

Have Diversified Groups Failed In Generating Value In India Too?

Ram Kumar Kakani, XLRI Jamshedpur
Neelakantan Ramachandran, IIM Calcutta



Mantra for Success ...

Product Focus combined with International Diversification

◆ Successful MNCs – Microsoft, Lafarge, Nokia, Coca-cola

Conglomerates usually do not perform well

◆ Failed Groups – Daewoo, Hyundai, Astra, Pantham



Business Groups

Groups are -

- ◆ Formally independent firms (or affiliates)
- ◆ Single administrative & financial control
- ◆ Owned by trusts/families/foundations

Bound together

- ◆ by equity cross-ownership; and
- ◆ common board membership



More on Groups ...

Affiliates' decisions are taken as

- ◆ a single decision making unit
- ◆ in the aggregate interest of the group

We also observe

- ◆ Member firms helping each other
- ◆ Conflicts of interest between shareholders



Varied Institutional Context

- ◆ Developing countries have voids – *Misguided Regulations, Informational Problems and Inefficient Judicial Systems (by Khanna and Palepu)*

But ...

- ◆ *These voids have been blown out of proportion*
- ◆ *These voids create equal difficulties to diversified and focused groups*



Blown Out of Proportion

◆ Labor Markets – Scarcity of trained people

Large pool of skilled and unemployed manpower. Good higher education

◆ Equity Markets – Underdeveloped & Illiquid markets

Indian capital markets are comparable to many developed countries



More or Less Equal Difficulties

- ◆ Makes them vulnerable to Bureaucrats, Regulators and Political Parties – *Autoriders Group*
- ◆ Makes it very difficult to Exit Business Operations without consequences – *CK Birla Group [Hindustan Motors], Tata Group [TOMCO]*



Conglomerates are Sources

- ◆ Diversified Groups are reluctant/choosy in revealing information – *Crossholdings and ownership stake*
- ◆ Jumbled dealings, weak disclosures, and poor treatment of minority shareholders implies bad reputation in factor markets – *Placement session of b-schools*
- ◆ Influences their standing in contract enforcement – *NEPC, Tata*




Our Research Method

- ◆ Performed cross-sectional regression
- ◆ Sample size: 240 business groups
- ◆ Time period: 1987-99 (12 years)
- ◆ Multiple measures of performance
- ◆ Multiple measures of product diversification
- ◆ Used control variables including industry effects and international diversification




Our Main Results



Our Main Results

FIGURE 1: Product Diversification, International Exposure and Financial Performance of Indian Business Groups





Contrasting Industry Structures

- ◆ Integrating diverse affiliates performing in varied businesses and managing is a very tough task
- ◆ They have varied market structures – While some are highly capital intensive; others need high intellectual capital
- ◆ Dynamics of world markets and changing technology make it more difficult
- ◆ Groups managed by families may not have such a wide range of skill set



Diversified Loose Value Due to ...

- ◆ Have complex structures hindering innovation
– *Cement (GACL Vs Tata/AV Birla/BK Birla)*
- ◆ Misallocate capital and shield loss-making affiliates [some form of 'socialist' reallocation of funds across divisions] – *Birla Tyres of BK Birla*
- ◆ Poor governance resulting in investors (incl. foreign) disinterest – trade at discounts to peers – *Wipro*



While International Exposure

- ◆ Allows exploiting of distinctive capabilities; Learn from international markets
- ◆ Provides broader base of markets for returns on innovation; Benefit from economies of scale
- ◆ Can take advantage of sops provided by Government incl. tax benefits, cheap finance
- ◆ Achieve higher investor fancy and higher discounting




Same Sector, Two Groups

- ◆ Videocon Vs BPL
- ◆ SM Dyechem Vs CK Mehta



Performance of Some Groups



Note: Groups in circles & bold were good performers. Groups in rectangles were average performers. Groups not covered, and underlined in red color were bad performers.



How they didn't do well

- ◆ Stretching Brands – Tata (Salt, Steel, Shampoo, and Software)
- ◆ Changing Direction Frequently – Alpine (Soya to Metal, Chemical), Indian Seamless (Steel to Airplanes)
- ◆ Lacking Success Formula in New Lines of Businesses – Videocon, GE Shipping



How they did well

- ◆ Cutting Unrelated Exposure – ITC (exit Agro-based, Financial Sectors)
- ◆ Concentrating on Core – MRF, Punjab Tractors, Ranbaxy
- ◆ Seeking External Markets – Dr. Reddy, Wipro, Ramco, Hero



Comparison of Capital Markets

Country	Companies	MC/GNP Ratio	Mkt. Turnover Ratio
USA	7651	210	124
Japan	2470	111	53
Germany	933	66	108
India	9871	85	245
China	950	36	134