
Performance measures: traditional accounting measures vs. modern value-based measures. The case of earnings and EVA[®] in the Athens Stock Exchange (ASE)

Dimitrios I. Maditinios*

Kavala Institute of Technology,
Department of Business Administration,
School of Business and Economics,
Agios Loukas 65404, Kavala, Greece
Fax: 0030-2510-462219
E-mail: dmadi@teikav.edu.gr
*Corresponding author

Željko Šević

Division of Accounting, Finance and Risk,
Caledonian Business School,
Glasgow Caledonian University,
Cowcaddens Road, Glasgow G4 0BA, UK
E-mail: Zeljko.Sevic@gcal.ac.uk

Nikolaos G. Theriou

Kavala Institute of Technology,
Department of Business Administration,
School of Business and Economics,
Agios Loukas 654 04, Kavala, Greece
E-mail: ntheriou@teikav.edu.gr

Abstract: This study is stimulated by both the EVA[®] proponents' assertions and by the mixed empirical results for its value relevance reported until now. Pooled time-series, cross sectional data of listed companies in the Athens Stock Exchange (ASE) over the period 1992–2001 have been employed to examine whether EVA[®] or the traditional accounting-based measures are associated more strongly with stock returns. Relative information content tests reveal that stock returns are more closely associated with earnings per share than with EVA[®]. However, incremental information content tests suggest that EVA[®] adds considerable explanatory power to earnings per share.

Keywords: performance measures; traditional accounting performance measures; EPS; ROI; ROE; modern value based performance measures; EVA; economic value added; SVA; shareholder value added; ASE; Athens stock exchange.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Maditinos, D.I., Šević, Ž. and Theriou, N.G. (2009) 'Performance measures: traditional accounting measures vs. modern value-based measures. The case of earnings and EVA[®] in the Athens Stock Exchange (ASE)', *Int. J. Economic Policy in Emerging Economies*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp.323–334.

Biographical notes: Dimitrios I. Maditinos is an Assistant Professor of Information Technology, Finance and Financial Modelling in the Kavala Institute of Technology, School of Business and Economics Greece. He holds Degrees in Business Administration with specialisation in Information Technology from Lund University, Sweden, and a PhD from the Greenwich University, the Business School. Before becoming a full academic, he was working in senior position for Greek Productivity Center as responsible for professional training in Information Technology and Management. His research interests are in financial modelling, performance measurement systems, investors' behaviour in stock exchanges, financial information systems and electronic commerce.

Željko Šević is a Professor of Accounting, Finance and Public Policy and the Dean of the Caledonian Business School at Glasgow Caledonian University in Scotland. Prior to joining the Caledonian Business School in 2008, as the Head of the Division of Accounting, Finance and Risk, he was the Professor of Accounting Finance and Public Policy in the University of Greenwich Business School, where he was also the Director of Research, Outreach and European Affairs. He has extensive professional experience not only in academia, but also private, public and third sectors. He holds terminal degrees in Law and Financial Economics, is a professionally qualified accountant and certified fraud examiner. He has research interests revolving around the public sector and the application of business models in public sector organisations.

Nikolaos G. Theriou is a Professor in the Department of Business Administration at Kavala Institute of Technology, Greece. He is also the Director of the Postgraduate Program in Finance and Financial Information Systems at Kavala Institute of Technology, which is offered in collaboration with the University of Greenwich. He holds a BA in Economics (University of Bradford, UK), a MBA (University of Bradford, UK), and a PhD in Strategic Management (University of Derby, UK). His research interests include strategic management and resource-based view, management control systems, performance measurement and balanced scorecard, knowledge management, capital assets pricing, corporate governance, and ABC.

1 Introduction

Traditional performance measures appeared in the early 1900s and have been used ever since, in various forms, to measure corporations' financial performance. After the introduction of the discounted cash flow techniques, the Free Cash Flow (FCF) valuation model, the more consistent determination of valuation (Miller and Modigliani, 1961), the incorporation of growth in valuation models (Gordon, 1962), the cost of capital and the Capital Asset Pricing Model (CAPM) (Sharpe, 1964; Lintner, 1965; Black, 1972), the divisional performance and the adaptation of residual income (Solomons, 1965), a new concept, the Shareholder Value (SHV) approach, developed in the early 1980s, (Rappaport, 1986; Stewart, 1991) followed. Value-based performance

measures based on SHV approach, such as Shareholder Value Added (SVA), Economic Value Added (EVA[®]), Economic Profit (EP) and Cash Flow Return On Investment (CFROI), have all gained popularity since the late 1980s. Thus, the Value Based Management (VBM) approach became increasingly popular both as a decision making tool and as an incentive compensation system.

Several empirical studies have been conducted in the last two decades, first in the USA and later in the rest of the international market community, to answer questions such as: *is it really better to use value-based measures than traditional accounting performance measures to measure the financial performance of corporations?*, or *which performance measure best explains a corporation's change of market value?*. However, the reported results are quite mixed and controversial. This study is motivated by the controversial results of the previous research and aims to conduct a research for the ASE to assess

- a which one of those measures best explains a corporation's change of market value (relative information content tests)
- b after a pairwise combination of one traditional and one value-based performance measure, whether one measure adds information to that provided by the other (incremental information content tests).

Since the performance measures (traditional and modern) are many and appear in different variations, this study is focused on the most popular mentioned in the literature. Those are, from the traditional measures, EPS, ROI, ROE and from the modern value-based measures, EVA[®] and SVA.

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 presents a summary of the related literature review; Section 3 describes the methodology followed; Section 4 presents and analyses the results of the statistical analysis, and Section 5 concludes the paper with the most important findings, which are compared with those which already existed from previous research.

2 Literature review

Since the early 1980s, there has been a global momentum in the economy. Capital markets – indeed, almost all financial institutions – became more and more global in outlook. Moreover, investors began to be more sophisticated than ever and wanted to know every possible detail about a company. What the company had paid out in dividends in the past was not sufficient for investors. Financial statements, such as the balance sheet and profit and loss account, prepared in a traditional way were no longer enough. Cash flow had become a more important measure. Many consulting firms, academics and practitioners observed such global trends. They were moving forward from the traditional audit, on which they had focused for many years, in order to keep pace with the new trends. Indeed, the essential goal for many firms became the maximisation of their value, so as to keep their shareholders satisfied, as well as their employees, customers, suppliers and their communities (Black et al., 1998).

The idea that the primary responsibility for management is to increase their company's value, gained prominence and became widely accepted in the USA after the Rappaport's (1986) publication of *Creating SHV*. Moreover, accounting

earnings were under attack. Rappaport (1981, 1986, 1998) argued that earnings fail to measure the real change in economic value. Arguments, such as the alternative accounting methods that could be used, the investment requirements' exclusion in the calculation of profits, and the ignorance of the time value for money, brought about harsh criticism for earnings.

To overcome the problems associated with earnings-based measures, several scholars proposed alternative theories and new (modern) performance measures. As a consequence, the SHV approach was developed in the late 1980s and early 1990s. This approach estimates the economic value of an investment by discounting forecasted cash flows by the cost of capital (Rappaport, 1998, p.32). Proponents of SHV approach, either academics or consulting firms, based their analysis on FCF and the cost of capital, and produced a variety of such measures. The most common referred to variants of those measures are:

- a SVA by Rappaport and LEK/Alcar Consulting group (Rappaport, 1986, 1998)
- b CFROI^{®1} by Boston Consulting Group (BCG) and HOLT Value Associates (Black et al., 1998; Madden, 1999; Barker, 2001),
- c Cash Value Added (CVA) by BCG and the Swedes Ottoson and Weissenrieder (Ottoson and Weissenrieder, 1996; Madden, 1999; Barker, 2001)
- d EVA[®] by Stern Stewart & Co. (Stewart, 1991, 1999; Ehrbar, 1998, 1999; Stern, 2001).

The empirical research for the value relevance of traditional accounting performance measures and modern value-based performance measures is broad, but with controversial results. Several studies proved the superiority of EVA[®] as a performance measure (Stewart, 1991; O'Byrne, 1996; Uyemura et al., 1996; Milunovich and Tseui, 1996; Bao and Bao, 1998; Forker and Powell, 2004; Worthington and West, 2004) while others (Biddle et al., 1997; Chen and Dodd, 1997, 2001; de Villiers and Auret, 1998; Turvey et al., 2000; Worthington and West, 2001a; Copeland, 2002; Sparling and Turvey, 2003) provided different and opposing results. Thus, the question of relevance still holds well and the empirical research continues.

3 Methodology

3.1 Sample and the data collection

The sample period spans 10 years, from 1992 to 2001. There are 163 companies in the sample with a different number of participating years for each. These companies put forward a total of 984 year-observations. After excluding the extreme observations (three standard deviations), the final sample was reduced to 977 year-observations. Table 1 shows the variation of companies' participation and the number of observations from year to year.

The research began the sample selection using daily closing prices of the common stocks, which were trading in the ASE during the period from January 1990 to April 2002, even though the investigation period spans the period from 1992 to 2001. They are raw prices in the sense that they do not include dividends, but they are adjusted

for capital splits and stock dividends. It begins in January 1990 since it needs at least a two-year prior trading period for each stock to incorporate it in the sample. The main reason for this was the need for 36 monthly returns for each stock, in order to calculate its risk (beta) for each year, although Fama and McBeth (1973) used 60 monthly returns for this calculation. Thus, the stocks, which make up the sample for 1992, have a trading presence in the ASE at least from the first month of 1990.

Table 1 Companies' participation (year-observations) from year 1992 to 2001

<i>Year</i>	<i>Companies' participation/observations</i>	<i>Companies' participation/observations (3 std excluded)</i>
1992	37	37
1993	55	55
1994	71	71
1995	73	73
1996	80	80
1997	106	106
1998	120	118
1999	135	130
2000	144	144
2001	163	163
<i>Total</i>	<i>984</i>	<i>977</i>

It also included the closing prices three months after the fiscal year end 2001 since the return period for each year spans the nine months prior to three months after the fiscal year end (Easton and Harris, 1991; Biddle et al., 1997; Chen and Dodd, 2001). Except for the daily closing prices for each stock, the daily General Index of the ASE and the three-month Government Treasury Bill rate were also collected, which are considered to be the short-term interest rates (risk-free interest rate). All data were acquired directly from the ASE data bank.

From the daily closing prices of the common stocks, the daily returns for each stock was calculated using the logarithmic approximation (Benninga, 2001):

$$R_{i,t} = \log(P_{i,t}/P_{i,t-1}) \quad (1)$$

where $R_{i,t}$ is the return of stock i at time t , while $P_{i,t}$ and $P_{i,t-1}$ are the prices of stock i at time t and $t-1$ respectively.

Daily returns were aggregated to compose the monthly returns, which are the primary inputs for our investigation. Using the same procedure, the monthly returns for the General Index (GI) were also calculated. Employing the first selection criterion, all financial companies and banks were excluded from the sample, whilst employing the second selection criterion, the companies with penalties or with long periods without transactions (more than two months) or with missing values, were also excluded. Using the monthly returns of each stock and the monthly returns of GI, the annual betas for each stock were estimated. Finally, annual returns were calculated as the aggregation of the monthly returns, extending nine months prior to three months after each fiscal year end.

The estimation of the adopted accounting and value-based performance measures was based on the annual balance sheet and income statement of each listed company included in the sample. This information was taken from the ASE database.

3.2 *The model*

This research is based on the Easton and Harris (1991) formal valuation model, which has been used by the majority of researchers who conducted similar studies (Biddle et al., 1997; Chen and Dodd, 1997, 2001; Worthington and West, 2001b) and which is actually the only model supported theoretically by their proponents. Up until now, as far as we know, this remains without any sound criticism from academia. The model links stock returns to earnings levels and earnings changes as below:

$$R_{jt} = \gamma_{t0} + \gamma_{t1}A_{jt} / P_{jt-1} + \gamma_{t2}\Delta A_{jt} / P_{jt-1} + \varepsilon_{jt} \quad (2)$$

where R_{jt} is the return on a share of firm j over the 12 months, extending from 9 months prior to fiscal year-end to three months after the fiscal year-end, A_{jt} is the accounting earnings per share of firm j for period t , ΔA_{jt} is the earnings change, and P_{jt-1} is the price per share of firm j at time $t - 1$.

Both relative and incremental information content approaches were employed to answer the two research questions under examination. The relative information content approach is used to explore the first research question, while the incremental information content approach is employed to answer the second.

To explore the first research question, five equations (variations) were developed, based on the Easton and Harris (1991) adopted model. Analytically, the earnings and earnings' change variables were replaced with each of the performance measures under examination. Thus, the following equations were finally developed:

$$\text{Returns} = a_0 + a_1\text{EPS}/P_{t-1} + a_2\Delta\text{EPS}/P_{t-1} + u_1 \quad (3)$$

$$\text{Returns} = b_0 + b_1\text{ROI} + b_2\Delta\text{ROI} + u_2 \quad (4)$$

$$\text{Returns} = c_0 + c_1\text{ROE} + c_2\Delta\text{ROE} + u_3 \quad (5)$$

$$\text{Returns} = d_0 + d_1\text{EVA}/P_{t-1} + d_2\Delta\text{EVA}/P_{t-1} + u_4 \quad (6)$$

$$\text{Returns} = e_0 + e_1\text{SVA}/P_{t-1} + u_5 \quad (7)$$

where, for all equations:

Returns are the annual compounded returns extending nine months prior to current fiscal year end to three months after the current fiscal year end

EPS is the earnings per share of firm at time t

Δ EPS is the change in earnings per share over period $t - 1$ to t

P_{t-1} is the market value per share at the first trading day of the ninth month prior to fiscal year end

ROI is the return on investment of firm at time t

Δ ROI is the change in ROI over period $t - 1$ to t

ROE is the return on equity of firm at time t

Δ ROE is the change in ROE over period $t - 1$ to t

EVA is the EVA[®] of firm at time t

Δ EVA is the change in EVA over period $t - 1$ to t

SVA is the SHV added over time $t - 1$ to t .

Through this approach (the relative information content approach), the study will investigate which one of the performance measures under examination is superior in terms of association with stock returns in the Greek capital market.

The equations will be estimated cross-sectionally by years, as well as using pooled cross-sectional and intertemporal data (Easton and Harris, 1991; Chen and Dodd, 2001; Worthington and West, 2001a). This design facilitates the use of testing procedures that are common in the information content literature and, therefore, will ease the comparison of the present study with those in the literature. In order to reveal the explanatory power of the variables under examination, the coefficients' significance, F -statistics, and R^2 's will be examined.

To explore the second research question the incremental information content tests will be employed (Cheng et al., 1993; Biddle et al., 1995; Chen and Dodd, 2001; Worthington and West, 2001b; Francis et al., 2003). The purpose of these tests is to examine whether one measure adds information to that provided by another measure. The coefficient of determination, $R^2_{p/q}$ denotes the increase in R^2 due to variable p , conditional on variable q , and $R^2_{p,q}$ denotes the R^2 due to both variables p and q (Cheng et al., 1993). Pooled time-series cross sectional data (all years) will be employed to reveal the information usefulness of each regression model. For this purpose the Easton and Harris (1991) model was extended, incorporating the combination of one traditional and one value-based performance measure. The new equations (variations) that have been developed to explore the incremental information content of the pairwise combination of these measures are six (equations (8)–(13)):

$$\text{Returns}_t = l_0 + a_1 \text{EPS}/P_{t-1} + a_2 \Delta \text{EPS}/P_{t-1} + d_1 \text{EVA}/P_{t-1} + d_2 \Delta \text{EVA}/P_{t-1} + u_{6t} \quad (8)$$

$$\text{Returns}_t = m_0 + a_1 \text{EPS}/P_{t-1} + a_2 \Delta \text{EPS}/P_{t-1} + e_1 \text{SVA}/P_{t-1} + u_{7t} \quad (9)$$

$$\text{Returns}_t = n_0 + b_1 \text{ROI} + b_2 \Delta \text{ROI} + d_1 \text{EVA}/P_{t-1} + d_2 \Delta \text{EVA}/P_{t-1} + u_{8t} \quad (10)$$

$$\text{Returns}_t = o_0 + b_1 \text{ROI} + b_2 \Delta \text{ROI} + e_1 \text{SVA}/P_{t-1} + u_{9t} \quad (11)$$

$$\text{Returns}_t = p_0 + c_1 \text{ROE} + c_2 \Delta \text{ROE} + d_1 \text{EVA}/P_{t-1} + d_2 \Delta \text{EVA}/P_{t-1} + u_{10t} \quad (12)$$

$$\text{Returns}_t = q_0 + c_1 \text{ROE} + c_2 \Delta \text{ROE} + e_1 \text{SVA}/P_{t-1} + u_{11t} \quad (13)$$

4 Results

4.1 Relative information content approach

Relative information content is assessed by comparing R^2 's from five separate regressions (3–7), one for each performance measure, EPS, ROI, ROE, EVA and SVA. R^2 's from these regressions are provided in Table 2. The higher R^2 is shown on the left and the lowest is shown on the right.

Following the Easton and Harris (1991) and Chen and Dodd (2001) methodology, the model was estimated using both the pooled cross-sectional and intertemporal (all years) samples and the individual year cross-sectional sample.

Table 2 Summary (all years) results from the five (3–7) regressions

<i>All years</i>	<i>Regression (3)</i> <i>EPS</i>	<i>Regression (6)</i> <i>EVA</i>	<i>Regression (4)</i> <i>ROI</i>	<i>Regression (7)</i> <i>SVA</i>	<i>Regression (5)</i> <i>ROE</i>
<i>R</i> ²	0.019	0.009	0.004	0.001	0.000
<i>F</i>	9.577***	4.546***	2.781*	0.910	0.005
Significance	0.000	0.01	0.062	0.340	0.995

*Significance at 10% level.

**Significance at 5% level.

***Significance at 1% level.

First, there is a significant difference between the five regressions in the relative information content tests. Regressions (3) and (6) are significant at 0.01 level, regression (4) is significant at 0.1 level, while regressions (5) and (7) are not statistically significant. Secondly, comparing the reported R^2 's of the five pooled regressions, it can be seen that all are largely consistent to those of Biddle et al. (1997), Worthington and West (2001a), Chen and Dodd (2001).

The results of the present study show that EPS ($R^2 = 1.9\%$) provides more information in explaining stock returns than EVA ($R^2 = 0.9\%$). Biddle et al. (1997) found that Earnings Before Extraordinary Items-EBEI with an $R^2 = 9.0\%$ provides more information than Residual Income-RI ($R^2 = 6.2\%$), and EVA ($R^2 = 5.0\%$). Worthington and West (2001b) also found similar results: EBEI ($R^2 = 23.6\%$), RI ($R^2 = 19.2\%$) and EVA ($R^2 = 14.3\%$), whilst Chen and Dodd (2001) reported that Operating Income-OI with an $R^2 = 6.2\%$ explains the stock returns better than RI ($R^2 = 5.0\%$) and EVA ($R^2 = 2.3\%$). The results of this research suggest that for the Greek capital market, the new information provided by the EVA measure is less value relevant than EPS, at least from a stock return perspective. On the other hand, the low explanatory power of the five regressions is consistent with Copeland's (2002) results, who also found low R^2 's for EPS and EVA (although EPS outperformed EVA), i.e., scaled EPS 4.5%, change in EPS 5.1%, scaled EVA 0.3%, and change in EVA 3%.

Examining separately each of the five regressions (3–7) and using the individual year cross-sectional sample, the results are largely consistent with those reported for the pooled cross-sectional and intertemporal (all years) sample.

4.2 Incremental information content approach

To test the incremental information power, each traditional performance measure (EPS, ROI and ROE) is combined pairwise with each of the value-based performance measures (EVA and SVA) forming six different equations (8)–(13). An assumption of a linear relationship between these variables was made.

All regression models were tested for multicollinearity using the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). According to Neter et al. (1985) a VIF in excess of 10 is often taken as an indicator of severe multicollinearity, while mild multicollinearity exists when the VIF is between 5 and 10. A VIF lower than 5 indicates that multicollinearity does not exist. The reported VIF from our regressions are mostly less than 5. Examination of the residual plot and normality plot reveal no serious violations of the regressions' assumptions. There was an attempt to correct these minor violations, but the outcome

either produced regressions with insignificant coefficients, or regressions with similar explanatory power to the initial ones.

Table 3 shows the detailed results from the pairwise combinations of one traditional performance measure and one value-based performance measure. It can be seen that regressions (8)–(12) are significant at the 0.05 level or better, whereas regression (13) is statistically insignificant.

Table 3 Incremental information content approach: Pairwise combinations (Incremental/One traditional measure + One value-based measure)

Regression	All years	CONST	EPS	ΔEPS	ROI	ΔROI	ROE	ΔROE	EVA	ΔEVA	SVA	R ²	F	No. of Obs.
8	coef	-0.0249	0.2580	0.0056					-0.1570	0.0001		0.072		976
	t	-1.073	7.772***	2.464**					-7.355***	0.405			18.761***	
	sign	0.283	0.000	0.014					0.000	0.686			0.000	
	VIF	1.834	1.834	1.004					1.824	1.006				
9	coef	0.0406	0.0958	0.0057					-0.0020		-0.0020	0.020		976
	t	1.848*	3.795***	2.451**					-0.966		-0.966		6.773***	
	sign	0.065	0.000	0.014					0.334		0.334		0.000	
	VIF	1.004	1.004	1.004					1.001		1.001			
10	coef	0.0281			0.0630	0.0032			-0.0680	0.0003		0.021		976
	t	1.243			2.195**	2.173**			-3.730***	1.000			5.141***	
	sign	0.214			0.028	0.030			0.000	0.317			0.000	
	VIF				1.293	1.025			1.267	1.000				
11	coef	0.0366			0.1480	0.0022			-0.0126		-0.0126	0.015		976
	t	1.635			2.887***	1.465			-3.005***		-3.005***		4.904***	
	sign	0.102			0.004	0.143			0.003		0.003		0.002	
	VIF				4.119	1.080			4.021		4.021			
12	coef	0.0420					0.0001	0.0009	-0.0528	0.0003		0.011		976
	t	1.869*					0.027	1.027	-3.072***	0.977			2.599**	
	sign	0.062					0.979	0.305	0.002	0.319			0.035	
	VIF						1.002	1.113	1.115	1.001				
13	coef	0.0556					-0.0003	0.0013			-0.0044	0.002		976
	t	2.519**					-0.059	1.102			-1.458		0.711	
	sign	0.012					0.953	0.271			0.145		0.546	
	VIF						1.000	2.126			2.126			

*Significance at 10% level.
 **Significance at 5% level.
 ***Significance at 1% level.

The highest R^2 (7.2%) is reported in regression (8), which combines EPS, Δ EPS and EVA, Δ EVA. The contribution of the EPS in the explanatory power of this regression is higher than that of EVA, since the R^2 of EPS alone is 1.9% (regression 3, Table 2) while that of EVA alone is 0.9% (regression 6, Table 2).

This suggests that the combination of EPS and EVA represents the most satisfactory explanation for stock returns in the Greek stock market. Chen and Dodd (1997, 2001) and Worthington and West (2001a) revealed almost similar results for the USA and Australian capital markets respectively. They found that EVA is a useful measure for measuring financial corporate performance, especially when it is combined with EPS. All other examined models have reported low R^2 s (lower than 2.1%).

5 Summary/conclusions

The relative information content approach revealed that in the Greek stock market, earnings levels and earnings changes are associated with stock returns and outperform all other performance measures under examination (ROI, ROE, EVA and SVA) in explaining stock returns. These results are consistent with those reported for various international markets. Easton and Harris (1991), for example, found that earnings levels and earnings changes are associated with stock returns for the US market. Also, Biddle et al. (1997) and Chen and Dodd (2001) found that earnings outperform EVA and residual income in the US stock market. Günther et al. (2000) and Worthington and West (2001b) revealed similar results for the German and Australian stock markets, respectively. On the other hand, the results of the present study do not support the claims of Stewart (1991) and the advocates of the EVA financial system, that EVA alone is the best performance measure.

On the other hand, the incremental information content approach provided further interesting results. When EVA is incorporated into an EPS model its explanatory power increases from 1.9% to 7.2%. This suggests that the new information provided by EVA is of some value relevance in explaining stock returns. The relative low explanatory power of performance measures under examination is, by and large, consistent with the reported results of several relevant studies conducted for the US market. Chen and Dodd (1997) found that EVA variables and accounting profit variables could not explain more than 47% of the variation of stock returns. Moreover, a recent study of Chen and Dodd (2001) provided evidence that EPS and EVA could not explain more than 23.49% of stock returns. These results support the claims of many scholars that more determinants should be employed to assess the value of the firm. This evidence suggests that the participants in the Greek Stock market should pay additional attention to the relatively new value-based performance measure.

This study can be further extended in examining the incremental information content not only of the pairwise combinations, but also from combinations incorporating more than one traditional or value-based performance measure. Another important suggestion for further research is to explore the value relevance of other factors beyond the above examined performance measures in explaining stock returns. Behavioural finance provides a good ground for this. Moreover, comparative studies within stock markets with similar market characteristics to those of Greece, should add value to this kind of research.

References

- Bao, B-H. and Bao, D-H. (1998) 'Usefulness of value added and abnormal economic earnings: an empirical examination', *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, Vol. 25, Nos. 1–2, pp.251–265.
- Barker, R. (2001) *Determining Value*, Prentice-Hall, London.
- Benninga, S. (2001) *Financial Modeling*, 2nd ed., The MIT Press, Cambridge.
- Biddle, G.C., Seow, G.S and Siegel, A.F. (1995) 'Relative versus Incremental Information Content', *Contemporary Accounting Research*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp.1–23.
- Biddle, G.C., Bowen, R.M. and Wallace, J.S. (1997) 'Does EVA beat earnings? Evidence on associations with stock returns and firm values', *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, Vol. 4, No. 3, pp.301–336.
- Black, A., Wright, P. and Bachman, J.E. (1998) *In Search of Shareholder Value: Managing the Drivers of Performance*, Pitman Publishing, London.
- Black, F. (1972) 'Capital market equilibrium with restricted borrowing', *Journal of Business*, Vol. 45, No. 3, pp.444–455.
- Chen, S. and Dodd, J.L. (1997) 'Economic value Added[®]: an empirical examination of a new corporate performance measure', *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp.318–333.
- Chen, S. and Dodd, J.L. (2001) 'Operating income, residual income and EVA[™]: Which metric is more value relevant?', *Journal of Managerial Issues*, Vol. 13, No. 1, pp.65–86.
- Cheng, C.S.A., Cheung, J.K. and Gopalakrishnan, V. (1993) 'On the usefulness of operating income, net income and comprehensive income in explaining security returns', *Accounting and Business Research*, Vol. 23, No. 91, pp.195–203.
- Copeland, T. (2002) 'What do practitioners want?', *Journal of Applied Finance*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp.5–12.
- de Villiers, J. and Auret, C.J. (1998) 'A comparison of EPS and EVA as explanatory variables for share price', *Studies in Economics and Econometrics*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp.47–63.
- Easton, P.D. and Harris, T.S. (1991) 'Earnings as an explanatory variable for returns', *Journal of Accounting Research*, Vol. 29, No. 1, pp.19–36.
- Ehrbar, A. (1998) *Economic Value Added: The Real Key to Creating Wealth*, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York.
- Ehrbar, A. (1999) 'Using EVA to measure performance and assess strategy', *Strategy and Leadership*, Vol. 27, No. 3, pp.20–25.
- Fama, E.F. and McBeth, J.D. (1973) 'Risk, return and equilibrium: empirical tests', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 81, No. 3, pp.607–636.
- Forker, J. and Powell, R. (2004) *Does EVA BEAT Earnings? Evidence on Associations with Stock Returns and Firm Values – Revisited*, Conference Paper, presented in EAA Meeting in Prague, 1–3 April.
- Francis, J., Schipper, K. and Vincent, L. (2003) 'The relative and incremental explanatory power of earnings and alternative (to earnings) performance measures for returns', *Contemporary Accounting Research*, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp.121–164.
- Gordon, M. (1962) *The Investment, Financing and Valuation of the Corporation*, Irwin, Homewood.
- Günther, T., Landrock, B. and Mucbe, T. (2000) 'Genwing versus Unternehmenswertorientierte performance – Eine Empirische Untersuchung auf Basis der Korrelation von Kapitalmarktrenditen für die Deutsche DAX-100-Unternehmen' [Profit versus value based performance measures. An empirical investigation based on the correlation with capital market for German DAX-100 companies], *Controlling*, Vol. 1, No. 2, pp.69–75; Vol. 2, No. 3, pp.129–134.
- Lintner, J. (1965) 'The valuation of risk assets and the selection of risky investments in stock portfolios and capital budgets', *Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 47, No. 1, pp.13–37.

- Madden, B.J. (1999) *CFROI Valuation: A Total System Approach to Valuing the Firm*, Butterworth-Heinemann, Oxford.
- Miller, M. and Modigliani, F. (1961) 'Dividend policy, growth and the valuation of shares', *The Journal of Business*, Vol. 34, No. 4, pp.411–433.
- Milunovich, S. and Tsuei, A. (1996) 'EVA in the computer industry', *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp.104–115.
- Neter, J., Wasserman, W. and Kunter, M.H. (1985) *Applied Linear Statistical Models*, Irwin, Inc., Homewood.
- O'Byrne, S.F. (1996) 'EVA and market value', *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp.116–125.
- Ottoson, E. and Weissenrieder, F. (1996) *Cash Value Added – A New Method for Measuring Financial Performance*, Gothenburg University Press, Gothenburg.
- Rappaport, A. (1981) 'Selecting strategies that create shareholder value', *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 59, No. 3, pp.139–149.
- Rappaport, A. (1986) *Creating Shareholder Value*, 1st ed., The Free Press, New York.
- Rappaport, A. (1998) *Creating Shareholder Value*, 2nd ed., The Free Press, New York.
- Sharpe, W.F. (1964) 'Capital asset prices: a theory of market equilibrium under conditions of risk', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 19, No. 3, pp.425–442.
- Solomons, D. (1965) *Divisional Performance: Measurement and Control*, Financial Executives Institute Research Foundation, New York.
- Sparling, D. and Turvey, C.G. (2003) 'Further thoughts on the relationship between economic value added and stock market performance', *Agribusiness*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp.255–267.
- Stern, J. (2001) *The EVA Challenge*, John Wiley & Sons, New York.
- Stern, J.M., Stewart III, G.B. and Chew Jr., D.H. (1995) 'The EVA[®] financial system', *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, Vol. 8, No. 2, pp.32–46.
- Stewart, G.B. (1991) *The Quest for Value: A Guide for Senior Managers*, 1st ed., Harper Business, New York.
- Stewart, G.B. (1999) *The Quest for Value*, 2nd ed., Harper Business, New York.
- Turvey, C.G., Lake, L., Van Duren, E. and Sparing, D. (2000) 'The relationship between economic value added and the stock market performance of agribusiness firms', *Agribusiness*, Vol. 16, No. 4, pp.399–416.
- Uyemura, D.G., Kantor, C.C. and Petit, J.M. (1996) 'EVA for banks: value creation, risk management and profitability measurement', *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp.94–111.
- Worthington, A.C. and West, T. (2001a) 'The usefulness of economic value-added in the Australian context', *Accounting, Accountability and Performance*, Vol. 7, No. 1, pp.73–90.
- Worthington, A.C. and West, T. (2001b) 'Economic value-added: a review of the theoretical and empirical literature', *Asian Review of Accounting*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp.67–86.
- Worthington, A.C. and West, T. (2004) 'Australian evidence concerning the information content of economic value-added', *Australian Journal of Management*, Vol. 29, No. 2, pp.201–224.

Note

¹CFROI[®] is a registered trademark of Holt Value Associates, LLP.