
| RMD      | 50  | 82.6729   | 53.639    | 9.6154   | 224.1192 |
| WIPD     | 50  | 24.31062  | 35.08111  | 0.08314  | 135.6835 |
| FGD      | 50  | 75.14479  | 77.74645  | 1.30067  | 32.9796  |
| SIZE     | 50  | 0.6970722 | 0.01614   | 0.01614  | 1.62076  |
| LEV      | 50  | 15.09436  | 13.81753  | 13.81753 | 17.18912 |

*Source: Generated by the researcher using (Stata Version 12)*

Table 4 reveals that the return on assets of the five pharmaceutical companies over the ten year period to 2013 have an average of 18.44% ranged from a negative return of -37.06% to a maximum of 97.43%. This means that for every one Naira worth of net investment, the industry had at worst made a loss of 37.06 kobo and had at best earned a maximum of 97.43 kobo. Every firm in the industry could earn an average of 18.44% on its net investment with a high degree of risk, as returns varied at both sides of the scale by as large a margin as 21.96%. It took an average of 83 days to convert Raw Materials to Work-in-Process inventories. While at a particular time, some firms in the industry were able to shorten this range to 10 days, others could not turn Raw Materials to the next stage of production till after 224 days. For the Work-in-Process inventory, it took an average of 24 days to turn to Finished Goods. While some firms could perform this process in a day, others could not till after 136 days. An average of 75 days is taken for the finished goods to be converted to cash from its sales. This is in line with the work of Capkun, Hameri & Weiss (2009).

**Table 5: Correlation Coefficients of the Variables**

| Variables | ROI     | GPM   | NPM | RMD | WIPD | FGD | SIZE | LEV |
|-----------|---------|-------|-----|-----|------|-----|------|-----|
| ROI       | 1.000   |       |     |     |      |     |      |     |
| GPM       | -0.2307 | 1.000 |     |     |      |     |      |     |

|      |         |         |         |         |         |         |        |       |
|------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|-------|
| NPM  | 0.6665  | -0.2901 | 1.000   |         |         |         |        |       |
| RMD  | -1.1678 | 0.1132  | 0.1683  | 1.000   |         |         |        |       |
| WIPD | 0.0476  | 0.7287  | -0.2353 | -0.2408 | 1.000   |         |        |       |
| FGD  | 0.0696  | 0.0078  | 0.3318  | 0.7160  | -0.3044 | 1.000   |        |       |
| SIZE | -0.1453 | 0.0932  | -0.4258 | -0.5152 | 0.0292  | -0.2456 | 1.000  |       |
| LEV  | -1.1119 | 0.3445  | -0.2156 | -0.3446 | 0.4289  | -0.4199 | 0.0063 | 1.000 |

*Source: Generated by the researcher using (Stata Version 12)*

From the above Table 4.2, the values on the diagonal are all 1.000, indicating that each variable is perfectly correlated with itself. The highest correlation with ROI is for FGD (0.0696) which implies absence of multi-collinearity with ROI and all variables. Likewise, the correlations within the explanatory variables prove lack of multi-collinearity as the highest correlation coefficient is that of FGD and RMD with a positive value of 0.7160. With regard to the nature of the correlation between the dependent and the independent variables, the relationship between ROI and RMD shows a negative amount of -1.168 which is less than 117%, which implies as RMD reduces by less than 117%, ROI will increase by the same percentage. Also, the correlation between WIPD and ROI is positive with about -0.476 coefficients, which implies that as the period of WIP decreased, the Profitability of Pharmaceutical companies in Nigeria may increase by 47.6%. Similarly, the nature of the correlation between ROI and FGD show a negative and insignificant amount of only -0.094 which is less than 9.4%, which implies as FGI days decrease by less than 9.4%, ROI will increase by the same percentage.

#### **4.3 Impact of Inventory Turnover Period (RMD, WIPD and FGD) on Profitability (ROI)**

In order to determine the impact of the discrete components of inventory on ROI as one of the profitability ratios, the first regression equation,

Profitability (ROI)<sub>it</sub> =  $\beta_0 + \beta_1\text{RMD}_{it} + \beta_2\text{WIPD}_{it} + \beta_3\text{FGD}_{it} + \beta_4\text{SIZE} + \beta_5\text{LEV} + \epsilon_{it}$  in the model is run. The regression results of the combined impact of the discrete components of inventory on profitability is evaluated from the model summary as presented in Table 6.



**Table 6: Regression Results of the Impact of RMD, WIPD, and FGD on Profitability (ROI, GPM, NPM)**

**Model Summary**

| Equation | Obs | Parms | RMSE      | R <sup>2</sup> | F        | P      |
|----------|-----|-------|-----------|----------------|----------|--------|
| ROI      | 50  | 6     | .2003399  | 0.2527         | 2.976107 | 0.0212 |
| GPM      | 50  | 6     | 11.07225  | 0.7220         | 22.84925 | 0.0000 |
| NPM      | 50  | 6     | 0.1707859 | 0.3859         | 5.530744 | 0.0005 |

*Source: Generated by the researcher using (Stata Version 12)*

In appraising the Model 1, based on the regression result in Table 6, the coefficient of determinations “R-square” shows 25.27% indicating that the variables considered in the model accounts for about 25.27% change in the dependent variable that is ROI, while the remaining of the change is as a result of other variables not addressed by this model. From the same result in Table 6, the p value is 0.02121 which is lower than 0.05 (for a 95% confidence level), thus, the null hypothesis will be rejected as the p-value is lower than 5% that means the explanatory variables have significant influence on the dependent variable. Thus, considering both correlation and regression outcomes, it can be concluded that the relationship between the discrete components of inventory and profitability, measured by ROI, is negative and significant. This is in line with Narware (2004) and Gill, Biger & Mathur (2010), who found a statistically significant association between Profitability and inventory turnover and in line with the findings of Alipour (2011); Deloof (2003); Lee, Song, & Lee (2009); Panigrahi (2013); and Usama (2012) who discovered an inverse relationship between the inventory turnover period and Profitability. However, opposed to Ali (2011); Gill, Biger & Mathur (2010); Padachi (2006); Rimo & Panbunyuen (2010); Soekhoe (2012); and Warnes (2013) who found a positive relationship.

**4.5 Impact of Inventory Turnover Period on Profitability (GPM)**

In appraising model 2 based on the regression equation in table 6, the coefficient of determination, R<sup>2</sup> shows 0.7220 which is more than 72%, indicating that the variables considered in the model accounts for 72.20% change in the dependent variable, while the remaining change is as a result of other variables not addressed by the model. The p value of this model is 0.0000 which is less than 5% for a 95% confidence level. Thus, the null hypotheses will be rejected as the p-value is lower than 5%. This means the explanatory variables have significant influence on the dependent variable, as the lower the p-value, the higher the relevance of the variable. Going by the correlation and regression results, it can be

concluded that the relationship between the discrete components of inventory and profitability, measured by GPM, is negative and significant.

#### **4.6 Impact of Inventory Turnover Period on Profitability (NPM)**

In appraising model 3 based on the regression result in table 4.3, the coefficient of determination,  $R^2$  shows 0.3859 which is 38.59%, indicating that the variables considered in the model accounts for 38.59% change in the dependent variable, while the remaining change is as a result of other variables not addressed by the model. The p value of this model is 0.0005 which is less than 5% for a 95% confidence level. Thus, the null hypotheses will be rejected as the p-value is lower than 5% that means the explanatory variables have significant influence on the dependent variable as the lower the p-value, the higher the relevance of the variable. Going by the correlation and regression results, it can be concluded that the relationship between the discrete components of inventory and profitability, measured by NPM, is negative and significant.

### **5.0 Summary, Conclusions and Recommendations**

#### **5.1 Summary**

Effective inventory management is vital for business survival and ultimate growth. Inventories constitute a significant portion of the overall manufacturing costs (50-60)%. Such a huge investment requires adequate planning and control in order to avoid wastage which invariably affects profitability. The financial management decisions of companies are basically concerned with three major areas: capital structure, capital budgeting, and Working Capital management. Among these major areas, the Working Capital Management (WCM) of which inventory management is an indispensable component of, is an area of great significance for every company as it virtually affects its overall Profitability and liquidity.

#### **5.2 Conclusions**

Inventory management is a vital aspect of firms' financial management decision. The ability of a firm to continuously operate in longer period is dependent on how it deals with investment in inventory management. The optimal Inventory management could be achieved by firm that manage the trade-off between Profitability and level of inventory. Based on the analysis made in chapter four, the following conclusions are drawn:

Raw Material Inventory Turnover Period (RMD) is negatively related to Profitability of the listed Pharmaceutical Firms in Nigeria; and the relationship is significant based on the documented evidence. When a company maintains a high level of inventory with generous trade credit policy, the sales are likely to increase, hence improving the Profitability of the company. However, the increases in Raw Material Inventory Days means a longer period is

taken for the Raw Material inventory to be converted to the next level of production, hence, increasing the storage costs and other negative costs associated with keeping inventory e.g deterioration, pilferage, insurance costs, obsolescence and so on.

Work-In-Process Inventory Days (WIPD) is also negatively related to Profitability of the listed Pharmaceutical Firms in Nigeria; also, the relationship is significant. Increases in the Work in Process Days have negative impact on company's performance, as semi-processed goods remain idle for a longer period of time, which ties down cash that may be used to finance other viable projects.

Finished Goods Inventory Days is negatively related to Profitability of the listed Pharmaceutical Firms in Nigeria also the relationship is significant. Due to the nature of pharmaceutical products, this component of inventory is expected to have a very short gestation period. This is evidenced by a high correlation coefficient between it and ROI as one of the profitability proxy.

In the overall, it can be deduced that Inventory Management impacts on the Nigerian Pharmaceutical companies' Profitability significantly.

### **5.3 Recommendations**

Based on the findings of this research, there is an impressive inventory management in the sampled firms of the study. Despite this, the following recommendations are offered based on the research findings:

In the case of high cost/level inventories, there should be periodic stock taking so as to discover in time, the slow moving stocks (if any) to avoid over investment in such stocks. Further, in case of dwindling demand for obsolete stock, prices should be written down to promote sales.

Proper communication among members of the Supply Chain should be maintained in order to avoid the "Bull Whip Effect" a situation that leads to unwarranted accumulation of stock along the Supply Chain.

The ABC inventory categorization should be adopted by the firms in order to differentiate between the fast moving top ranking goods from the average and slow moving goods. The essence of this is to help management in assigning different level of control to different category of goods.

Similarly, companies should sufficiently plan and control their operations, especially, investment in inventories, amend the shortfalls as noted, consider the principles of finance in their decision making and utilize the services of professionals in complex business areas.

## References

- Alipour, M. (2011). Working Capital Management and Corporate Profitability: Evidence from Iran. *World Applied Science Journal*, 12(7), 1093-1099.
- Banjoko, S.A (2000). *Production and operations management*. Saban publishers, Lagos.
- Capkun, V., Hameri, A. & Weiss, L. (2009). On the relationship between inventory and financial performance in manufacturing companies. *International Journal of Operations and Production Management*, Vol. 29 No.8, 2009, pp 789-806.
- Coyle, J. J., Bardi, E. J., & Langley, C. J. Jr. (2003). *The Management of Business Logistics: A Supply Chain Perspective* (7th ed.). Mason: South- East.
- Deloof, M. (2003). Does Working Capital Management Affects Profitability of Belgian Firms? *Journal of Business, Finance and Accounting*, pp 573-588.
- Gill, A., Biger, N. & Mathur, N. (2010). The Relationship Between Working Capital Management and Profitability: Evidence from the United States. <http://astonjournals.com/bej> accessed on 4th April, 2014.
- Jacobs, R. F., Chase, R. B. & Aquilano, N. J. (2009). *Operations and Supply Management*, McGraw Hill, Boston.
- Lee, H.J., Song, S.H & Lee, H.J (2009). Correlation Between Supply Chain Management and Financial Performances: Evidence from Korean Companies. *Journal of Operations Management*, Vol. 10 No. 5, pp. 5-21.
- Muller M. (2003). *Essentials of Inventory Management*. Amacom publishers, 1601 Broadway, New York.
- Monday, J. U. (2008). *Effects of Efficient Materials Management on Performance of Firms in Food & Beverage Manufacturing Industry in Nigeria*. MBA Dissertation, Obafemi Awolowo University, Nigeria.
- Padachi, K. (2006). Trends in Working Capital Management and its Impact on Firms' Performance: An Analysis of Mauritanian Small Manufacturing Firms. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 2(2), 45 – 58.
- Panigrahi, A.K. (2013). Cash Conversion Cycle and Firms' Profitability: A Study Cement Manufacturing Companies of India. *International Journal of Current Research* 5(6), pp 1484-1488.
- Rimo, A., & Panbunyuen, P. (2010). *The Effect of Company Characteristics on Working Capital Management: A Quantitative Study of Swedish Listed Companies*. UMEÅ School of Business Spring Semester Master Thesis, Two-Year, 15 hp
- Soekhoe, S.G (2012). The Effects of Working Capital Management on the Profitability of Dutch Listed Firms. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 2012(66) pp 1450-2887.
- Usama, M. (2012). Working Capital Management and its Effects on Firms' Profitability.

In other Foods Sector of KSE. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*. 1(12) pp 62-73.

Warnes, S. (2013). The impact of Working Capital Management on Firms' Profitability: Empirical Evidence from Cement Sector of Pakistani Stock Exchange. *American Journal of Governance and Politics*, 3(2), pp 46-55.

|      |          | EVANS MEDICA               |         |            |         |         |         |         |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|------|----------|----------------------------|---------|------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|--------|--------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| YEAR | TURNOVER | COST OF SALES              | PAT     | TOTAL DEBT | F/A     | C/A     | T/A     | C/L     | RMI    | WIP    | FGI    | INV     | SIZE     | LEV      | ROA      | RMD      | WIPD     | FGD      | INVD     |
| 2004 | 1009091  | 529247                     | 46652   | 1883744    | 1358315 | 2032555 | 3390870 | 1653588 | 157197 | 26632  | 43422  | 227251  | 6.00393  | 0.555534 | 0.013758 | 108.4123 | 18.367   | 29.94638 | 156.7257 |
| 2005 | 1068624  | 536279                     | 14223   | 1735962    | 1304235 | 1988585 | 3292820 | 1530668 | 201201 | 14931  | 31094  | 247226  | 6.028825 | 0.527196 | 0.004319 | 136.9406 | 10.16228 | 21.16307 | 168.2659 |
| 2006 | 2908469  | 1354039                    | 132204  | 2178476    | 1404258 | 2415119 | 3819377 | 2023317 | 414824 | 70680  | 33231  | 518735  | 6.463664 | 0.570375 | 0.034614 | 111.8216 | 19.05277 | 8.957877 | 139.8322 |
| 2007 | 3151753  | 1639485                    | -317019 | 3023873    | 1598611 | 2826595 | 4425206 | 2569577 | 424406 | 71676  | 361837 | 857919  | 6.498552 | 0.683329 | -0.07164 | 94.48588 | 15.95729 | 80.55609 | 190.9993 |
| 2008 | 4465237  | 2015865                    | -510098 | 3873419    | 1135509 | 2683911 | 3819420 | 3116300 | 486169 | 85521  | 107233 | 678923  | 6.649845 | 1.014138 | -0.13355 | 88.02756 | 15.48475 | 19.41601 | 122.9283 |
| 2009 | 2193563  | 1300328                    | -622697 | 3452079    | 1638470 | 2159723 | 3798193 | 3165666 | 526198 | 24326  | 85578  | 636102  | 6.34115  | 0.908874 | -0.16395 | 147.7029 | 6.828269 | 24.02161 | 178.5528 |
| 2010 | 2594838  | 1392783                    | 169846  | 3327849    | 1642792 | 2201017 | 3843809 | 1579566 | 427599 | 14729  | 122414 | 564742  | 6.41411  | 0.865769 | 0.044187 | 112.0588 | 3.859959 | 32.08045 | 147.9992 |
| 2011 | 2757873  | 1540541                    | 15196   | 3431395    | 1695272 | 2267278 | 3962550 | 1801576 | 448686 | 17321  | 44389  | 510396  | 6.440574 | 0.865956 | 0.003835 | 106.3071 | 4.10386  | 10.51707 | 120.928  |
| 2012 | 3030540  | 1433957                    | 27795   | 4023665    | 4210125 | 2410162 | 6620287 | 2190451 | 370585 | 30149  | 51900  | 452634  | 6.48152  | 0.607778 | 0.004198 | 94.32886 | 7.674139 | 13.21065 | 115.2136 |
| 2013 | 3120847  | 1435986                    | 388995  | 4013775    | 4209135 | 2430264 | 6639399 | 2290652 | 380584 | 303246 | 53780  | 737610  | 6.494272 | 0.604539 | 0.058589 | 96.73713 | 77.0793  | 13.66984 | 187.4863 |
|      |          |                            |         |            |         |         |         |         |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|      |          |                            |         |            |         |         |         |         |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|      |          | PHARMA-DEKO PLC DATA SHEET |         |            |         |         |         |         |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| YEAR | TURNOVER | COST OF SALES              | PAT     | TOTAL DEBT | F/A     | C/A     | T/A     | C/L     | RMI    | WIP    | FGI    | INV     | SIZE     | LEV      | ROA      | RMD      | WIPD     | FGD      | INVD     |
| 2004 | 712481   | 223589                     | 30619   | 830544     | 368499  | 733490  | 1101989 | 733878  | 43713  | 82346  | 28118  | 154177  | 5.852773 | 0.753677 | 0.027785 | 71.3597  | 134.4265 | 45.9015  | 251.6877 |
| 2005 | 564944   | 328592                     | 8216    | 759576     | 498663  | 734380  | 1233043 | 732888  | 42711  | 95686  | 18119  | 156516  | 5.752005 | 0.616017 | 0.006663 | 47.44338 | 106.288  | 20.12659 | 173.858  |
| 2006 | 648868   | 535689                     | -337330 | 1351678    | 616516  | 340195  | 956711  | 270102  | 32194  | 137149 | 7495   | 176838  | 5.812156 | 1.412838 | -0.35259 | 21.93588 | 93.4486  | 5.106834 | 120.4913 |
| 2007 | 790399   | 491272                     | -242284 | 1564037    | 652283  | 417705  | 1069988 | 1205058 | 25160  | 84454  | 4076   | 113690  | 5.897846 | 1.461733 | -0.22644 | 18.69311 | 62.74673 | 3.028343 | 84.46818 |
| 2008 | 1105570  | 752634                     | -197972 | 1672466    | 622556  | 488137  | 1110693 | 1404041 | 44966  | 98726  | 2682   | 146374  | 6.043586 | 1.505786 | -0.17824 | 21.80687 | 47.8785  | 1.300672 | 70.98604 |
| 2009 | 501930   | 418791                     | -461497 | 1891812    | 910110  | 335295  | 1245405 | 1636842 | 71032  | 132895 | 35775  | 239702  | 5.700643 | 1.519034 | -0.37056 | 61.9084  | 115.8255 | 31.17993 | 208.9138 |
| 2010 | 494457   | 383006                     | 464094  | 3047495    | 881174  | 1055820 | 1936994 | 2070468 | 71026  | 142377 | 54752  | 268155  | 5.694129 | 1.573312 | 0.239595 | 67.6869  | 135.6835 | 52.17798 | 255.5484 |
| 2011 | 1261876  | 692673                     | 42158   | 3245755    | 808956  | 1240293 | 2049249 | 2177412 | 67982  | 17723  | 71196  | 156901  | 6.101017 | 1.583875 | 0.020572 | 35.82272 | 9.339032 | 37.51632 | 82.67807 |
| 2012 | 1037463  | 546712                     | 740945  | 1839379    | 2128112 | 654699  | 2782811 | 1839379 | 92035  | 8882   | 68597  | 169514  | 6.015973 | 0.660979 | 0.266258 | 61.4451  | 5.929868 | 45.79725 | 113.1722 |
| 2013 | 1251987  | 683574                     | 45360   | 3143364    | 805976  | 1246282 | 2052258 | 2180489 | 71047  | 17973  | 72017  | 161037  | 6.0976   | 1.531661 | 0.022102 | 37.93613 | 9.596832 | 38.45407 | 85.98704 |
|      |          |                            |         |            |         |         |         |         |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|      |          |                            |         |            |         |         |         |         |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|      |          | MAY AND BAKER DATA SHEET   |         |            |         |         |         |         |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| YEAR | TURNOVER | COST OF SALES              | PAT     | TOTAL DEBT | F/A     | C/A     | T/A     | C/L     | RMI    | WIP    | FGI    | INV     | SIZE     | LEV      | ROA      | RMD      | WIPD     | FGD      | INVD     |
| 2004 | 1900865  | 1800395                    | 91139   | 76803      | 409452  | 926837  | 1336289 | 417883  | 83296  | 113237 | 260821 | 457354  | 6.278951 | 0.057475 | 0.068203 | 16.88687 | 22.95691 | 52.8771  | 92.72088 |
| 2005 | 1996974  | 1243478                    | 101759  | 492559     | 644129  | 1302006 | 1336289 | 492554  | 245350 | 60652  | 179631 | 485633  | 6.300372 | 0.368602 | 0.07615  | 72.01796 | 17.80327 | 52.72736 | 142.5486 |
| 2006 | 2253389  | 1215293                    | 211470  | 225948     | 1664154 | 2300418 | 1336289 | 986923  | 306822 | 74297  | 231147 | 612266  | 6.352836 | 0.169086 | 0.158252 | 92.15064 | 22.31429 | 69.42248 | 183.8874 |
| 2007 | 3859749  | 2363690                    | 208318  | 21562      | 1778032 | 2676969 | 1336289 | 1582729 | 467302 | 165231 | 82066  | 714599  | 6.586559 | 0.016136 | 0.155893 | 72.16058 | 25.5149  | 12.6726  | 110.3481 |
| 2008 | 5439910  | 3529046                    | 417962  | 472674     | 2300418 | 3429738 | 1336289 | 2138612 | 459307 | 223877 | 164923 | 848107  | 6.735592 | 0.353721 | 0.312778 | 47.50492 | 23.15501 | 17.05755 | 87.71749 |
| 2009 | 4604458  | 2878932                    | 232081  | 427483     | 3506376 | 2647472 | 1336289 | 2637900 | 311416 | 219523 | 354792 | 885731  | 6.663179 | 0.319903 | 0.173676 | 39.48229 | 27.83181 | 44.98164 | 112.2957 |
| 2010 | 4639202  | 2770229                    | 192977  | 1066023    | 4158408 | 2658508 | 1336289 | 2693127 | 436384 | 191680 | 280153 | 908217  | 6.666443 | 0.797749 | 0.144413 | 57.49711 | 25.25339 | 36.91242 | 119.6649 |
| 2011 | 4749617  | 2808205                    | 253062  | 746899     | 5037202 | 1996463 | 1336289 | 2940557 | 353408 | 96672  | 214507 | 664587  | 6.676659 | 0.558935 | 0.189377 | 45.93465 | 12.56507 | 27.88082 | 86.38054 |
| 2012 | 5484925  | 3455499                    | 82282   | 2165805    | 4968740 | 3103110 | 1336289 | 2768543 | 393827 | 258524 | 298680 | 951031  | 6.739171 | 1.620761 | 0.061575 | 41.59945 | 27.30756 | 31.54919 | 100.4562 |
| 2013 | 6253986  | 4026568                    | -78116  | 1889692    | 4782075 | 3374525 | 1336289 | 3207522 | 693309 | 195280 | 322387 | 1210976 | 6.796157 | 1.414134 | -0.05846 | 62.84702 | 17.70173 | 29.22371 | 109.7725 |
|      |          |                            |         |            |         |         |         |         |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|      |          |                            |         |            |         |         |         |         |        |        |        |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |

| GLAXOSMITH KLINE DATA SHEET |          |               |         |            |          |          |          |          |         |       |         |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
|-----------------------------|----------|---------------|---------|------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|---------|-------|---------|---------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| YEAR                        | TURNOVER | COST OF SALES | PAT     | TOTAL DEBT | F/A      | C/A      | T/A      | C/L      | RMI     | WIP   | FGI     | INV     | SIZE     | LEV      | ROA      | RMD      | WIPD     | FGD      | INVD     |
| 2004                        | 7149033  | 4350526       | 955261  | 3504261    | 2122516  | 3899467  | 6021983  | 2975635  | 1120340 | 34606 | 1005230 | 2160176 | 6.854247 | 0.581911 | 0.158629 | 93.99417 | 2.903371 | 84.33669 | 181.2342 |
| 2005                        | 8273679  | 5109759       | 881903  | 4802924    | 2695056  | 5105818  | 7800874  | 3734763  | 1115013 | 23105 | 924056  | 2062174 | 6.917699 | 0.61569  | 0.113052 | 79.64754 | 1.650435 | 66.00711 | 147.3051 |
| 2006                        | 10012127 | 6052067       | 967091  | 4675132    | 3114388  | 5210621  | 8325009  | 3417071  | 1594337 | 53641 | 936400  | 2584378 | 7.000526 | 0.561577 | 0.116167 | 96.15442 | 3.235087 | 56.47426 | 155.8638 |
| 2007                        | 9915400  | 6041660       | 836877  | 4117210    | 3515775  | 5203386  | 8719161  | 3331697  | 758606  | 11503 | 1413799 | 2183908 | 6.99631  | 0.472203 | 0.095981 | 45.83032 | 0.694941 | 85.41305 | 131.9383 |
| 2008                        | 12545129 | 7177239       | 1277441 | 4159822    | 3961996  | 5649286  | 9611282  | 3321911  | 921268  | 0     | 1326204 | 2247472 | 7.098475 | 0.432806 | 0.132911 | 46.85128 | 0        | 67.44438 | 114.2957 |
| 2009                        | 14952445 | 8444296       | 1701829 | 5495121    | 4788426  | 7289936  | 12078362 | 4625976  | 1457778 | 24487 | 2846915 | 4329180 | 7.174712 | 0.454956 | 0.140899 | 63.01164 | 1.058437 | 123.0563 | 187.1264 |
| 2010                        | 16489111 | 9270385       | 2326484 | 6407504    | 6880710  | 7273188  | 14153898 | 4576644  | 1159544 | 3512  | 2447005 | 3610061 | 7.217197 | 0.452702 | 0.164371 | 45.65437 | 0.138277 | 96.34517 | 142.1378 |
| 2011                        | 21148210 | 12314048      | 2671444 | 8934844    | 7262238  | 10447981 | 17710219 | 6610469  | 1204464 | 2805  | 2121511 | 3328780 | 7.325274 | 0.504502 | 0.150842 | 35.70145 | 0.083143 | 62.88359 | 98.66818 |
| 2012                        | 25127000 | 14990778      | 2754863 | 11129661   | 8835220  | 12736048 | 21571268 | 9449552  | 1940578 | 15694 | 2552532 | 4508804 | 7.400141 | 0.515948 | 0.12771  | 47.24978 | 0.382122 | 62.14982 | 109.7817 |
| 2013                        | 29183675 | 17581625      | 2915896 | 13867949   | 12122017 | 13900136 | 26022153 | 11753615 | 2247240 | 9864  | 3359236 | 5616340 | 7.46514  | 0.532929 | 0.112054 | 46.6534  | 0.20478  | 69.73878 | 116.597  |
|                             |          |               |         |            |          |          |          |          |         |       |         |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| NEIMETH PLC DATA SHEET      |          |               |         |            |          |          |          |          |         |       |         |         |          |          |          |          |          |          |          |
| YEAR                        | TURNOVER | COST OF SALES | PAT     | TOTAL DEBT | F/A      | C/A      | T/A      | C/L      | RMI     | WIP   | FGI     | INV     | SIZE     | LEV      | ROA      | RMD      | WIPD     | FGD      | INVD     |
| 2004                        | 1002024  | 912869        | 59175   | 532459     | 54800    | 896653   | 951453   | 54800    | 247846  | 5799  | 358897  | 612542  | 6.000878 | 0.559627 | 0.062194 | 99.09833 | 2.318662 | 143.5008 | 244.9178 |
| 2005                        | 1241949  | 1088347       | 98427   | 469304     | 58571    | 938002   | 1010223  | 72221    | 273135  | 5342  | 364896  | 643373  | 6.094104 | 0.464555 | 0.097431 | 91.60155 | 1.791552 | 122.3755 | 215.7686 |
| 2006                        | 1203530  | 482231        | 82228   | 335301     | 48874    | 2560917  | 2609791  | 724390   | 296102  | 6102  | 372075  | 674279  | 6.080457 | 0.128478 | 0.031508 | 224.1192 | 4.618596 | 281.6231 | 510.3609 |
| 2007                        | 1503857  | 608099        | 116415  | 311840     | 95261    | 2523278  | 2618539  | 794897   | 293193  | 13815 | 543090  | 850098  | 6.177207 | 0.119089 | 0.044458 | 175.9836 | 8.292194 | 325.9796 | 510.2554 |
| 2008                        | 1946513  | 652136        | 98267   | 751199     | 155438   | 2958259  | 3113697  | 885158   | 397158  | 13345 | 425299  | 835802  | 6.289257 | 0.241256 | 0.03156  | 222.289  | 7.469186 | 238.0395 | 467.7977 |
| 2009                        | 1731820  | 713456        | -455206 | 1792983    | 182334   | 2640091  | 2822425  | 1238852  | 419737  | 19112 | 476196  | 915045  | 6.238503 | 0.635263 | -0.16128 | 214.735  | 9.77759  | 243.6191 | 468.1318 |
| 2010                        | 1871667  | 990350        | -48839  | 1805889    | 300648   | 2578299  | 2878947  | 1255065  | 454078  | 20565 | 475901  | 950544  | 6.272229 | 0.627274 | -0.01696 | 167.3534 | 7.579366 | 175.3964 | 350.3292 |
| 2011                        | 1898501  | 791692        | 113077  | 1796576    | 394163   | 2523433  | 2917596  | 1763187  | 320977  | 24143 | 551055  | 896175  | 6.278411 | 0.615773 | 0.038757 | 147.9826 | 11.13084 | 254.0572 | 413.1706 |
| 2012                        | 2330203  | 1028283       | -59936  | 1315262    | 556443   | 2341112  | 2897555  | 1098513  | 396873  | 25958 | 499366  | 922197  | 6.367394 | 0.453921 | -0.02069 | 140.8743 | 9.214069 | 177.2553 | 327.3436 |
| 2013                        | 2016522  | 959225        | 130578  | 1110870    | 506189   | 2384890  | 2891079  | 919505   | 321464  | 53143 | 294628  | 669235  | 6.304603 | 0.384241 | 0.045166 | 122.322  | 20.22174 | 112.1105 | 254.6543 |

