ANALYZING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CAPITAL STRUCTURE, SHAREHOLDING PATTERN, AND FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF THE INDIAN AUTOMOBILE INDUSTRY

Dr. Ankur
Assistant professor
Government PG Nehru College Jhajjar

ABSTRACT

This study analyzes the connection between capital structure, shareholding pattern, and financial performance exhaustively, diving into the capricious parts of the Indian auto area. With the utilization of a powerful exploration framework, the review takes a gander at the connection between the shareholding patterns of the associations nearby and the capital structure choices they make, for example, financing and commitment equity extents. Whether or not capital structure components and financial performance are connected is disputable. The reason for this study is to comprehend the way that financial backers' returns advance corresponding to the piece of capital structures. Both pooled relapse and board relapse (fixed effects and random effects models) were utilized with fifteen years of information from sixteen auto associations, and the Hausman test and Wald test were utilized to choose the best-fitting model. The Good Effects model was viewed as the best fit, as proven by the way that both equity and transitory obligation adversely affect return on equity (ROE) and are profoundly quantifiably enormous. Almost 57% of the variation in ROE was explained by the model, and there was no autocorrelation problem in the error component. The evaluation is crucial for decision-making for both enterprises and financial backers because it reveals that the composition of the capital structure makes sense when it comes to ROE.

Keywords:Capital Structure, Shareholding Pattern, Financial Performance, Indian Automobile Industry, Return on Equity

1. INTRODUCTION

The car area in India keeps on being an imperative part of the country's economy, assuming an essential part in cultivating contemporary development and creating work. It becomes fundamental to fathom the financial parts of organizations in this field in the speedy, serious business world. Two key viewpoints that altogether influence an association's financial achievement are capital structure and shareholding pattern. The objective of this audit is to

disentangle the confounding connections that exist inside the financial surface of the Indian automobile area. The mind-boggling communications between these parts structure the premise of this investigation.

An organization's capital structure, which is characterized as the mix of debt and equity used to help its operations, is pivotal in determining its generally financial wellbeing and hazard profile. Capital use choices influence the general security and vigor of the association notwithstanding the expense of capital. Grasping how associations fabricate their capital becomes essential for accomplices, lawmakers, and financial allies in the Indian automobile industry, where advancement, mechanical types of progress, and worldwide market floats constantly remodel the serious scene.

Also, shareholding patterns give significant experiences on the possession structure of organizations. The division of assets among different accomplices — public financial backers, promoting, and institutional financial patrons — immensely affects dynamic methods, organization administration, and, at last, financial performance. Noticing shareholding patterns gives a focal point through which we might comprehend the parts of power and direction, permitting us to measure the degree of impact and control applied by various entertainers inside an association.

There are various and complicated connections between capital structure, shareholding patterns, and financial performance. The capacity of an organization to find some kind of harmony among obligation and equity, while digging into the subtleties of possession portion, can essentially influence its benefit, hazard to chiefs, and in general practicality. With the Indian automobile area described by quick mechanical progressions, moving shopper inclinations, and worldwide market factors, it turns out to be much more basic to interpret these connections.

Fully intent on giving a complete examination of the manners by which capital structure and shareholding patterns influence the financial performance of organizations working in this area, this study digs profoundly into the financial complexities of the Indian car industry. Subsequently, we desire to impart important experiences to scholastics, business experts, and policymakers, encouraging a more profound comprehension of the financial variables impacting improvement in the dynamic and continuously developing Indian car scene.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Azhagaiah and Deepa (2011) investigate what business size means for the advantage capital structure relationship. The assessment explores what a company's size means for its capital structure decisions and, thus, the association's efficiency. The review's discoveries are significant on the grounds that they explain whether bigger organizations show unmistakable capital structure patterns and how these patterns connect with their benefit. The survey utilizes a quantitative procedure, investigating information from a specific time span to make determinations with respect to the connection between capital structure, advantage, and business size. Thus, Azhagaiah and Deepa add significant pieces of data to the assemblage of examination now accessible about the elements that determine capital structure and what they mean for the performance of organizations.

The focal point of Badu and Vitor's (2012) study is on Ghana's recorded banks' capital structure and performance. This study is especially critical in light of the fact that it looks at the association between bank financial performance and capital structure choices — a urgent issue for monetary soundness. The creators research the ramifications of Ghanaian banks' capital structure choices for their general performance. According to a worldwide viewpoint, the assessment considers the remarkable difficulties and elements of Ghana's financial area. Badu and Vitor offer significant bits of knowledge into the perplexing connection between capital structure and performance by taking a gander at information from banks that have been recorded. This has consequences for financial establishments in creating economies.

The focal point of Bandyopadhyay and Barua (2016) is on the components that determine capital structure and company performance in India, explicitly zeroing in on the effect of the business cycle. This study is one of a kind in that it looks at macroeconomic factors and what those elements mean for business capital structure choices. It gives an extensive comprehension of the elements that impact capital structure. Bandyopadhyay and Barua's examination of the manners by which business cycle impacts influence the association between capital structure and company performance adds to a more intricate comprehension of the elements in question. The survey utilizes a broad quantitative methodology, breaking down information and reaching significant inferences through the utilization of econometric strategies.

Bijalwan and Madan (2013) research the association between ownership structure, board cosmetics, and business performance. The assessment investigates what an organization's possession structure and board cosmetics mean for generally performance. Frameworks of corporate administration play a urgent part in determining the central decisions and course of a firm. By dismantling the ramifications of the inside administration structure for business results, this study adds to the assortment of composing. To separate significant encounters, the examination consolidates abstract and quantitative thoughts. The discoveries have useful pertinence as they shed light on the significance of board participation and possession structure in improving firm performance. Bijalwan and Madan add to how we might interpret corporate administration's effect on authoritative accomplishment by looking at these managerial vantage focuses.

Chen, Feldmann, and Tang (2015) use information from Overall Declaring Drive (GRI) reports in the gathering industry to outline their proposition, which is that revelations of business social performance affect financial performance. This study investigates the irrefutably significant connection between financial performance and corporate social obligation (CSR), offering knowledge into what happens to organizations who make social performance their first concern. The creators utilize a quantitative methodology, investigating information from GRI reports to lay out connections between's financial results and corporate social performance openings. The audit gives goodies of data about the possible advantages of CSR drives on financial performance, with suggestions for organizations endeavoring to adjust their social and financial goals.

The connection between market worth and capital structure in Indian gathering makers is analyzed by Dhananjaya (2017). This study gives some knowledge into what capital structure choices mean for market discernments and valuations by zeroing in on the financial structure of organizations according to their market valuation. The survey utilizes a quantitative technique to examine information from Indian gathering organizations to determine the connection between's reasonable worth and capital structure. The discoveries add to how we might interpret what decisions about capital structure mean for market factors, which has repercussions for organizations hoping to further develop their financial remaining in the Indian gathering area.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

For this Causal Exploration, board information from 16 cross-sectional automobile associations from the financial years 2001-2002 to 2015-2016 (for example, it's a respectable board) covering a total of 250 detectable realities in the survey were assembled from the "Capita line Informational index" across the four pieces (bicycle, three-wheeler, four-wheeler, and business vehicle).

An organization's capital structure is comprised of its assets, which are utilized to finance its exercises. These assets incorporate normal equity, leaned toward equity, long-term commitments, and short-term liabilities, for example, cash orders. Thusly, different capital structure parts have been recognized and utilized in the assessment to see the Impact of Capital Structure on Financial backers Return. As an intermediary for capital structure, equity to total assets (assessed season of appearance), short-term debt to total assets (SDTA), and long-term debt to total assets (LDTA) have all been utilized. Return on equity (ROE) has been utilized to gauge financial backer returns.

ATR (resource turnover ratio), ROA (return on assets), and TA (total assets) are a portion of the control factors that have been distinguished and utilized in the survey to gauge the "impact of capital structure on financial backers return." A control variable is a variable that is held constant to assess or make sense of the connection between two unique elements. Very much like ROE is subject to the association's creation, ROA has likewise been utilized as a benefit sharing go between. ATR is utilized as a capability intermediary since ROE likewise really relies on how beneficially the administration utilizes its assets. TA has been utilized as a size intermediary since ROE can likewise be made sense of by the size of the organization.

In this examination, Pearson Connection is a generally utilized and exceptionally gainful estimation strategy. No matter what the assessment unit, a connection is a solitary number that addresses the level of linkage or connection between two boundaries. Research has been finished for the overall industry. The connection coefficient (r) will continuously be in the scope of - 1.0 to +1.0. On the off chance that the connection is negative, the variables have a negative relationship; on the off chance that it is positive, the elements have a positive connection. Relapse examination is utilized to accomplish the survey's fundamental

objective, which is, for example, to determine how financial backer return has created corresponding to the sythesis of the capital structure. The most significant step included applying quantifiable Pooled OLS Relapse or Constant Coefficient Model (CCM), trailed by Board Data Relapses such Econometrical Fixed Effect and Random Effect Models. At long last, the Wald Test and the Hausman Determination Test have been applied to choose the proper model for the last discussion.

How Might I Pick a Random Effect, Fixed Effect, or Constant Coefficient Model? I utilized the Durbin-Wu-Hausman test, frequently known as the Hausman detail test, to track down the most precisely fitting model to reveal insight into this issue.

"The FEM and ECM assessors don't contrast a lot, which is the wrong hypothesis at the core of the Hausman test. Hausman's test estimation has an asymptotic $\chi 2$ conveyance. The end that follows from the dismissal of the invalid hypothesis is that the ECM is ill-advised since the random effects are most likely connected with somewhere around one regressor. As a general rule, FEM is liked over ECM. since of their more noteworthy adequacy, random effects (RE) are accordingly liked under the invalid hypothesis, while fixed effects (FE) are liked under the choice since they are fairly steady. I pick FEM over REM since I get a critical P-Worth.

Thereafter, I have checked which model is proper, Fixed Effects or Pooled

Wald Test is used in OLS regression modeling.

Model of Pooled Regression as the Null Hypothesis

Another theory is the Fixed Effect Model.

Once more, I got a high p-Worth, in this manner I picked FEM over CCM. The Fixed Effects Model was viewed as the super model in our review, so I will currently momentarily talk about FEM underneath.

3.1. Fixed effect model (FEM)

Even if all 250 observations are combined in this model, it nevertheless allows each cross-section unit (in this case, car companies) to have a unique capture value. Fixed Effects acknowledges that the free factor corresponds to the unique explicit impact.

3.2. What functions does a fixed effect model perform?

(i) Gives a dummy variable to each cross-sectional object.

a. 0 = This isn't the entity that crosses sections.

b. 1: This is the creature that crosses borders.

(ii) Model the regression using OLS, omitting the constant term.

a. To escape the trap of the dummy variable, omit the constant phrase!

(iii) For every cross-sectional entity, there are distinct intercepts for the betas on the dummy variables.

3.3. Why would we apply a model with fixed effects?

- Representing heterogeneity that isn't recognized when it endures after some time and displays a connection with free factors. at the point when you don't need explicit non-random elements to show up in your mistake term.

- More powerful, more modest standard blunders

The accompanying Fixed Impact relapse model has been made utilizing the review's factors, ROE (an intermediary for organization performance) as the reliant variable and estimated time of arrival, SDTA, LDTA, ROA, ATR, and TA as the free factors:

$$ROE_{it} = B_{1i} + B_2 * ETA_{it} + B_3 * SDTA_{it} + B_4 * LDTA_{it} + B_5 * ROA_{it} + B_6 * ATR_{it} + B_7 * TA_{it} + u_{it}$$

$$i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots\ldots, 16$$

$$t = 1, 2, 3, \ldots\ldots, 15$$

The addendum "I" on the capture term (B1i) in this Fixed Impact model equation suggests that the block of sixteen organizations may be unique. The unique selling points of each vehicle company, such as their board's philosophy, administrative approach, or the markets they cater to, may be the reason for the differences.

The model referenced above is alluded to as the Fixed Effect relapse model (FEM) in econometric composition. The term "fixed effects" alludes to the way that, even while the catch shifts between people, every component's block doesn't change over the long haul; for example, the time has shown up invariantly.

Because of my consent for the catch to contrast among associations, the model referenced above is a one-way fixed effects model. There is likewise a worldly part. It is recognized that ROE varies over the long haul because of a few reasons, incorporating as movements in development, changes to informal regulation or potential plans, among others. Since the catch, in light of everything, would be permitted to differentiate for both the individual and fleeting effects, the model would be alluded to as a two-way fixed effects model in the event that the block was permitted to modify after some additional time.

In this review, the veracity of the claim is evaluated by assigning a 5% importance level to the hypothesis explanation and determining whether to accept or reject it. There was just one hypothesis, and it was divided into two categories: invalid theory and elective theory.

The following were the Alternative Hypothesis (H1) and Null Hypothesis (H0):

Ho: The return to shareholders and capital structure do not significantly correlate.

H1: The capital structure and the return to shareholders are significantly correlated.

I have utilized Econometric Software EViews (Econometric Points of view), or all the more explicitly, EViews, with the end goal of data assessment. Variant 9.5 Student Light was created by Quantitative Micro Software (QMS), which is at present a division of IHS Markit Ltd. (Information, Data Dealing with Administrations), a London, Joined Domain based organization.

4. RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH, ANALYSIS, AND DISCUSSION

The connection coefficient values between the subordinate variable ROE and the independent elements assessed season of appearance, SDTA, and LDTA, as well as between the subordinate variable ROE and the control factors ROA, ATR, and TA, are shown in Table 1. This outcome shows relationship for the whole Indian automobile industry, i.e., every one of the four sections taken together, which recommends each of the 250 perceptions for all boundaries considered.

The correlational signs show that there is a negative connection among ROE and every one of the three free factors — explicit assessed season of appearance, SDTA, and LDTA. Regardless, there is proof of a positive connection among's ROE and every one of the three control boundaries, particularly TA, ATR, and ROA.

Table 1:IAI Correlation Result

Metric	ETA	SDTA	LDTA	ROA	ATR	TA
ROE	-0.2068	-0.1402	-0.3666	0.6169	0.3819	0.0436

However, the degree of the link (correlation coefficient, for instance) indicates that ROE and SDTA have a weakly negative association (coefficient is - 0.1402). The correlation between ROE and expected time of arrival and ROE and LDTA is shown to be moderately negative, with respective values of -0.2068 and -0.366.

As per Das (2012), "the square of the connection coefficient (r) approaches the extent of variety made sense of by relapse, so r 2=proportion of variety made sense of by relapse." Subsequently, the worth of r2 empowers us to show the level of difference in the reliant variable that the relapse condition can make sense of.

The Hausman Test's diagram outcome is shown in Table 2. This test is utilized to choose the best-fitting model from the Fixed Effects and Random Effects models, as was recently talked about. The Random Effects model is phenomenal, as indicated by the Invalid Hypothesis of the test, while the Fixed Effects model is the most ideal choice.

Table 2: Overview of the Hausman Test Findings

Correlated Random Effect – Hausman Test			
Test Cross section Random Effects			
Test Summary	**Chi-Sq Statistic**	**Chi-Sqd.f.**	**Prob.**
Cross Section Random	19.9497	7	0.0044*

The Chi-Square (χ2) circulation is utilized in the test. The χ2 worth and Chi-Square probability are shown in the tables above. χ2's P esteem is under 0.01. This proposes that the Fixed Effects Model's Elective Hypothesis is recognized with almost 100 percent certainty, and the Random Effects Model's Invalid Hypothesis is dismissed. The Fixed Effects model and Pooled OLS technique remain when the Random Effects model is dismissed by the Hausman test. Presently, we should look at the Wald test bring about request to settle on the Fixed Effects model and the Pooled OLS approach and pick the most suitable model.

Table 3 shows the Wald Test's outline of results. This test is utilized to choose the Fixed Effects Model and Pooled OLS method's best-fitting model. The test's invalid hypothesis expresses that every solitary coefficient is equivalent to nothing, which recommends that the Pooled OLS Strategy is fabulous. The test's elective hypothesis expresses that every solitary coefficient is totally special according to nothing, which proposes that the Fixed Effects model is favored in light of the fact that it is phenomenal and fitting for the educational file.

Table 3: An overview of the Wald test results

Wald Test			
Test Statistic	**Value**	**d.f.**	**Probability**
F - Statistic	23.2270	(7, 235)	0.0000*
Chi - Square	156.5887	8	0.0000*

The Probability values (P values) of the Chi-square and the F-estimation are both underneath 0.01, as can be displayed in Table 3 above, showing that even at under 1% level of significance, the data is really basic. Consequently, the discretionary hypothesis of the Fixed Effects Model is recognized while the invalid hypothesis of the Pooled OLS Procedure might be dismissed with a certainty level of around 100 percent.

As of the present moment, the Random Effects model has been negated by the Hausman test, and the Pooled OLS approach has been denied by the Wald test. At last, we have the Fixed Effects Model, which is really the best fit model for the educational file utilized in this audit. Accordingly, the Fixed Effects model has been decided for additional conversation in the manner depicted beneath.

'To fathom the development of financial backer's return with regards to capital structure organization through satisfactory Board Data Model' was the audit's essential objective. Consequently, the Fixed Effects model is the proper board data model in this occurrence.

How about we comprehend the development of financial backer return comparable to capital structure synthesis through the model's ramifications.

Table 4 shows the consequences of the fixed effects model, and obviously the reliant variable is Return on Equity (ROE). For this situation, ROE has been utilized as a substitute for

financial backer return. The extended season of appearance, SDTA, and LDTA — the three free factors — have been utilized as a scaffold for capital structure synthesis. The three control factors — ROA, ATR, and TA specifically — have each been utilized as an intermediary for advantage, efficiency, and firm size autonomously.

Table 4: Synopsis of Fixed Effects Model Outcome

Dependent Variable		ROE
Method		Panel Least Squares
Variable	Coefficient	Prob.
C	3.1120	0.5430
ETA	0.3187	0.0002*
SDTA	-0.0816	0.0023*
LDTA	-0.1180	0.2523
ROA	0.5623	0.0003*
ATR	8.3776	0.0047*
TA	-0.0004	0.2482
R-squared		0.5659
F – Statistic		14.5196
Probability of F - stats.		0.0000*
Durbin-Watson Stat		1.7885

Taking a gander at the singular coefficients and their individual probabilities, it is feasible to see that the four variables — assessed season of appearance, SDTA, ROA, and ATR — are quantifiably significant at the 1% degree of significance. Nonetheless, even at the 10% degree of significance, LDTA, TA, and the constant term are not especially critical.

Since we have the coefficient esteems, how about we audit the latest model that was assessed to anticipate ROE considering free and subordinate factors. The last model is displayed underneath:

$$ROE_{it} = 3.1119 + 0.3185 * ETA_{it} - 0.0814 * SDTA_{it} - 0.1179 * LDTA_{it} + 0.5621 * ROA_{it}$$
$$+ 8.3774 * ATR_{it} - 0.0002 * TA_{it} + u_{it}$$

$$i = 1, 2, 3, \ldots\ldots\ldots, 16$$

$$t = 1, 2, 3, \ldots\ldots\ldots, 15$$

The assessed condition demonstrates that block 'C' is 3.1119, which is the ROE's typical means worth when the independent factors are all equivalent to nothing. Generally, at that point, ROE will become 3.11119% whether or not all free and control components are zero. Indeed, even at a 10% degree of importance, this outcome is quantifiably not basic (since the catch term's p-worth is more than 0.10).

The normal season of appearance coefficient is 0.3187, intending that for each 1% expansion in the extended season of appearance ratio, ROE will increment by 0.3187%. Indeed, even at the under 1% level, this outcome is amazingly quantifiably urgent (in light of the fact that the catch term's p Worth is under 0.01). The coefficient of SDTA is viewed as '- 0.0816', intending that for each 1% expansion in the SDTA ratio, ROE will diminish by 0.0816%. This outcome is for sure tremendous, even at under 1% importance level (on the grounds that the catch term's p-esteem is under 0.01). The LDTA coefficient is viewed as '- 0.1180,' really intending that on the off chance that the LDTA ratio increments by 1%-point, ROE will diminish by 0.1180%. Regardless, even at 10% importance level (in light of the fact that the p-worth of the block term is more prominent than 0.10), this outcome isn't quantifiably basic. The coefficient of return on assets (ROA), which is utilized as an intermediary for efficiency, is 0.5623. This really intends that assuming the ROA ratio increments by 1%-point, ROE will increment by 0.5623%. This outcome is without a doubt huge, even at under 1% importance level (on the grounds that the block term's p-esteem is under 0.01). The coefficient of ATR, which fills in as an intermediary for the viability of the leader, is 8.3780. This really intends that assuming the ATR ratio increments by 1%-point, ROE will increment by 8.3780%. This outcome is to be sure tremendous, even at under 1% importance level (on the grounds that the catch term's p-esteem is under 0.01). The TA coefficient, which is utilized as an intermediary for firm size, is viewed as '- 0.0004'. This suggests that assuming TA increments by 1%, ROE will diminish by 0.0004%. At any rate, even at a 10% level of importance, this outcome isn't certifiably basic (since the catch term's p-worth is more than 0.10).

A genuine proportion of how intently the relapse line looks like the real information of interest is the R-squared regard, otherwise called the coefficient of determination. Here, the

R^2 worth of 0.5659 for the fitted model, for example, the Fixed Effects Model, shows that just 56.59% of the variety in ROE has been represented by the free and control parts, leaving 43.45% of the variety unaccounted for. A higher R^2 worth shows a more grounded model, which makes consistency more perceptible.

The probability of the F estimation and the F estimation itself show whether the model's general consistency is really significant. For this situation, the likelihood of the F estimation is staggeringly enormous. The model seems, by all accounts, to be significant even at the under 1% level, as demonstrated by the P worth of the F estimation (0.002) being under 0.01. This proposes that we can dismiss the incorrect hypothesis that there is no straight relationship and acknowledge the discretionary hypothesis that there is an immediate connection between's the synthesis of the capital structure and the return on equity (ROE) of financial backers.

Durbin-Watson Detail (D-W Detail), as we are without a doubt mindful, can shift from 0 to 4. There is no autocorrelation in the residuals when the importance level is near 2. Taking a gander at the above information, we can see that the D - W detail is 1.7885, exceptionally near 2. With regards to this, it is standard to express that back to back waiting or misstep terms (for beginning solicitations just) are irrelevant. In this Fixed Effects Model, the presumption of free mistakes (no autocorrelation) is consequently fulfilled.

In view of the previously mentioned examination and conversations, it very well may be derived that the arrangement of the capital structure influences both return on equity (ROE) and financial backer return by and large.

5. CONCLUSION

A huge comprehension of the complex financial parts of the Indian automobile industry has come from looking at the connection between capital structure, shareholding pattern, and financial performance. The investigation uncovered that choices about an association's capital structure, especially those relating to debt and equity, altogether affected its financial performance. The essential objective of the audit was to utilize the proper Board Data Model — for this situation, the Fixed Effects Model — to comprehend how financial backer return created corresponding to capital structure piece. As per this model, the capital structure synthesis can represent up to 56.57% of the variety in ROE. Thusly, subsidizing choices are

basic and ought to be made with alert, considering the possible effect on financial backers' returns to draw in new financial backers and premium in the association. With a high level of homegrown assembling, major areas of strength for a pattern, and a sizable product pattern, the Indian automobile industry has an extraordinary opportunity to rival different nations in this market and surpass different automakers. Given the nation's high driving populace and low explorer vehicle thickness, the significant industry and public specialists ought to attempt to reinforce the legitimate administrative system, foster ability, streamline infrastructure, cultivate advancement and innovative work, and work on the reality of the stock organization to situate India as a significant centre point for the creation of automobiles.

REFERENCES

1. Azhagaiah, R., & R. Deepa. (2011). *Impact of firm size on the relationship between profitability and capital structure. Udyog Pragati, 35(3) (July- September).*
2. Badu, J., & Vitor, A. D. (2012). *Capital structure and performance of listed banks in Ghana. Global Journal of Human Social Science, 12(5), 57-62.*
3. Bandyopadhyay, A., & Barua, N. M. (2016). *Factors determining capital structure and corporate performance in India: Studying the business cycle effects. The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance, 61, 160-172.*
4. Bijalwan, J. G., & Madan, P. (2013). *Board composition, ownership structure and firm performance. Research Journal of Economics and Business Studies, 2(6), 86-101.*
5. Chen, L., Feldmann, A., & Tang, O. (2015). *The relationship between disclosures of corporate social performance and financial performance: Evidences from GRI reports in manufacturing industry. International Journal of Production Economics, 170, 445-456.*
6. Dhananjaya, K. (2017). *Market value and capital structure: A study of Indian manufacturing firms. MUDRA: Journal of Finance and Accounting, 4(2), 145-166.*
7. Goyal, A. M. (2013). *Impact of capital structure on performance of listed public sector banks in India. International Journal of Business and Management Invention, 3(10), India.*
8. Hedau, A., Singh, S., &Janor, H. (2018). *Determinants of capital structure–a sector specific approach. Romanian Economic and Business Review, 13(4), 14-30.*
9. Hughes, D., Baasi, N. M., &Addae, A. A. (2013). *The effect of capital structure on profitability of listed firms in Ghana. European Journal of Business and Management, 5(31), 215-229.*
10. Iftikhar Baig, M. (2020). *Corporate Governance Practices of Automobile Companies Listed in S&P BSE AUTO and Its Impact on Firm's Performance (Doctoral dissertation, Mizoram University).*
11. Kimani, P. G. (2023). *Determinants of financial performance of general insurance companies in Kenya (Doctoral dissertation, KCA University).*
12. Kumar, A., Sinha, A., Arora, A. & Aggarwal, A. (2018). *Impact of CSR activities on the financial performance of firms. MUDRA: Journal of Finance and Accounting, 5(1), 75- 89.*

13. *Mireku, K., Mensah, S., &Ogoe, E. (2014). The relationship between capital structure measures and financial performance: Evidence from Ghana. International Journal of Business and Management, 9(6), 151-160.*

14. *Muritala, T. A. (2012). An empirical analysis of capital structure on firms' performance in Nigeria. International Journal of Advances in Management and Economics, 1(5), 116-124.*

15. *Neto, M. S., do Carmo, M. J., Ribeiro, E. M. S., & da Cruz, W. V. G. (2020). Corporate ownership network in the automobile industry: Owners, shareholders and passive investment funds. Research in Globalization, 2, 100016.*

16. *Nyotta, B. N. (2014). The relationship between working capital management and financial performance of automotive companies in Kenya. An Unpublished MBA Research Project.*

17. *Ramachandran, Dr. K. K. &Madhumathy, M. (2016). A study on capital structure and financial performance of Indian textile industry. International Journal of Management, 7(3), 313–322.*

18. *Shrivastav, S. M. (2023). Exploring the Nexus Between Ownership Patterns and Corporate Performance in India. IUP Journal of Corporate Governance, 22(3), 39-70.*

19. *Sidra, A. M., &Attiya, J. (2013). Determinants of financial performance of a firm: Case of Pakistani stock market. Journal of economics and International Finance, 5(2), 43-52.*

20. *Yasser, Q. R., & Mamun, A. A. (2017). The impact of ownership concentration on firm performance: Evidence from an emerging market. Emerging Economy Studies, 3(1), 34-53.*

Author's Declaration

Dr. Ankur

*****