

democratic control

open membership

Centre for the Study of Co-operatives University of Saskatchewan Comparative Financial Performance Analysis of Canadian Co-operatives, Investor-Owned Firms, and Industry Norms

Andrea Harris and Murray Fulton

Copyright © February 1996 Centre for the Study of Co-operatives University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

With proper acknowledgement, this work may be freely referred to and quoted. However, permission must be obtained from the publisher and the author for reproduction of this work in any form or for its inclusion in any electronic data storage or retrieval system. Direct all such requests to the Centre for the Study of Co-operatives, University of Saskatchewan, 101 Diefenbaker Place, Saskatoon, Sask. S7N 5B8 Fax: (306) 966-8517 Phone: (306)966-8509. E-mail: hendersb@duke.usask.ca. Website: http://www.coop_studies.usask.ca.

ISBN 0-88880-339-7

Editing and layout: Byron Henderson

Canadian Cataloguing in Publication Data is available by contacting the Centre.

Centre for the Study of Co-operatives

The Centre for the Study of Co-operatives was established in 1984 as a post-secondary teaching and research institute at the University of Saskatchewan. The Centre is supported financially by the University of Saskatchewan, by major co-operatives, and by the Government of Saskatchewan.

The objectives of the Centre are:

- to develop and offer university courses that provide an understanding of co-operative theory, principles, development, structures, and legislation;
- to undertake original research into co-operatives;
- to publish co-operative research, both that of Centre staff and of other researchers; and
- to maintain a resource centre of materials that support the Centre's teaching and research functions.

For more information about the Centre, contact:

Centre for the Study of Co-operatives 101 Diefenbaker Place, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Sask., S7N 5B8 Phone: (306) 966-8509 Fax: (306) 966-8517

The Centre for the Study of Co-operatives publications are designed to disseminate and encourage the discussion of research conducted at, or under the auspices of, the Centre for the Study of Co-operatives. The views expressed constitute the opinions of the author, to whom any comments should be addressed.

List of Occasional Papers Centre for the Study of Co-operatives*

85.01	Worker Co-operatives in Mondragon, the U.K., and France: Some Reflections (48p.) Christopher Axworthy
85.02	Employment Co-operatives: An Investment in Innovation: Proceedings of the Saskatoon Worker Co-operative Conference (277p.) Skip McCarthy, editor
85.03	Prairie Populists and theIdea of Co-operation, 1910-1945 (41p.) David Laycock
86.01	Co-operatives and Their Employees: Towards a Harmonious Relationship (73p.) Christopher Axworthy
86.02	Co-operatives and Social Democracy: Elements of the Norwegian Case (33p.) Finn Aage Ekelund
86.03	Encouraging Democracy in Consumer and Producer Co-operatives (115p.) Stuart Bailey
86.04	A New Model for Producer Co-operatives in Israel (40p.) Abraham Daniel
87.01	Election of Directors in Saskatchewan Co- operatives: Processes and Results (64p.) Lars Apland
87.02	The Property of the Common: Justifying Co-operative Activity (67p.) Finn Aage Ekelund
87A.03	Co-operative/Government Relations in Canada: Lobbying, Public Policy Development and the Changing Co-operative System (227p.) David Laycock
87A.04	The Management of Co-operatives: A Bibliography (137p.) Lou Hammond Ketilson, Bonnie Korthuis and Colin Boyd
87.05	Labour Relations in Co-operative (22p.) Kurt Wetzel and Daniel G. Gallagher
87A.06	Worker Co-operatives: An International Bibliography/Coopératives de Travailleurs: Une Bibliographie Internationale (68p.) Rolland LeBrasseur, Alain Bridault, David Gallingham, Gérard Lafrenière and Terence Zinger
88.01	Worker Co-operatives and Worker Ownership: Issues Affecting the Development of Worker Co- operatives in Canada (291p.) Christopher Axworthy and David Perry

88.02	A History of Saskatchewan Co-operative Law - 1900 to 1960 (58p.) Donald Mullord, Christopher Axworthy and David Liston
88.03	Co-operativeOrganizations in Western Canada (29p.) Murray Fulton
88.04	Farm Interest Groups and Canadian Agricultural Policy (36p.) Barry Wilson, David Laycock and Murray Fulton
89.01	Patronage Allocation, Growth and Member Well-Being in Co-operatives (38p.) Jeff Corman and Murray Fulton
89.02	The Future of Worker Co-operatives in Hostile Environments: Some Reflections from Down Under (84p.) Allan Halladay and Colin Peile
90.01	Community-Based Models of Health Care: A Bibliography (49p.) Lou Hammond Ketilson and Michael Quennell
91.01	The Co-operative Sector in Saskatchewan: A Statistical Overview (43p.) Louise Simbandumwe, Murray Fulton, and Lou Hammond Ketilson
91.02	Farmers, Capital, and the State in Germany, c. 1860-1914 (29p.) Brett Fairbairn
92.01	Co-operatives in Principle & Practice (133p.) Anne McGillivray and Daniel Ish
92.02	Matador: The Co-operative Farming Tradition (18p.) George Melnyk
92.03	Co-operative Development: Towards a Social MovemenPerspective (140+p.) Patrick Develtere
93-01	The Co-operative Movement: An International View (14p.) S.K. Saxena
94-01	Credit Unions and Caisses Populaires: Background, Market Characteristics and Future Development (21p.) J.T. Zinger
94-02	The Meaning of Rochdale: The Rochdale

- 94-02 The Meaning of Rochdale: The Rochdale Pioneers and the Co-operative Principles (57p.) Brett Fairbairn
- * These and other publications are available from the Centre. Please contact the office for price and ordering information. Phone: (306) 966-8509 Fax: (306) 966-8517

Table of Contents

List of Tables	v
List of Figures	vii
Acknowledgments	x

1

Introduction and Summary of Results	1
Introduction	1
Summary of Results	3
Liquidity	4
Profitability	4
Productivity	6
Leverage	6
Growth	6

Theory and Methodology	11
Theoretical Basis for the Comparison of Co-operatives and IOFs	11
Comparative Co-operative Performance	12
Performance Measurement	14
Financial Ratios	16
Liquidity Ratios	19
Current Ratio (CURRENT) and Quick Ratio (QUICK)	19
Profitability Ratios	19
Rate of Return Ratios (ROA, ROE, ROS)	19
Productivity Ratios	21
Sales to Asset Ratios (SALE2TA, SALE2FA, SALE2INV)	21
Days of Net Sales in Accounts Receivable (RECABLES)	22
Leverage Ratios	22
Debt Ratio (DEBT2TA)	22
Net Sales to Net Worth (SALE2EQ)	23

Total Liabilities-to-Equity (DEBT2EQ) and Long-term Debt-to-	
Equity (LTDBT2EQ)	23
Growth Rates	23
Asset Growth and Sales Growth	23
Methodology	24
Appendix 2.1 Determination of Outliers and Extraordinary Observations	26

3

Retail Sector	
Industry Overview	29
Overall Results	30
Retail Grocers with Total Assets Greater than \$1,000,000	30
Liquidity	32
Profitability	32
Productivity	35
Leverage	36
Growth	36
Retail Grocers with Total Assets Less than \$1,000,000 and	
Greater than \$250,000	39
Liquidity	40
Productivity	40
Leverage	40
Appendix 3.1 Investor-Owned Retail Grocers and Their Operations	44
Appendix 3.2 Yearly Median Ratios for Retail Grocers with Total Assets .	
Greater than \$250,000 and Less than \$1,000,000, 1987-1993	46

Fruit and Vegetable Sector	
Industry Overview	47
Overall Results	48
Fruit and Vegetable Firms with Total Assets Greater than \$250,000	49
Liquidity	50

Profitability	53
Productivity	53
Leverage	56
Growth	56
Appendix 4.1 Description of Operations for Investor-Owned Fruit and	
Vegetable Firms	59

5

Dairy Sector	63
Industry Overview	63
Overall Results	65
Dairy Firms with Total Assets Greater than \$1,000,000	65
Liquidity	65
Productivity	66
Leverage	67
Appendix 5.1 Industry Norms and Yearly Median Ratios for Dairy Firms	
With Total Assets Greater Than \$1,000,000, 1986-1993	70

Grain and Oilseeds Handling Sector	71
Industry Overview	71
Overall Results	72
Comparison of Grain and Oilseeds Handling Companies	73
Liquidity	74
Profitability	76
Productivity	78
Leverage	79
Growth	82
Appendix 6.1 Description and Operations of Grain and	
Oilseeds Handling Companies	85
Appendix 6.2 Mean Ratios of Co-operative and IOF Grain and	
Oilseeds Handling Companies	88

Feed Sector	89
Industry Overview	89
Overall Results	90
Feed Companies with Total Assets Greater than \$1,000,000	91
Liquidity	94
Profitability	94
Productivity	94
Leverage	98
Growth	98
Feed Companies with Total Assets Greater than \$250,000 and	
Less than \$1,000,000	99
Liquidity	100
Productivity	100
Leverage	101
Appendix 7.1 Description of Investor-Owned Feed Companies	104
Appendix 7.2 Yearly Median Ratios for Co-operative Feed Mills and	
Industry Norms for Firms with Total Assets Greater than \$250,000 and	
Less than \$1,000,000	106

Fi	shing Sector	107
	Industry Overview	107
	Overall Results	108
	Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than \$1,000,000	109
	Liquidity	110
	Profitability	110
	Productivity	112
	Leverage	115
	Growth	115

Harris and Fulton

Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than \$250,000 and		
Less than \$1,000,000	117	
Liquidity	118	
Productivity	118	
Leverage	119	
Appendix 8.1 Description of Investor-Owned Fish Firms with Total Assets		
Greater than \$1,000,000	122	
Appendix 8.2 Median Ratios for Co-operatives and Industry Norms for		
Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than \$250,000 and		
Less than \$1,000,000	126	

9

Conclusion	127
Summary of Results	127
Retail Grocery	127
Fruit and Vegetables	128
Dairy	128
Grain and Oilseeds Handling	129
Feed Milling	129
Fish	129

Conclusions, Limitations, and Areas for Further Research...... 130

List of Tables

Table 1.1	Overview of Sectors Analysed and Methodology
Table 1.2	Summary of Financial Performance Indicators Analysed5
Table 1.3	Summary of Results from Co-operative / Industry Norm
	Comparative Analysis8
Table 1.4	Summary of Results from Co-operative / IOF Comparative Analysis9
Table 2.1	Summary of Financial Performance Indicators Analysed, General
	Interpretation, and Expectation for Co-operatives18
Table 3.1	Consumer Co-operatives in Canada, 199229
Table 3.2	Consumer Products Sold by Co-operatives in Canada, 199230
Table 3.3	Sample Summary of Retail Grocers with Total Assets Greater than
	\$1,000,000
Table 3.4	Comparison of Retail Grocery Firms with Total Assets Greater than
	\$1,000,000
Table 3.5	Averages of Selected Variables for Retail Grocers with Total Assets
	Greater than \$250,000 and Less than \$1,000,000, 1987-199340
Table 4.1	Summary of Canadian Fruit and Vegetable Co-operatives, 199247
Table 4.2	Geographic Distribution of Sales by Fruit and Vegetable
Table 4.3	Summary Statistics for Fruit and Vegetable Firms
Table 4.4	Comparison of Fruit and Vegetable Firms with Total Assets Greater
	than \$250,000
Table 5.1	Summary of Canadian Dairy Co-operatives, 199263
Table 5.2	Dairy Products Sold by Canadian Co-operatives, 199264
Table 6.1	Grains and Oilseeds Sold by all Co-operatives in Canada, 199271
Table 6.2	Grains and Oilseeds Co-operatives in Canada, 199271
Table 6.3	Mean Statistics for Grain and Oilseeds Handling Companies,
	1989-199374
Table 6.4	Comparison of Grain and Oilseeds Handling Firms75
Table 7.1	Summary of Farm Supply Co-operatives in Canada, 1992
Table 7.2	Farm Supplies Sold by Co-operatives in Canada, 199290
Table 7.3	Summary Statistics for Feed Firms and Industry Norms Analysed92
Table 7.4	Comparison of Feed Firms with Total Assets Greater than \$1,000,00093
Table 8.1	Summary of Canadian Fishing Co-operatives, 1992107
Table 8.2	Summary Statistics of Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than
	\$1,000,000
Table 8.3	Comparison of Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than \$1,000,000111

List of Figures

Figure 3.1	Liquidity Ratios for Retail Grocers with Total Assets Greater than for	
	Retail Grocers with Total Assets Greater than \$1,000,000, 1989-1993	34
Figure 3.2	Profitability Ratios for Retail Grocers with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1989-1993	35
Figure 3.3	Productivity Ratios for Retail Grocers with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1989-1993	37
Figure 3.4	Leverage Ratios for Retail Grocers with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1989-1993	38
Figure 3.5	Growth Rates for Retail Grocers with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1990-1993	39
Figure 3.6	Liquidity Ratios for Retail Grocers With Total Assets Greater than	
	\$250,000 and Less than \$1,000,000, 1987-1993	41
Figure 3.7	Productivity Ratios for Retail Grocers With Total Assets Greater than	
	\$250,000 and Less than \$1,000,000, 1987-1993	42
Figure 3.8	Leverage Ratios for Retail Grocers With Total Assets Greater than	
	\$250,000 and Less than \$1,000,000, 1987-1993	43
Figure 4.1	Liquidity Ratios for Fruit and Vegetable Firms with Total Assets	
	Greater than \$250,000, 1990-93	51
Figure 4.2	Profitability Ratios for Fruit and Vegetable Firms with Total Assets	
	Greater than \$250,000, 1990-1993	54
Figure 4.3	Productivity Ratios for Fruit and Vegetable Firms with Total Assets	
	Greater than \$250,000, 1990-1993	55
Figure 4.4	Leverage Ratios for Fruit and Vegetable Firms with Total Assets	
	Greater than \$250,000, 1990-1993	57
Figure 4.5	Growth Rates for Fruit and Vegetable Firms with Total	58
Figure 5.1	Liquidity Ratios for Dairy Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1986-1993	66
Figure 5.2	Productivity Ratios for Dairy Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1986-1993	68
Figure 5.3	Leverage Ratios for Dairy Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1986-1993	69
Figure 6.1	Liquidity Ratios for Grain and Oilseeds Handling Companies,	
	1989 - 1993	76

Figure 6.2	Rates of Return on Assets for Grain and Oilseeds Handling	
	Companies, 1989-1993	77
Figure 6.3	Return on Sales and Return on Equity Ratios for Grain and Oilseeds	
	Handling Companies	78
Figure 6.4	Productivity Ratios for Grain and Oilseeds Handling Companies,	
	1989-1993	80
Figure 6.5	Leverage Ratios for Grain and Oilseeds Handling Companies,	
	1989-1993	81
Figure 6.6	Sales Growth Rates for Grain and Oilseeds Handling Companies,	
	1990-1993	83
Figure 6.7	Total Asset Growth Rates for Grain and Oilseeds Handling	
	Companies, 1990-1993	84
Figure 7.1	Liquidity Ratios for Feed Companies with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1989-1993	92
Figure 7.2	Profitability Ratios for Feed Companies with Total Assets Greater	
	than \$1,000,000, 1989-1993	95
Figure 7.3	Productivity Ratios for Feed Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1989-1993	96
Figure 7.4	Leverage Ratios for Feed Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1989-1993	97
Figure 7.5	Growth Rates for Feed Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1990-1993	99
Figure 7.6	Liquidity Ratios for Feed Companies with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$250,000 and Less than \$1,000,000, 1986-1993	100
Figure 7.7	Productivity Ratios for Feed Firms with Assets Greater than \$250,000	
	and Less than \$1,000,000, 1986-1993	102
Figure 7.8	Leverage Ratios for Feed Firms with Assets Greater than \$250,000 and	
	Less than \$1,000,000, 1986-1993	103
Figure 8.1	Liquidity Ratios for Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1989-1993	112
Figure 8.2	Profitability Ratios for Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1989-1993	114
Figure 8.3	Productivity Ratios for Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1989-1993	115
Figure 8.4	Leverage Ratios for Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1989-1993	116

Figure 8.5	Growth Rates for Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$1,000,000, 1990-1993	117
Figure 8.6	Liquidity Ratios for Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$250,000 and Less than \$1,000,000, 1986-1991	118
Figure 8.7	Productivity Ratios for Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$250,000 and Less than \$1,000,000, 1986-1991	120
Figure 8.8	Leverage Ratios for Fish Firms with Total Assets Greater than	
	\$250,000 and Less than \$1,000,000, 1986-1991	121

ix

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to acknowledge the financial support of the Co-operatives Secretariat in preparation of this project. The Co-operatives Secretariat also provided the financial data for the co-operatives used in this study. The authors would particularly like to thank Maurice Therrien, Alain Roy and the other Secretariat staff for the support and attention they gave to the project. The authors would also like to thank Lynden Hillier and Mary Pat MacKinnon of the Canadian Co-operative Association for their encouragement and their efforts in making this project possible. Finally, the authors would like to thank the researchers and staff at the Centre for the Study of Co-operatives for their helpful comments. As usual, the views and results in this paper are those of the authors.

Andrea Harris Murray Fulton

Saskatoon October 1995

1 Introduction and Summary of Results

Introduction

The performance of co-operatives in the Canadian economy is attracting increasing attention. The recent GATT and NAFTA agreements, industry structural change, increased competition, and deregulation raise concerns about Canadian co-operatives' ability to compete and survive. These events, however, also represent an opportunity for new co-operative development and for repositioning by existing co-operatives. Co-operative proposals for financial restructuring highlight the need for additional capital and raise questions about co-operatives' capacity to generate competitive rates of return that will attract outside investors. At the same time, co-operatives are under increased pressure to pursue local members' needs, such as community development, which are not wholly reflected in traditional rate of return figures.

An important aspect of Canadian co-operatives' ability to form, compete, attract capital, and provide services to their members is their financial and operating performance relative to other firms in the economy. Comparative performance data provides critical benchmarks for specific co-operatives. It also highlights the co-operative sector's strengths and weaknesses, which are useful in advertising the benefits of co-operatives to new members and the general public, and in encouraging new co-operative businesses to form.

Despite its importance, and although the ownership structure of firms has been shown to be an important factor in the competitiveness of firms, there is a lack of performance comparison data in Canada (Vining and Boardman). Available information from studies in the United States suggests co-operatives' financial performance is as strong as that of their investor-owned counterparts. The purpose of this paper is to empirically examine the financial performance of Canadian co-operatives and to compare this performance with that of investor-owned firms (IOF) and industry norms. The methodology used in this study focuses on comparing a number of accounting ratios and growth rates which provide insight into the liquidity, profitability, productivity, leverage, and growth of a firm.

This study differs from similar U.S. studies because it compares a number of ratios in each performance category and covers a broad range of industry sectors. The research follows the financial performance and growth of co-operatives over time and takes account of the industry in which the co-operative is operating. For instance, retail grocery cooperatives are compared to other retail groceries, while dairy co-operatives are compared to other dairies. Differences in scale are accounted for by comparing firms in two size categories.

Co-operatives in each sector are compared to published industry standards (with the exception of grains and oilseeds, for which comparable industry norms are unavailable). Non-parametric statistical tests are also undertaken to ascertain if significant differences between co-operatives and investor-owned firms exist. However, the range of co-operatives that can be directly compared with their investor-owned counterparts is restricted to those organizations which are relatively large. Table 1.1 provides an overview of the size of

firms, the period covered, and the form of comparative analysis undertaken for each of the industry sectors examined in this study.

The empirical results are linked to a conceptual framework which explicitly considers the unique characteristics of co-operatives. This conceptual framework is developed by reference to the fairly large theoretical literature on co-operative behaviour which suggests that differences between the financial performance of co-operatives and other business organizations can be expected due to differences in their business objectives, strategies, and structure. The analysis therefore allows a number of questions to be analysed, including Canadian co-operatives' relative efficiency and profitability and whether Canadian cooperatives have greater constraints with respect to capital and growth. Questions such as these are important for co-operative policy makers and advocates, co-operative development workers, and co-operative members and managers.

Many of the benefits attributed to co-operative enterprise are difficult to measure and quantify. Hence, co-operatives are typically modeled as a variant of an investor-owned firm (IOF) and are evaluated using financial performance criteria, such as ratios and growth rates, developed for investor-owned firms. Financial ratios and growth rates reflect the effect of corporate strategic decisions and, as such, can provide insight into the impact different business strategies may be having on co-operative performance. Although financial performance indicators are difficult to interpret by themselves, they are well-suited to comparative analysis. Furthermore, because these are the criteria by which financial institutions and critics commonly use to judge co-operative performance, they can provide an indicator of co-operatives' ability to operate and survive in a market.

	Type of Comparison	
	Co-op/IOF Co-op/Ind.Norm	
Sector and Size of Firms Analysed		
Retail Grocery		
Total Assets > \$1,000,000	1989-1993	1989-1993
Total Assets > \$250,000; < \$1,000,000	-	1987-1993
Fruit and Vegetables		
Total Assets > \$250,000	1990-1993	1990-1993
Dairy		
Total Assets > \$1,000,000	-	1986-1993
Grains and Oilseeds		
Total Assets > \$1,000,000	1989-1993	-
Feed		
Total Assets > \$1,000,000	1989-1993	1989-1993
Total Assets > \$250,000; < \$1,000,000	-	1986-1993
Fish		
Total Assets > \$1,000,000	1989-1993	1989-1993
Total Assets > \$250,000; < \$1,000,000	-	1986-1993

Table 1.1Overview of Sectors Analysed and Methodology

Summary of Results

The results of this study are based on a comparison of a number of performance criteria typically used to evaluate the financial performance of firms. The rates and ratios compared in the study are grouped into five broad performance categories: liquidity, profitability, productivity, leverage, and growth. Table 1.2 lists these performance indicators and how they are calculated from balance sheet and income statement entries.

The organizational structure of co-operatives is unique. Co-operatives can provide members with a number of benefits, both directly through patronage refunds, and indirectly, through the market, but they also face a number of problems unique to userowned businesses. Co-operative theory suggests that both the positive and negative aspects of user-ownership and control will affect the business decisions and strategies of a cooperative firm.

The different goals and business strategies of co-operative firms versus investor-owned firms are expected to affect financial performance in a number of ways. A co-operative objective to increase the welfare of its members may lead to lower profit levels and higher liquidity ratios than IOF competitors or the industry norms. Moral hazard and horizon problems may cause operational inefficiencies and have a negative impact upon productivity ratios. Low levels of member investment may cause a co-operative to be more highly leveraged. All of these factors can combine to have a negative impact upon the relative growth of co-operative firms.

To examine if the goals and business strategies have influenced the financial performance of co-operatives, mean and median values of the selected financial indicators for co-operatives in different sectors and size categories are compared with published industry norms over a number of years through the use of graphic analysis and yearly and summary statistics. Table 1.3 provides an indication of the expected difference between the ratios analysed for co-operatives versus IOFs in the first column, and also summarizes the results of the comparisons of co-operatives and industry norms for similarly sized firms. Plus signs indicate a larger overall average ratio for co-operatives than the industry norm and minus signs indicate a lower co-operative overall average ratio. Profit and growth measures could not be compared due to the unavailability of data.

In a number of sectors, co-operatives are also compared directly with investor-owned firms. Non-parametric statistical tests are conducted to examine if significant differences exist between the mean ratios of large co-operatives and IOFs. The null hypothesis is that co-operatives and IOFs have similar mean values for each of the performance indicators. Table 1.4 summarizes the results from these tests. The approximation symbol (\approx) is used to denote cases where the null hypothesis could not be rejected and plus and minus signs are used to indicate the relative difference between the co-operative mean ratio and the IOF mean ratio when the hypothesis is rejected.

Liquidity

Co-operatives operating in all of the sectors analysed in this study appear to be more liquid in the short-run than other firms in their industry. The results from the industry norm comparisons show that higher than average current and quick ratios were reported in each sector. In sectors where direct co-operative and IOF comparisons were made, cooperatives were found to be at least as liquid as the IOFs. These results suggest that further research is required regarding the attitudes of co-operatives towards risk. Perhaps, as Staatz (1984) suggests, co-operatives are more risk averse that other forms of enterprise and are therefore more likely to support business strategies which maintain a stable short-term debt position.

Profitability

The results from the non-parametric statistical comparisons of profitability measures for co-operatives and IOFs suggest that although co-operatives may not theoretically hold profit maximization as their primary objective, there is little evidence to suggest that this has had a significant impact upon their reported rates of return. Large co-operatives in the retail grocery and fish sectors report rates of return which are generally higher than their IOF counterparts, while co-operatives involved in the fruit and vegetable, feed, and grain handling sectors report rates of return which are generally similar to those of their IOF competitors.

Table 1.2Summary of Ratios Analysed



Productivity

By examining asset turnover ratios, co-operatives in all sectors, with the exception of the retail grocery industry, appear to be more productive than what is considered the norm for the industries within which they operate. Co-operatives operating in the feed, fish, fruit and vegetable, and dairy sector generally report higher asset turnover ratios than the industry norm. Retail grocers as a whole report lower asset turnover ratios than the industry norm. In comparison to IOFs, large co-operatives in the feed, fish, fruit and vegetable, and grain handling industries all report similar mean sales-to-total asset and sales-to-inventory ratios, while retail grocers report lower sales-to-total asset figures. Feed, fish, and grain handling co-operatives also report higher sales-to-fixed asset ratios than their IOF competitors. The latter result could be due to operational efficiencies, but may also indicate a lack of capital investment on behalf of co-operatives.

With the exception of the dairy and retail grocery industry, co-operatives in the remaining sectors all reported lower levels of accounts receivable as a portion of sales when compared to industry norms, suggesting greater efficiency in credit collection. None of the comparisons made between co-operatives and IOFs (again, with the exception of retail grocers) indicate statistically significant differences in credit collection policies. The higher number of credit days reported by retail grocery co-operatives is not surprising when considering that a large percentage of their accounts receivable are likely being held by member-patrons.

Leverage

Based on the comparison of leverage ratios, the majority of co-operative firms analysed do not appear to be more leveraged or less financially secure in the long-run than other firms operating in the same industry. With the exception of co-operatives operating in the fruit and vegetable and fish sectors, co-operative firms report lower relative debt levels than comparable industry norms. Non-parametric analysis suggests that large cooperatives in the retail grocery, feed, and grain handling industry are less leveraged than their IOF competitors, while large commercial fish co-operatives are as leveraged as their IOF competitors. Fruit and vegetable co-operatives are, on the other hand, more leveraged than IOF processors and wholesalers.

It must be noted, however, that leverage ratios do not reveal the complete debt structure of co-operatives. This is because co-operatives frequently rely on retained earnings as a means of generating additional capital. Retained earnings are included in total equity figures even though they are, in some aspects, similar to debt in that they must be repaid to members at a future date.

Growth

Statistical comparisons of the sales and asset growth rates of co-operative firms and IOFs suggest that co-operatives in the retail grocery, fruit and vegetable, fish, and grain handling sector are growing at rates comparable to investor-owned firms. Co-operatives involved in feed milling report lower sales growth than their competitors, but a similar rate of asset growth. However, there are extremely high variances in the growth rates amongst the co-operative and investor-owned firms. One implication of this large variance

is that the rejection of statistical hypotheses is very difficult. Hence, conclusive statements regarding differences between co-operative and IOF growth are hard to make. An additional implication, is that both co-operatives and IOFs need to keep this variance in mind when comparing their growth rates with their industry counterparts.

Table 1.3 Summary of Results from Co-operative / Industry Norm Comparative Analysis

Table 1.4 Summary of Results from Co-operative / IOF Comparative Analysis