

P.K. Jain · Seema Gupta
Surendra S. Yadav

Public Sector Enterprises in India

The Impact of Disinvestment and Self
Obligation on Financial Performance

Public Sector Enterprises in India

P.K. Jain • Seema Gupta • Surendra S. Yadav

Public Sector Enterprises in India

The Impact of Disinvestment
and Self Obligation on Financial
Performance

P.K. Jain
Surendra S. Yadav
Department of Management Studies
Indian Institute of Technology Delhi
New Delhi, India

Seema Gupta
Management Studies
Guru Nanak Institute of Management
and Technology
New Delhi, India

ISBN 978-81-322-1761-9

ISBN 978-81-322-1762-6 (eBook)

DOI 10.1007/978-81-322-1762-6

Springer New Delhi Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2014940937

© Springer India 2014

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

*Dedicated to
Professor Max Peyrard
Emeritus Professor and Chair
Jean Monnet ad personam
University of Paris 1 Sorbonne
School of Management*

Preface

Practice without theory is blind.

Theory without practice is sterile.

(Marx, Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Law, Jan. 1844, MECW, Vol. 3, P. 182)

The public sector in India has played a dominant role in shaping the path of the country's economic development. Visionary leaders of independent India drew up a road map for the development of public sector as an instrument for self-reliant economic growth. The public sector has provided the much required thrust and has been instrumental in setting up a strong and diversified industrial base in the country. As a result of the initiatives taken during the five-year plans, the role of central public sector enterprises (PSEs) in terms of contribution to the Indian economy has been phenomenal. The number of PSEs as on 31 March 2009 was 246, with a total capital of nearly Rs. 5.3 lakh crores. The number rose to 260 on 31 March 2012 with a total capital of 13.43 lakh crores as against modest number of five PSEs having a total investment of Rs. 29 crores on the eve of the First Five-Year Plan (1 April 1951).

With the onset of economic reforms in 1991, the Government of India initiated a systemic shift to a more open economy with greater reliance on market forces and a larger role of the private sector including foreign investment. Accordingly, the PSEs were exposed to competition with domestic private sector companies as well as large multinational corporations. In order to compete in the new environment, the PSEs undertook significant initiatives for improving technology and scaling up capacities to operate at par with the private counterparts in the liberalized economy. Keeping pace with the global changes over a period of time, the PSEs in India also have adopted the policies like disinvestment, self-obligations (MoU), restructuring, etc. Thus, the continued focused efforts towards achieving excellence have helped several of the PSEs to become self-reliant, and they are playing a critical role in building the Indian economy.

It was, therefore, considered worthwhile to carry out a comprehensive study which assesses the performance of PSEs as well as the impact of MoU and

disinvestment on the financial performance. Further, the liberalization of Indian economy had effects of global upheavals on Indian enterprises; the most recent event being the global recession in 2008. The study also attempts to analyze whether there was any impact of this recession on Indian PSEs.

This research monograph covers 209 non-financial central public sector enterprises (PSEs) in India. A time span of 20 years (1991–1992 to 2010–2011) has been considered; this period has been divided into four different sub-phases (1991–1992 to 1995–1996, 1996–1997 to 1999–2000, 2000–2001 to 2007–2008, and 2008–2009 to 2010–2011). From the statistical point of view, the “first” phase, “second” phase, “third” phase, and “fourth” phase have been considered as four independent samples. The performance of the MoU PSEs, subsequent to the recommendations of the National Council of Applied Economic Research (NCAER), which have been implemented from the year 2004 to 2005, has also been evaluated. For this purpose, the third phase period (2000–2001 to 2007–2008) has been sub-divided into two phases: 2000–2001 to 2003–2004 is referred as pre-NCAER recommendation phase two, and 2004–2005 to 2007–2008 corresponds to post-NCAER recommendation phase two. The subsequent period (i.e., 2008–2009 to 2010–2011) is of particular importance, due to the recession (caused by American financial crisis) that had impacted the world economy during the second half of 2008. Hence, to assess the impact of recession on the performance of these PSEs, fourth phase (2008–2009 to 2010–2011) is marked as post-recession phase.

In this research, primarily 18 ratios related to profitability, efficiency, liquidity, leverage, and productivity of capital have been used for assessing financial performance, pertaining to the sample public sector enterprises (PSEs), disinvested PSEs, and MoU PSEs. Another set of classification (1) in terms of manufacturing PSEs and service PSEs and (2) profit-making and loss-making PSEs has also been followed for the purpose of analysis. Apart from secondary data, the inferences have been drawn from the questionnaire survey based on the 30 responses from PSEs.

The sample virtually covers the universe of the central PSEs in India. Based on the major findings, some concrete suggestions/recommendations have been made for government/management of PSEs for their better functioning.

The findings suggest that liberalization and economic reforms have yielded positive impact on the performance of the sample PSEs in India as reflected by the majority of the ratios over a period of time. Survey findings have indicated satisfying compounded annual growth rate in their net profits over the time.

Sector-wise disaggregate analysis shows that there is no sector-wise statistically significant difference, though better profitability and liquidity have been recorded in service sector PSEs than those of manufacturing sector PSEs. It is worth noting that the loss-making PSEs have positive operating profits as well as positive rates of return on their investments from year 2005–2006 onwards. This is a signal for their turnaround. There is a need to review the policy of their closure. In operational terms, closure of sick/loss-making PSEs should be taken on the merits of each case instead of having blanket policy of closing them.

The study has inferred that there is better profitability, assets turnover, productivity of capital, and liquidity position in disinvested PSEs vis-à-vis non-disinvested PSEs.

MoU has brought about a positive impact on the financial performance of MoU PSEs; the increase in profitability, efficiency, liquidity, and productivity is commendable during the post-MoU phase; *t*-test has also corroborated significant difference between MoU and non-MoU PSEs in many ratios. Phase three has shown marked improvement in the parameters of profitability and productivity compared to previous two phases in MoU PSEs. Similarly, efficiency, liquidity, and leverage ratios have also shown satisfactory results in sizable number of cases.

The study indicates that MoU has made significant impact in improving the profitability, operational efficiency, liquidity, and productivity of PSEs. It is important to note that the loss-making MoU PSEs have reduced their losses and have turned their losses into profits by enhancing their productivity and operational efficiency over period of time. Further, manufacturing PSEs over which service PSEs have an edge have shown better profitability after signing MoUs. In sum, MoUs have yielded the desired results. *Therefore, it is recommended that MoU should be mandatory for all the PSEs (instead of the current practice of its being voluntary in nature).*

It is reasonable to infer from the study that economic reforms, liberalization policies, and MoU have laid positive and salutary impact in improving the financial performance of PSEs in a large number of cases over the phases. The study is useful for the government, ministries, academics, and the public at large to develop the policies as well as strategies for the development of PSEs in India.

It would not, therefore, be out of context to state that contrary to the normal expectation, the disinvestment has not made the desired impact on financial performance. It may be due to the inadequate level of disinvestment (partial disinvestment), on the one hand, and the lack of full autonomy in their functioning, on the other. *Therefore, the study suggests that the government henceforth should aim at strategic disinvestment, as small and modest sizes of disinvestment are not likely to be fruitful. The government's intervention in the operational functioning and managerial decision making should be a matter of last resort.*

It is also for consideration of the government that the disinvestment should be driven by the objective of most efficient allocation of resources, both monetary and non-monetary. The resources currently blocked in non-strategic PSEs should be released as soon as possible through sale of government stakes in such PSEs for redeployment.

Another important outcome is that the global recession has not made any significant dent on Indian PSEs. It may be, therefore, inferred that the Indian economy has remained insulated to a large extent from the recessionary influences in the recent past. However, this needs to be taken with a note of caution as the impact may be felt with a time lag or in a gradual manner.

New Delhi, India

P.K. Jain
Seema Gupta
Surendra S. Yadav

Acknowledgement

At the outset, we would like to express our gratitude to the numerous researchers/authors who have enriched the stream of literature on public sector enterprises, in general, and on their financial performance, in particular. This set of literature has helped us to provide better insight on the subject; this, in turn, has enabled us to present the work in the appropriate form. We also gratefully acknowledge the contribution of a large number of publications from the government on the subject of public sector enterprises (PSEs) in India, their disinvestment policies, formulation of Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), etc.; we have liberally drawn on these documents as well as on Public Enterprises Surveys (annual publication on PSEs in India). This work has been possible because of help, encouragement, cooperation, and guidance of many persons. We convey our heartfelt thanks to all of them.

We are grateful to Prof. R. K. Shevgaonkar, Director, IIT Delhi, for his encouragement and support. We also express our gratitude towards Prof. Sushil, Dean (Faculty), and Prof. Anurag Sharma, Dean (Academics), for their unstinting support in this academic endeavor. Dr. Seema Gupta expresses her gratitude towards Shri. J. S. Sahni (Chairman) and Dr. Nirmal Singh (Director), Guru Nanak Dev Institute of Management and Information Technology, for their blessings, motivation and support.

We thank Prof. Kanika T. Bhal, Head, Department of Management Studies (DMS), IIT Delhi, for keeping us relatively free from administrative responsibilities during the work on this book. We thank Prof. Ravi Shankar, Dr. Seema Sharma, and Dr. Shveta Singh for their support from time to time. We thank all colleagues in the Department of Management Studies for their good wishes in this academic endeavor.

Special thanks are due to Dr. Vasudha Gupta (who obtained her Ph.D. from DMS) for helping in many ways at various stages of the study.

We are grateful to the late Prof. V. K. Bhalla, Faculty of Management Studies, Delhi University, for lively exchange of views on the subject of financial management, which is the core of this book.

We sincerely acknowledge the cooperation of all the respondents of the survey who took out time from their busy schedules to fill the questionnaire. We are indebted to the Mr. K. P Singh, Department of Public Enterprises, who has allowed

access to the library. There is a special word of appreciation for Rejani for helping in formatting and typing.

Professor P. K. Jain acknowledges his wife Uma for her patience, understanding, cooperation and encouragement.

Dr. Seema Gupta acknowledges, with deep gratitude, motivation and inspiration of her husband Mr. Rajender Gupta and in-laws in completion of this project. She acknowledges moral support of her mother and other family members. She also acknowledges the patience of her sons, Divyansh and Sarthak, as they were deprived of her company for a long period of time.

We have a word of appreciation for the excellent support from Ms. Sagarika Ghosh and her team members of Springer for the speedy and excellent publication of the book.

Last but not least, we are sincerely grateful and thankful to all those, not mentioned above, who helped in carrying out the study, our family members and loved ones for their continuous encouragement and support.

19 Sep 2013

P.K. Jain
Seema Gupta
Surendra S. Yadav

Contents

1	The Impact of Disinvestment and Self-Obligation on Financial Performance of PSEs in India: An Introduction.....	1
1.1	Introduction	1
1.2	Significance and Motivation of the Study	3
1.3	Objectives of the Study	3
1.4	Scope of the Study.....	4
1.5	Methodology of the Study.....	4
1.6	Organization of the Study.....	4
1.7	Summary	4
	References.....	5
2	Public Sector Enterprises in India: An Overview.....	7
2.1	Introduction	7
2.2	The Role of Public Sector Enterprises in India.....	9
2.2.1	Catalyst of Acceleration of the Rate of Economic Growth	9
2.2.2	Development of Capital Intensive Sector	9
2.2.3	Development of Agriculture	10
2.2.4	Balanced Regional Development	10
2.2.5	Increasing Employment Opportunities	10
2.2.6	Model Employer.....	11
2.2.7	Preventing Concentration of Economic Power.....	11
2.2.8	Export Promotion and Import Substitution	11
2.2.9	Research and Development	12
2.2.10	Mobilisation of Resources	12
2.3	Changes Since the 1990s.....	12
2.4	Key Sectors for PSE Operations.....	13
2.4.1	Coal.....	14
2.4.2	Oil and Natural Gas	14
2.4.3	Power Generation	14
2.4.4	Telecommunications	15

2.5	Representative Operational Excellence Initiatives	
	Adopted by PSEs	15
2.5.1	Corporate Governance	15
2.5.2	Organization Development/Human Resources Management	16
2.5.3	Streamlining Business Processes and Practices	16
2.5.4	Environment Excellence	17
2.5.5	Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)	17
2.5.6	Empowering PSEs with Due Accountability	17
2.6	Contribution to Indian Economy	18
2.7	Summary	19
	References	19
3	Literature Review on Aspects of PSEs	21
3.1	Introduction	21
3.2	Literature Review	21
	3.2.1 Transition and Performance of Public Sector Enterprises in India	22
	3.2.2 Disinvestment and Privatization	31
	3.2.3 Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)	52
	3.2.4 Measures of Financial Performance	57
3.3	Gaps Identified in the Literature	61
	References	62
4	Research Methodology to Assess the Financial Performance of PSEs	69
4.1	Introduction	69
4.2	Identified Gaps, Research Objectives, and Hypotheses	70
	4.2.1 Gaps Identified from Literature Review	70
	4.2.2 Research Objectives	70
	4.2.3 Hypotheses	70
4.3	Data Collection	71
	4.3.1 Primary Data	71
	4.3.2 Secondary Data	72
4.4	Research Model and Data Analysis	73
	4.4.1 Research Model	73
	4.4.2 Data Analysis	73
4.5	Summary	80
	References	96
5	Financial Performance of PSEs in India	99
5.1	Introduction	100
5.2	Scope and Methodology	100
5.3	Manufacturing and Service Sector PSEs	104
	5.3.1 Profitability Test	104
	5.3.2 Efficiency Test	112

5.3.3	Solvency and Liquidity Test	127
5.3.4	Productivity Test	132
5.4	Profit-Making and Loss-Making PSEs	138
5.4.1	Profitability Test	138
5.4.2	Efficiency Test	148
5.4.3	Solvency and Liquidity Test	158
5.4.4	Productivity Test	163
5.5	Summary of Results and Main Findings	168
5.5.1	Summary of Results	168
5.5.2	Main Findings	168
	References	190
6	Impact of Disinvestment on Financial Performance of PSEs	191
6.1	Introduction	191
6.2	An Overview of Disinvestment	192
6.2.1	Genesis and Rationale	192
6.2.2	Disinvestment Policies and Process	193
6.3	Scope and Methodology	196
6.4	Financial Performance Disinvested and Non-disinvested	
	Central PSEs in India	198
6.4.1	Profitability Ratios	198
6.4.2	Efficiency Analysis	206
6.4.3	Solvency and Liquidity Test	218
6.4.4	Productivity Test	223
6.5	Main Findings	229
	References	230
7	Impact of MoU/Self-Obligation on Financial	
	Performance of PSEs	231
7.1	Introduction	232
7.2	Features of MoU	233
7.2.1	Objectives of MoU System	233
7.2.2	Structure of MoU	233
7.2.3	NCAER Study on MoU and Performance Evaluation	239
7.2.4	Basic Targets	242
7.2.5	Awards Under the MoU System	242
7.2.6	Achievements of the MoU System	243
7.3	Methodology, Data Source, and Scope of the Study	244
7.4	MoU and Non-MoU Central PSEs in India	245
7.4.1	Profitability Ratios	245
7.4.2	Efficiency Ratios	250
7.4.3	Leverage and Liquidity Ratios	259
7.4.4	Productivity Test	263
7.5	MoU PSEs in India	268
7.5.1	Analysis of Profitability	269
7.5.2	Analysis of Efficiency	270
7.5.3	Analysis of Leverage and Liquidity Position	276

7.5.4	Analysis of Productivity	276
7.6	MoU PSEs (Disaggregative Analysis)	281
7.6.1	Part I: Manufacturing and Service Sector MoU PSEs.....	281
7.6.2	Part II: Profit-Making and Loss-Making MoU PSEs	308
7.7	Summary of Results and Main Findings	341
7.7.1	Summary of Results	341
7.7.2	Main Findings.....	344
	References.....	345
8	Financial Performance of PSEs in India (with focus on Disinvestment and MoU): Concluding Observations	347
8.1	Major Findings	348
8.1.1	Financial Performance.....	349
8.1.2	Disinvestment in PSEs.....	351
8.1.3	Memorandum of Understanding (MoU)/Self-Obligations	352
8.1.4	Impact of Recession	356
8.1.5	Implications and Recommendations of the Study	356
	References.....	358
	Index.....	359

Abbreviations

ANOVA	Analysis of variance
APM	Administrative price mechanism
ATR	Acid test ratio
CATR	Current assets turnover ratio
CR	Current ratio
DCP	Debtor collection period
DPE	Department of Public Enterprises
EBIT	Earnings before interest and taxes
EMP	Employment level
FATR	Fixed assets turnover ratio
FGIHP	Finished-goods inventory holding period
FP	Financial performance
GDP	Gross domestic product
GDRs	Global depository receipts
HPC	High Power Committee
IHP	Inventory holding period
LM	Loss making
MoU	Memorandum of understanding
NCAER	National Council of Applied Economic Research
NCMP	National Common Minimum Program
NIE	Net income per employee
NPM	Net-profit margin
OPM	Operating profit margin
PM	Profit making
PRP	Performance related pay
PSEs	Public sector enterprises
Q1	Lower quartile
Q3	Upper quartile
R&D	Research and development
RMHP	Raw-material inventory holding period

ROCE	Return on capital employed
ROI	Return on investment
RONW	Return on net worth
ROR	Rates of return
ROTA	Return on total assets
SE	Sales efficiency per employee
SEBI	Security and Exchange Board of India
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
TATR	Total assets turnover ratio
TD/TE	Total debt to total equity
TF	Task force
VRS	Voluntary Retirement Scheme
WIPHP	Work-in-process inventory holding period

List of Annexures

Annexure 4A.1	List of the Central PSEs in India Used in the Study.....	81
Annexure 4A.2	List of the PSEs Responded to the Questionnaire	87
Annexure 4A.3	Industry-Wise Classification of the PSEs Responded to the Questionnaire.....	88
Annexure 4A.4	List of the Merged and Closed PSEs	89
Annexure 4A.5	Questionnaire Survey on Financial Decisions and Performance of Public Sector Enterprises in India.....	90
Annexure 5A.1	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Return on Net Worth (RONW) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	173
Annexure 5A.2	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Return on Capital Employed (ROCE) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	174
Annexure 5A.3	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Return on Total Assets (ROTA) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	175
Annexure 5A.4	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Operating Profit Margin (OPM) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	176
Annexure 5A.5	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Net-Profit Margin (NPM) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	177
Annexure 5A.6	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Total Assets Turnover Ratio (TATR) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	178
Annexure 5A.7	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Fixed Assets Turnover Ratio (FATR) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	179
Annexure 5A.8	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Current Assets Turnover Ratio (CATR) of PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	180

Annexure 5A.9	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Raw-Material Inventory Holding Period (RMIHP) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	181
Annexure 5A.10	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Work-in-Progress Inventory Holding Period (WPIHP) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	182
Annexure 5A.11	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Finished-Goods Inventory Holding Period (FGIHP) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	183
Annexure 5A.12	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Debtor Collection Period (DCP) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	184
Annexure 5A.13	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Total Debt to Total Equity (TD/TE) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	185
Annexure 5A.14	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Current Ratio (CR) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	186
Annexure 5A.15	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Acid Test Ratio (ATR) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	187
Annexure 5A.16	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Sales Efficiency of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	188
Annexure 5A.17	Frequency Distribution Pertaining to Net Income Efficiency (NIE) of the PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	189
Annexure 7A.1	MoU Format for Manufacturing PSEs.....	345

List of Figures

Fig. 4.1	Research model	74
Fig. 5.1	Mean values of profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the manufacturing PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	109
Fig. 5.2	Mean values of the profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the manufacturing PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	109
Fig. 5.3	Mean values of profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the service PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	110
Fig. 5.4	Mean values of the profitability ratios OPM and NPM of the services PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	110
Fig. 5.5	Mean values of turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the manufacturing PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	114
Fig. 5.6	Mean values of turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the service PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	116
Fig. 5.7	Mean values of the inventory (RMIHP, WIPIHP and FGIHP) and debtor collection periods (DCP) of the manufacturing PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	120
Fig. 5.8	Mean values of the inventory holding (RMIHP, WIPIHP and FGIHP) and debtor collection periods (DCP) of the service PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	120
Fig. 5.9	Mean values of leverage ratio (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CA/CL and ATR) of the manufacturing PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	130
Fig. 5.10	Mean values of leverage ratio (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CA/CL and ATR) of the service PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	130

Fig. 5.11	Mean values of the output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the manufacturing PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	134
Fig. 5.12	Mean values of the output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the service PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	134
Fig. 5.13	Mean values of profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the profit-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	141
Fig. 5.14	Mean values of the profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the profit-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	141
Fig. 5.15	Mean values of profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the loss-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	144
Fig. 5.16	Mean values of the profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the loss-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	144
Fig. 5.17	Mean values of the turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the profit-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	150
Fig. 5.18	Mean values of the turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the loss-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	152
Fig. 5.19	Mean values of the inventory (RMIHP, WPIHP and FGIHP) and debtor collection period (DCP) of the profit-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	157
Fig. 5.20	Mean values of the inventory (RMIHP, WPIHP and FGIHP) and debtor collection period (DCP) of the loss-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	157
Fig. 5.21	Mean values of leverage ratio (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CA/CL and ATR) of the profit-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	162
Fig. 5.22	Mean values of leverage ratio (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CA/CL and ATR) of the loss-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	162
Fig. 5.23	Mean values of the output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the profit-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	165
Fig. 5.24	Mean values of the output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the loss-making PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	168
Fig. 6.1	Mean values of select significant profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	201

Fig. 6.2	Mean values of the select significant profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	201
Fig. 6.3	Mean values of select significant profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of non-disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	204
Fig. 6.4	Mean values of the select significant profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the non-disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	204
Fig. 6.5	Mean values of select significant turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	208
Fig. 6.6	Mean values of select significant turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the non-disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	210
Fig. 6.7	Mean values of the inventory (RMIHP, WIPIHP and FGIHP) and debtors collection periods (DCP) of the disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	212
Fig. 6.8	Mean values of the inventory (RMIHP, WIPIHP and FGIHP) and debtors collection periods (DCP) of the non-disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	216
Fig. 6.9	Mean values of select significant leverage ratios (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CR and ATR) of the disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	220
Fig. 6.10	Mean values of select significant leverage ratios (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CR and ATR) of the non-disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	221
Fig. 6.11	Mean values of the select significant productivity/output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	225
Fig. 6.12	Mean values of the select significant productivity/output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the non-disinvested PSEs for the years 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	227
Fig. 7.1	Mean values of profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	247
Fig. 7.2	Mean values of the profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	247
Fig. 7.3	Mean values of profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the non-MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	249
Fig. 7.4	Mean values of the profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the non-MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	249

Fig. 7.5	Mean values of turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	252
Fig. 7.6	Mean values of turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the non-MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	253
Fig. 7.7	Mean values of the inventory holding periods (RMIHP, WIPIHP and FGIHP) and debtor collection period (DCP) of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	255
Fig. 7.8	Mean values of the inventory holding periods (RMIHP, WIPIHP and FGIHP) and debtor collection period (DCP) of the non-MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	257
Fig. 7.9	Mean values of leverage ratios (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CR and ATR) of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	260
Fig. 7.10	Mean values of leverage ratios (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CR and ATR) of the non-MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	262
Fig. 7.11	Mean values of the Output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	265
Fig. 7.12	Mean values of the productivity ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the non-MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	266
Fig. 7.13	Mean values of the profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE, ROTA, OPM and NPM) of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	270
Fig. 7.14	Mean values of the turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	272
Fig. 7.15	Mean values of the inventory holding period (RMIHP, WIPIHP and FGIHP) and debtors collection period (DCP) of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	274
Fig. 7.16	Mean values of the leverage (TD/TE) and liquidity (CR and ATR) ratios of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	277
Fig. 7.17	Mean values of the productivity (SE and NIE) ratios of the MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	279
Fig. 7.18	Mean values of profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the manufacturing MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	284
Fig. 7.19	Mean values of the profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the manufacturing MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	284
Fig. 7.20	Mean values of profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the service MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	286

Fig. 7.21	Mean values of the profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the service MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	286
Fig. 7.22	Mean values of turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the manufacturing MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	291
Fig. 7.23	Mean values of turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the service MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	292
Fig. 7.24	Mean values of the inventory holding and debtors collection periods of the manufacturing MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	296
Fig. 7.25	Mean values of the inventory holding and debtors collection periods of service MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	296
Fig. 7.26	Mean values of leverage ratios (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CR and ATR) of the manufacturing MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	302
Fig. 7.27	Mean values of leverage ratios (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CR and ATR) of the service MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	305
Fig. 7.28	Mean values of the output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the manufacturing MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	308
Fig. 7.29	Mean values of the output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the service MoU PSEs for the period 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	311
Fig. 7.30	Mean values of profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the profit-making PSEs signed MOU for the year 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	315
Fig. 7.31	Mean values of the profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the profit-making PSEs signed MOU for the years 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	315
Fig. 7.32	Mean values of profitability ratios (RONW, ROCE and ROTA) of the loss-making PSEs signed MOU for the years 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	318
Fig. 7.33	Mean values of the profitability ratios (OPM and NPM) of the loss-making PSEs signed MOU for the years 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	318
Fig. 7.34	Mean values of turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the profit-making PSEs signed MOU for the years 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	320
Fig. 7.35	Mean values of turnover ratios (TATR, FATR and CATR) of the loss-making PSEs signed MOU for the years 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	324

Fig. 7.36	Mean values of the inventory holding and debtors collection periods of the profit-making PSEs signed MOU for the years 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	325
Fig. 7.37	Mean values of the inventory and debtors holding periods of the loss making PSEs signed MOU for the years 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	329
Fig. 7.38	Mean values of leverage ratios (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CR and ATR) of the profit-making PSEs signed MOU for the years 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	331
Fig. 7.39	Mean values of leverage ratios (TD/TE) and liquidity ratios (CR and ATR) of the loss-making PSEs signed MOU for the years 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	335
Fig. 7.40	Mean values of the output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the profit-making PSEs signed MOU for the years 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	338
Fig. 7.41	Mean values of the output ratios (sales and net income efficiency) of the loss making PSEs signed MOU, 1994–1995 to 2010–2011	339

List of Tables

Table 2.1	Taxes and duties paid by Central PSEs to the Government, 2007–2008 to 2011–2012.....	12
Table 2.2	Summary of grading the performance of MoU signing CPSEs, 2005–2006 to 2011–2012.....	13
Table 3.1	Studies related to performance of public sector enterprises, 1974–2012	22
Table 3.2	Studies related to disinvestment in PSEs at global level, 1952–2012	31
Table 3.3	Studies related to disinvestment in public sector enterprises in India, 1988–2011	32
Table 3.4	Studies related to Memorandum of Understanding (MoU), 1990–2012	52
Table 3.5	Studies related to financial performance of corporate enterprises, 1985–2011.....	57
Table 5.1	Mean values of key profitability ratios of the manufacturing PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	105
Table 5.2	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of key profitability ratios of the manufacturing PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	107
Table 5.3	Mean values of key profitability ratios of the service PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	108
Table 5.4	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of key profitability ratios of the service PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	109
Table 5.5	Relative proportion of the sample PSEs (based on survey) in which top management team has completed their tenure in India.....	111
Table 5.6	Decision-making approach on financial aspects among survey PSEs in India.....	111

Table 5.7	Survey response to sound basis of computing ROA followed by sample PSEs in India.....	112
Table 5.8	Survey response on compounded annual growth rate of net profit of sample PSEs in India from 2003 to 2008.....	112
Table 5.9	Financial objectives followed by sample PSEs in India.....	112
Table 5.10	Independent sample <i>t</i> -test to find out significance of difference between the sample manufacturing and service PSEs during 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	113
Table 5.11	Mean values of key turnover ratios of the manufacturing PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	115
Table 5.12	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of key turnover ratios of the manufacturing PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	116
Table 5.13	Mean values of key turnover ratios of the service PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	117
Table 5.14	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of key turnover ratios of the service PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	117
Table 5.15	Mean values of inventory holding period and debtor collection period of manufacturing PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	119
Table 5.16	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of inventory holding and debtor collection period of manufacturing PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	121
Table 5.17	Mean values of inventory holding period and debtor collection period of service PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	122
Table 5.18	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of inventory holding period and debtor collection period of service PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	123
Table 5.19	Financial performance measurement adopted by sample PSEs in India	124
Table 5.20	Usage of ratio analysis in the measurement of financial performance among sample PSEs in India.....	124
Table 5.21	Effect of macroeconomic factors on productivity and financial performance of PSEs in India	124
Table 5.22	Opinion of sample PSEs related to the trend of DCP and bad-debt losses in India	124
Table 5.23	Opinion to handle the usage of inventories, adopted by the sample PSEs in India	124
Table 5.24	Macroeconomic factors affecting the productivity of the responded PSEs in India.....	125
Table 5.25	Macroeconomic factors affecting the profitability of the responded PSEs in India.....	125

Table 5.26	Independent sample <i>t</i> -test of efficiency ratios to find out significance of difference between the sample manufacturing and service PSEs during 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	126
Table 5.27	Mean values of key leverage and liquidity ratios of the manufacturing PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	128
Table 5.28	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of key leverage and liquidity ratios of the manufacturing PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	129
Table 5.29	Mean values of key leverage and liquidity ratios of service PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	129
Table 5.30	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of key leverage and liquidity ratios of the service PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	130
Table 5.31	Independent sample <i>t</i> -test of leverage and liquidity ratios to find significant difference between sample manufacturing and service PSEs during 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	131
Table 5.32	Mean values of key productivity ratios of the manufacturing PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	133
Table 5.33	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of key productivity ratios of the manufacturing PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	135
Table 5.34	Mean values of key productivity ratios of the service PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	136
Table 5.35	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of key productivity ratios of the service PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	137
Table 5.36	Independent sample <i>t</i> -test of productivity ratios to find out significant difference between the sample manufacturing and service PSEs during 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	138
Table 5.37	Mean values of key profitability ratios of the profit-making PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	139
Table 5.38	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of key profitability ratios of the profit-making PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	140
Table 5.39	Mean values of key profitability ratios of loss-making PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	142
Table 5.40	Median, lower (Q1), and upper quartile (Q3) values of key profitability ratios of the loss-making PSEs, 1991–1992 to 2010–2011	143
Table 5.41	Opinion related to the impact of liberalization policies on financial performance of sample PSEs in India.....	145
Table 5.42	Policy on communicating financial targets to subordinates among sample PSEs in India.....	145
Table 5.43	Policy on communicating financial targets to government among sample PSEs in India.....	145