# A SPECIFIC MODEL OF RATING IN ROMANIAN TOURISM BUSINESS

# TODEA (Maris) Angela 1, SABĂU Cătălin 2, CSEGEDI Sandor<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup> Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca

#### Abstract.

This paper aims to present a model specific ratings tourism enterprises with which to analyze the financial performance of SC Tourism Felix SA against three bank rating models: the Banca Transilvania Romanian Development Bank Group model Societe the general and Raiffeisen Bank and two models for bankruptcy risk analysis: the Altman and Robertson model.

Keywords: ratings, liquidity, solvency, performance

JEL classification: -

#### 1. Introduction

Financial standing is an assessment based business activity scores that besides analyzing the financial position, financial performance and cash flows provides more complete information on what happened in the company. With financial standing, managers can be informed at any time about the causes that led to a lack of financial resources, the causes that led to unpaid obligations to the credit institution or the state, and the causes that led to unpaid obligations to shareholders of the entity or investors.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Ph.D. student, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, maris\_angela2000@yahoo.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ph.D. student, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, cat\_sab@yahoo.com

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ph.D. student, Faculty of Economics and Business Administration, Babes-Bolyai University, Cluj-Napoca, Romania, exkontalex@yahoo.com

#### 2. Method and results

To achieve their own financial rating model we considered important and relevant to a firm's financial performance analysis following indicators, which we included in the model:

- Patrimonial solvency
- Current liquidity
- Indebtedness
- · Return on equity
- Economic profitability

Patrimonial solvency was calculated as the ratio between equity and total liabilities. Current liquidity ratio is calculated as current assets (consisting of current assets and prepaid expenses) and current liabilities (consisting of short-term debt and income in advance). Route calculation indebtedness to the ratio between total debt and total assets. Return on equity was calculated as the ratio of net result for the year and equity. Economic rate of return was calculated as the ratio between the net result for the year and total balance sheet.

To give scores to each criterion we developed the following scoring grid.

Scores awarded Financial performance criteria 10 points 0 points 8 points 3 points 6 points 40,1-50,030,1-40,0Patrimonial solvency Over 50.0 20,1-30,0Sub 20,0 Current liquidity > 150% 136%-121%-100% - 120% <100% 149% 135% Indebtedness  $\leq 30\%$ 31% - 42% 43% - 55% 56% - 70% > 70% 5.1 - 10%1,1-5%Return on Equity > 15,1% 10,1 - 15%0 - 1.0%5 - 7,5%Economic profitability 7.5 - 10% $2,\overline{5-5}$ % < 2,5% > 10%

**Table 1: Performance criteria scores** 

Source: own preworks

Based on these financial confidence intervals will be calculated the total score of the firm, and firm performance will fall within one of the groups of economic performance - financial below:

Category "A" - 41 - 50 points

Category "B" - 26 to 40 points

Category "C" - 16 to 25 points

Category "D" - 5 to 15 points

Category "E" - <5 points

Table 2: The rating from SC Tourism Felix SA - LEI -

Table 2: The rating from SC Tourish Felix SA - LEI -							
		Accomplis	Accomplis	Accomplis	Accomplis	Accomplis	
INDICAT		hed	hed	hed	hed	hed	
ORS		31.12.200	31.12.200	31.12.201	31.12.201	31.12.201	
		8	9	0	1	2	
T		70 532	151 023	129 713	136 052	145 761	
Equity		742	695	542	862	009	
Total		85 981	166 285	146 922	154 080	168 232	
liabilities		264	167	693	764	169	
Patrimonia	1	82,03	90,82	88,29	88,30	86,64	
l solvency	1	82,03	90,82	00,29	88,30	80,04	
Points		10	10	10	10	10	
awarded		10	10	10	10	10	
Current		44 819	56 142	68 491	81 286	100 718	
Assets		545	115	180	900	720	
Current		11 504	11 661	14 103	12 291	18 268	
liabilities		433	531	783	690	373	
Current	2	389,58	481,43	485,62	661,32	551,33	
liquidity		309,30	461,43	463,02	001,32	331,33	
Points		10	10	10	10	10	
awarded		10	10	10	10	10	
Takal dalah		15 448	15 261	17 209	18 027	22 471	
Total debt		522	472	151	902	160	
Tatal assats		85 981	166 285	146 922	154 080	168 232	
Total assets		264	167	693	764	169	
Indebtedne ss	3	17,97	9,18	11,71	11,70	13,36	
Points		10	10	10	10	10	
awarded		10	10	10	10	10	
Net		12 715	13 514	- 21 310	19 636	14 414	
result for		098	213	153	090	793	
the year				133			
Equity		70 532	151 023	129 713	136 052	145 761	
Equity		742	695	542	862	009	

Return on Equity	4	18,03	8,95	-16,43	14,43	9,89
Points awarded		10	6	0	8	6
Net result for the year		12 715 098	13 514 213	- 21 310 153	19 636 090	14 414 793
Total assets		85 981 264	166 285 167	146 922 693	154 080 764	168 232 169
Economic rate of return	5	14,79	8,13	-14,50	12,74	8,57
Points awarded		10	8	0	10	8
TOTAL SC ORE		50,00	44,00	30,00	48,00	44,00
Mark	0	Very good	Very good	Good	Very good	Very good

Source: own processing in Excel 2009, according to financial statements

From the above data calculated following:

Patrimonial solvency high values, exceeding the limit of 50% throughout the period analyzed in a slightly downward trend since 2009 until 2012. This high value indicates that the share of own sources in total liabilities is high, the company resorting to external financing only to a small extent. At this performance criterion SC Tourism Felix SA obtained the maximum score of 10 points.

Current liquidity high values far above the range of safety signs that the company can cover its current liabilities from current assets. This is not necessarily positive, because the company should invest this surplus liquidity to future benefits. And company performance criterion received the maximum score throughout the period analyzed.

*Indebtedness* also records perform well, ranging between this security because company records very small debt compared to total assets.

Return on equity and return on assets values are oscillating throughout the period under review, in 2010 this indicator was negative because the company

recorded loss from financial activities and thus a negative result. Scores for these indicators were given differentiated by the value obtained rates as can be seen in the table above.

After calculating the final score by summing the scores obtained for each criterion, the company analyzed was placed in Group 'A' economic performance - financial years 2008, 2009, 2011 and 2012, achieving a score between 41 and 50 points and were awarded "Very Good". For 2010, the company received a "Good" and was classified as "B" financial economic performance achieving 30 points.

To improve the grade obtained in 2010 we made a script based on the following hypotheses:

- It will review the portfolio shares and 20,000,000 savings will find lei so that adjustment expenses recorded will decrease the value of financial assets and of investments held as current assets, thus decreasing the value of total expenditure;
- Improved production sold 20% leading to an increase in operating revenue and consequently to an increase in total revenues.

After applying this scenario, their model will be presented as follows:

Table 3: Change its model from the application scenario for 2012 - LEI -

INDICATOR S		accomplis hed 31.12.200 8	accomplis hed 31.12.200 9	accomplis hed 31.12.201 0	accomplis hed 31.12.201	accomplis hed 31.12.201 2
Equity		70 532 742	151 023 695	129 713 542	136 052 862	145 761 009
Total liabilities		85 981 264	166 285 167	146 922 693	154 080 764	161 607 326
Patrimoni al solvency	1	82,03	90,82	88,29	88,30	90,19
Points awarded		10	10	10	10	10
Current		44 819	56 142	68 491	81 286	100 718
Assets		545	115	180	900	720
Current		11 504	11 661	14 103	12 291	11 643
liabilities		433	531	783	690	530

Revista Economica 65:5 (2013)

Current liquidity	2	389,58	481,43	485,62	661,32	865,02
Points awarded		10	10	10	10	10
Total debt		15 448 522	15 261 472	17 209 151	18 027 902	15 846 317
Total assets		85 981 264	166 285 167	146 922 693	154 080 764	168 232 169
Indebtedn ess	3	17,97	9,18	11,71	11,70	9,42
Points awarded		10	10	10	10	10
NT 1		10.715	12.514	11 406	10.626	1 4 41 4
Net result for the year		12 715 098	13 514 213	11 426 760	19 636 090	14 414 793
Equity		70 532 742	151 023 695	129 713 542	136 052 862	145 761 009
Return on Equity	4	18,03	8,95	8,81	14,43	9,89
Points awarded		10	6	6	8	6
Net result		12 715	13 514	11 426	19 636	14 414
for the year		098	213	760	090	793
Total assets		85 981 264	166 285 167	146 922 693	154 080 764	168 232 169
Economic		4U <del>4</del>	107	023	/ U <del>1</del>	107
rate of		14,79	8,13	7,78	12,74	8,57
return	5					
Points awarded		10	8	8	10	8
TOTAL SCORE		50,00	44,00	44,00	48,00	44,00
Rating 0	0	Very good	Very good	Very good	Very good	Very good

Source: own processing in Excel 2009

It can be seen from the above table that the following application scenario assumptions, SC Tourism Felix received a "very good" in 2010.

### 3. Conclusions

By applying the model of rating financial performance of SC Tourism Felix SA, we used five indicators considered important and relevant for financial analysis of an economic entity. The five indicators chosen were: patrimonial solvency, current liquidity, leverage, return on equity and return on assets ratio. As expected, the entity has been rated "Good" in 2010, due to financial loss and implicitly negative result obtained in that year. For that year was made a scenario with two hypotheses: increased production sold and portfolio revaluation of shares held. This scenario has improved the value indicators and providing "very good" and for 2010.

As a general conclusion from the above, even if some indices were out of range safety intervals overall evolution of society is a good one, it giving credibility with investors and creditors and as a possible source of investment for potential interested entities.

## 4. References

- Achim, M. (2009) Economic Analysis Financial, Cluj Napoca: Risoprint Publishing House.
- Altman, E. (2010) Predicting Financial distress of companes: Revisting the Z-score and Zeta models, available online at: http://pages.stern.nyu.edu/~ealtman/Zscores.pdf.
- Anghel, I. (2002) Bankruptcy. Radiography and prediction, Bucharest: Economic Publishing House.
- Bătrâncea, I. et. of. (2013) Standing & Rating in Business, Cluj-Napoca: Editura Risoprint.
- Bătrâncea, M. (2003) Risk and bankruptcy, Cluj Napoca: Dacia Publishing House.
- Cape, I. (2004) Methods and Techniques bank books Science House, Cluj Napoca.
- Edum Fotwe, F., Price, A. and Thorpe, A. (1996) A review of tools for predincting Financial ratio contractor insolvency, Construction Management and Economics, 14, 189-198.
- Pahone, C.L. (2006) Estimation of the risk of failure in business activity, available online at: http://www.univagroiasi.ro/Horti/Lucr St 2006/45 pahone.pdf.

- Rusovici, Al. (1999) How to determine the rating, Journal Economic Tribune, no. 12, Bucharest.
- Turliuc, V., Cocris, V. (2009) Currency and Credit, Iasi: Ed University "Alexandru Ioan Cuza".