IJAER/ January-February 2019/Volume-8/Issue-1 ISSN: 2278-9677

International Journal of Arts & Education Research

An investigation on the impact of business ownership structure on corporate performance in India

Mritunjay Kumar

M.Phil, Roll No: 150460

Session: 2015-16

University Department of Management

B.R.A Bihar University, Muzzaffarpur

Abstract

This paper endeavors to break down whether there is strong proof to help the possibility that variations across firms in noticed ownership structures lead to deliberate variations in noticed firm performance. The ongoing review analyzes by assessing the effect of the ownership structure on corporate performance, estimated by profitability, utilizing information of BSE 100 File organizations. This study plan ownership structure, first, as an exogenous variable and, second; we consider four distinct proportions of ownership structure showing various gatherings of shareholders with conflicting interests. In the event of advertisers holding and non-advertisers institutional holding no impact is found on EPS of the firm. Furthermore, in the event of return on initial capital investment advertisers holding, non-advertisers institutional holding and non-advertisers non institutional holding altogether affect return for capital invested of the firm. On the off chance that when non-advertisers holding is produced as individual measure no results are tracked down on return on initial capital investment of the firm. Further in the event of PAT, it is found that the non-advertisers holding and non-advertisers non-institutional holding altogether affect PAT of the firm. In the event of advertisers holding and non-advertiser institutional holding no impact is tracked down on PAT of the firm. Presence of concentrated ownership is tracked down in Indian firms.

Keywords: *Ownership Structure, Firm Performance, Earning Per Share, Return on Investment, Profit after Tax, India*

Introduction

The job of ownership and its effect on present day organizations and their performance has been a discussed subject in monetary economics since the early works of. The concept of ownership structure is created in light of the presence of various proprietors or shareholders in present day organizations. Ownership doesn't lie in that frame of mind of one person alone, yet is all things considered, dispersed among numerous persons. The control of these organizations, in this way, lies with the directors who address the interest of the proprietors in the separate organizations.

Since the development of the concept of weakened ownership, restricted ownership freedoms and the ascent of administrative powers in recorded organizations or firms, the relationship between ownership structure and firm performance has been of extraordinary concern. Without the firm proprietors' proper control, firm performance might decline, and expropriations by directors might rise. seen that administrative ownership could bring down office conflict yet increment firm performance. Strong ownership control is essential for working on firm performance. The equivocalness of the relationship between ownership structure and firm performance has accordingly incited the interest of examination today as it is exceptionally critical for administration.

The relationship between ownership structure and firm performance has gotten significant notification in the money writing. are among the principal variety of specialists to cause to notice the way that firm performance is contrarily impacted as diffuseness of the ownership structure improves. Succeeding examinations by researchers have either upheld or dismissed this contention. Concentrates on all through the world have zeroed in on various parts of ownership and their consequences for firm performance.

The relationship between corporate ownership structure, corporate administration and performance has been a significant and on-going talk and delivered banter in the writing of corporate administration and money during most recent twenty years. It has gotten considerable attention of academicians, specialists, administrative bodies, strategy creators and government on account of two reasons - one is liberalization, globalization and privatization prompting integration of monetary business sectors of economies and the other is flood of high-profile corporate outrages and disasters that occurred all over the planet in most recent twenty years. The outcome of any business firm primarily relies on the great corporate administration. Powerful corporate administration systems incorporate both inward components, for example, ownership structure, governing body and its significant advisory groups and outer components, for example, unfriendly takeover offers, lawful protection of minority shareholders and restraining the supervisors in the outside work market. Corporate administration changes in India have basically centered around interior administration components. The ownership structure is one of the key inside administration instruments broadly considered to relieve administration issues of firms. Corporate ownership structure has two dimensions, one is concentration or diffuseness of ownership and the other is personality or class of ownership, both of these have significant implications for corporate administration. However, there are variation in corporate administration structures and frameworks across nations, the current writing has remained to a great extent confined to the US and Europe, where the administration frameworks are very not the same as those tracked down in India and other arising economies.

Ownership Structure

With a couple of exceptions, organizations have proprietors. The nature and the quantity of proprietors normally shift a great deal for every business. As a matter of fact, the proprietor of a business can be an individual or much another business. To make things more confounded, the freedoms of a proprietor to the business can be parted between the economic and the board privileges. The administration privileges here allude to the capacity to impact the arrangement of the officials while the economic freedoms incorporate the freedoms to get profits and profits of the business.

A great deal of organizations likewise own different organizations. Honestly, there are essentially three degrees of ownership in a share ownership structure. These are guardians, members, and auxiliaries. Here, parent organizations own the auxiliaries. How much ownership interest can go from a fraction to even a total 100 percent. Additionally, an offshoot is a kin legitimate substance.

This way to deal with ownership structure incorporates situations, for example, public firms, intently held organizations, outside financial backers, and joint endeavors. An ownership structure concerns the inward organization of a business substance and the privileges and obligations of the singular holding the fair or legitimate interest in that business.

For example, a shareholder who is likewise the proprietor of a corporation has specific freedoms. These freedoms are particular from the ones of the individuals from a restricted obligation organization. Additionally, inside the corporation, a holder of favored stock could have various freedoms when contrasted with the holder of common stock.

Ownership Identity and Performance

Ownership character is the other dimension of the ownership structure saw in the ongoing review. It is a concept which can be depicted as comprised of various kinds of proprietors who have a specific percentage of shares in the firms. They in this way contained advertisers, corporate financial backers, monetary institutional financial backers, government bodies, individual financial backers and worker stock proprietors. These ownership types or ownership personalities have an alternate degree of conduct, which means the different sorts of commitment that can impact firm performance. Ownership characters offer the shareholders three bases of abilities, for example, formal power, social effect power and expertise in the firms concerned. In ownership characters, huge institutional shareholders have the most elevated level of motivation, impetus and assets to control the actions of the chiefs. They can drive administrative way of behaving towards working on firm performance by decreasing the administrators' self-consuming ways of behaving.

Conclusion

Observational works in view of ownership structure and its effect on firm performance have been restricted and inconsistent when seen according to the perspective of an arising economy like India. Consequently, in this review, we endeavor to test the effect of ownership structure on Indian firms' corporate performance, post the US monetary emergency of 2008. In our review, it is found that Indian recorded firms have high ownership concentrations. Most creating economies have organizations with concentrated ownerships. Regardless of the way that high ownership concentration wins in the Indian context, there appear to be no critical effect on firms' monetary performance (ROA) despite the fact that it adversely affects the market performance (MC). In view of this, it is derived that enormous shareholders don't upgrade firm performance, post US monetary emergency 2008.

Reference

1. Alonso-Bonis, S., & de Andrés-Alonso, P. (2007). Ownership structure and performance in large Spanish companies. Empirical evidence in the context of an endogenous relation.
2. Al-Saidi, M., & Al-Shammari, B. (2015). Ownership concentration, ownership composition and the performance of the Kuwaiti listed non-financial firms.
3. Anderson, R.C., & Reeb, D.M. (2003). Founding-family ownership and firm performance: evidence from the S&P 500.
4. Barnhart, S.W., & Rosenstein, S. (1998). Board composition, managerial ownership, and firm performance: An empirical analysis.

5. Barontini, R., & Caprio, L. (2006). The effect of family control on firm value and performance: Evidence from continental Europe.
6. Boone, N., Colombage, S., & Gunasekarage, A. (2011). Block shareholder identity and firm performance in New Zealand.
7. Carney, M., & Gedajlovic, E. (2001). Corporate governance and firm capabilities: A comparison of managerial, alliance, and personal capitalisms.
8. Chauhan, Y., Dey, D.K., & Jha, R.R. (2016). Board structure, controlling ownership, and business groups: Evidence from India.
9. Cheung, Y-L., Rau, P.R., & Stouraitis, A. (2006). Tunneling, propping, and expropriation: Evidence from connected party transactions in Hong Kong.
10. Denis, D.K., & McConnell, J.J. (2003). International corporate governance.
11. Earle, J.S., Kucsera, C., & Telegdy, Á. (2005). Ownership concentration and corporate performance on the Budapest stock exchange.
12. Franks, J., & Mayer, C. (2001). Ownership and control of German corporations.
13. Shleifer, A., & Vishny, R. W. (1986). Large shareholders and corporate control.
14. Loderer, C., & Martin, K. (1997). Executive Stock Ownership and Performance Tracking Faint Traces.
15. Lauterbach, B., & Vaninsky, A. (1999). Ownership Structure and Firm Performance.
16. Joh, S. W. (2003). Corporate governance and firm profitability: Evidence from Korea before the economic crisis.
17. Graham, J. R., Campbell, R. H., & Rajgopal, S. (2005). The economic implications of corporate financial reporting. Journal of Accounting and Economics.
18. Demsetz, H., & Villalonga, B. (2001). Ownership Structure and Corporate Performance.
19. Demsetz, H. (1983). The Structure of Ownership and the Theory of the Firm.
20. Cho, M. H. (1998). Ownership Structure, Investment, and the Corporate Value: An Empirical Analysis.