

Determinants of Manufacturing Investment in India: An Empirical Study

Garima Raghuwanshi¹, Abhishek Vaishnav², Manoj Kumar Mishra^{3*}

¹Associate Professor, Department of Management, Sanjay Rungta Group of Institutions, Bhilai, India

²Assistant Professor, Department of Management, Sanjay Rungta Group of Institutions, Bhilai, India

³Dean Academics and Professor, AISECT University, Hazaribag, India, Email: mkmishraeco@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author

Received: 11.04.2024

Revised : 13.05.2024

Accepted: 24.05.2024

ABSTRACT

This paper analyses the determinants of manufacturing investment in India based on the data from 2001 to 2018. However, current data has also been used for analysis purpose. It is an empirical study based on secondary data and time series econometrics. Analysis of short-run shows that change in Output & Profit increase Gross Fixed Capital Formation (GFCF) 1% rise from the previous year will give a higher investment done within the current-year, and a past-yr profit by same rate can gives you about nearly 60% raise into active investment. On the other hand, interest rate does not have any significant impact on GFCF in short run as well long-run and it seems to be less influential investment behaviour of emerging market like India. Output is significant in the long-run, but fixed investment only has a relationship with output as its proxy (the coefficient of 0.34 implies that when GFCF rises by 1%/output gap increases by one percentage point). Similar results hold true in various models and highlight the influence of output on manufacturing investment decisions within India. This study can be useful for study the future trend of investment scenario in manufacturing sector in India.

Keywords: Manufacturing Investment, Gross Fixed Capital Formation (GFCF), Output, Profit, Investment Theory, Interest Rates

INTRODUCTION

The Reserve Bank of India (RBI) surprising announcement a few days back that it would continue to keep the policy rate low possibly for an amount of time from now on has created quite some stir within Indian policymaking circles (See, Rangarajan 2021; Mohanty 2022) out accessible in alt OMR—goals and feedback June/July Ed. In the face of COVID-19 restrictions, planned domestic growth support is accorded by RBI being within a context where monetary policy and economic growth are intertwined in complex ways. Papdemos (2003) asserts that economic growth cannot come directly through monetary policy but due to this, can make an environment where prices are kept at a stable level so the economy may grow itself. The connection between financial approach and financial development has been examined broadly in the writing of money related financial aspects. A survey of the hypothetical and observational writing on this relationship tracked down conflicting discoveries (Twinoburya and Odhiambo, 2018). They place that all things being equal, this connection is less vigorous in emerging nations (with less created monetary business sectors and a restricted level of worldwide market reconciliation). For instance, real variables are affected through several transmission channels by monetary policy in a manner that depends on the level of financial and banking sector development across countries. In the first place, the loan fee channel: changes in strategy rates are related with a decline in long haul genuine financing costs which impact total interest through business venture and sturdy utilization choices (Khudrakpam et al. 2012). The resource cost channel and the credit channel are likewise strong correspondence channels for financial policy transition. The credit channel centers through which banks as monetary go-betweens make an interpretation of financial strategy into changes in the total assets and pay of borrowers, with comparing effects on acquiring interest from spending units and resulting influences upon total interest and speculation.

The resource cost channel manages the financial exchange; in this way, money related strategy likewise can make an abundance impact on investors by impacting Tobins' q . Expansive monetary policies tend to push up stock prices and thus make investors perceive their assets as worth more relative to what it would cost them had they used those resources in some other project or firm (their marginal replacement costs) which raises investment levels indirectly via an increase in firms' " q " through higher net present

value of equity issues emanating from increased share prices due primarily but not exclusively because central banks have stoked demand for these equities despite changing fundamentals over time while this might seem like good news at first glance if you stop there:- with all that new capital coming into companies across every sector. for no good reason almost all growth rates are going down overall! This paper analyses the Indian data of a decade and more revealing how corporate investment responds to interest rates from 2001. To this end, since the policy rate is intended to influence interest rates, and thus acts as an independent variable in reduced form specifications, this study employs lending rate of scheduled commercial banks (SCBs) as a measure for real-money market conditions. Most models assume that interest rates have a significant impact on business investment decisions in developed economies tend to be heavily affected by interest rates, whereas the evidence on emerging markets is less decisive (Greene and Villeneuve 1991). The efficacy of interest rates affecting investment decisions in less developed countries is contentious to the extent that the financial and banking sectors remain underdeveloped. The current review is an endeavour to comprehend the determinants of business speculation conduct in India with explicit reference to loan fees.

Major Theories of Investment Behaviour

Speculation is the primary driver of a nation's all out efficiency yield and long haul development (DeLong and Summers, 1992). However financial analysts dissent, also: Do ventures bring development, or does development empower further speculation? DeLong and Summers see reserve funds as the deciding component in monetary development, while Bloomstrom, Lipsey, and Zejan are of the assessment that capital arrangement causes development. These outcomes highlight the requirement for country-explicit examination to actually direct approaches.

Presently, the facts confirm that there are banter about whether giving cash for speculation truly prompts solid financial development or not (Ronald Bailey capably covers a couple of these focuses here); however all else equivalent economies encountering quick Gross domestic product increments have comparatively been related with high rates venture. There is still a lot of discussion about how venture functions, with various hypothetical customs underscoring totally different logical elements. On the Keynesian side, it contends that speculation still up in the air by contrasting peripheral productivity of capital with the genuine loan cost. Venture speculations incorporate:

1. **Flexible Accelerator Theory (Koyck, 1954)** - Based on J.M. Clark's theory but also relates investment to changes in output and allows for new capital depreciation
2. **Neoclassical investment theory (Jorgenson 1963)** — investments are based on profit maximization, user cost of capital (depending prices and depreciation), especially interest rates changing.
3. **Q Theory of Investment (Tobin, 1969)**; determinants determine that firms take their investment decisions by comparing the market value to input cost ratio. It is over 1, it [Q ratio] encourages investment and below 1 discourages the same.

Dusenberry accelerator theory and financial theory are other theories which also help in understanding the investment behaviour but they have not been discussed here. II: Literature Review The literature after this section will focus on four connate articles concerning the subject of manufacturing investment in India.

Investment Trends and Patterns in India

Public investments are important to support investment decisions and generally require high levels of capital funds, while private ones could be key drivers in economic growth productivity as well especially for developing nations. In fact, investment in public infrastructure development has long been recognized as an important source of productivity enhancement across sectors (Munnel 1992). Ab-joint The conjunction of a parapsydokian and an aporia. This study looks at what influences private as well as public sector investments Since India's economy was opened in 1991, it has seen a significant rise in industrial productivity. During 1970-1990 normal pace of capital development as rate to Gross domestic product was around 18.9% (RBI,2020). Post-1991, the speculation rate expanded significantly to arrive at a high of 39% in 2011-12. From 2000 to 2010, the average investment rate was only 31.7%. However, starting 2011-12 there was a moderation in the growth rate and it fell to just over 32.2% by FY19 from almost 39% at its peak level as of R3:Q4 or an absolute decline of nearly -7%. This has obviously had an impact on GDP growth because of the decline in investment rate. Fastest GDP growth also happened in India when investment rates were going up. Between 2004-05 and 2010-11, that time during which GDP expanded at an average of around 8.5%, the rate averaged a little over one-third of investment. The Investment Ratio and GDP Growth Rate illustrate that investment is essential for economic progress.

Related Background Investment is the essential driver that prompts financial development in any nation (Khan and Reinhart 1990, Greene et al. India had the option to accomplish solid development all through the 21st 100 years to a limited extent because of low utilization and venture rates during the mid-2000s, which empowered a high investment funds rate (Mohan 2008). Indeed, even these periods occurred as the Gross domestic product development rates had zoomed together. These speculations advance different advantages, remembering capital consumption and development for work as well as request which makes the economy steadier.

Families are the biggest supporters of interest in land, through responsibility for and by consuming different administrations (development work, leases) This is exceptionally low contrasted with venture by the confidential area in land - where public area has nearly made no speculations by any means. Manufacturing sector follows, with GFCF as per cent of GDP pretty much stable at 5% from the year 2011-12. The direction of investment is waning in the majority areas for this, still. In all, the rate of decrease of Total GFCF from 2011-12 to 2019-20 stood at -34% compared with -28%.

Noted earlier, the household sector is separately accounted for being the first contributor of Gross Fixed Capital Formation (GFCF) in India from 2011-12. Despite the rise in funding activities of private corporations as whole equalling those from households, between 2015-16 and 2016-17 investment levels for private sector businesses eclipsed household investments. These investments by the household sector into real estate, agriculture etc. creates a ripple effect and leads to more demand in other sectors Back To Top Higher spending on real estate, for instance is followed by an increase in demand for raw materials of building like steel and iron. In correlation, confidential area GFCF was at 11% until 2015-16 it plunged to about ₹10.4 lakh crores when FY19 finished Public area GFCF, then again floated at around 7% through a large portion of the decade from 2010 to 2020 period.

The overall investment might be more potent on the manufacturing side which could have a good impact on GDP growth. It is mainly concerned with the sectorial structure of an economy and argues that manufacturing (goods producing) enterprises are engines of growth supporting a process driving forward both this engine itself but also overall development more broadly. Kaldor [1966]; Stiglitz 1997; Krugman, 1980). Productivity in manufacturing generates labour from other less productive sector, increasing economy wide productivity and output (Kaldor 1967). A few examinations (Lopez and Thirwall, 2014; Sankaran and Samataraya, 2015) have explored the linkages between development in Gross domestic product yield on one side with assembling result of another. In Figure 4 we can see that Manufacturing Gross Value Added (GVA) has an even stronger correlation with GDP growth rates at around 0.8, and often grows faster than the GDP itself. Although the correlation between these two series is well documented, a focus on simple correlational analyses does not do justice to estimating an econometric model of potential determinants affecting manufacturing investment. This paper examines the determinants of manufacturing investment in India using four key explanatory variables pertaining to output, retained profits and interest rates.

Methodology and Data

The study is about comprehending, few of the determinants which matter most in investment decision by manufacturing units in India for period 2001 –2018. Our dependent variable is GFCF (Gross Fixed Capital Formation: augmentations to the proper capital supply of firms). Interests in resources that give gets back to the long haul on the grounds that decent capital has a more drawn out lifetime is GFCF. The information we use are on GFCF, yield change and benefit in ASI. Loan fee and business assumption file information are likewise taken from the RBI's Data set on Indian Economy (DBIE).

The model is utilized to concentrate on the determinants of fixed venture: yield worth, benefit and prime loaning pace of part significant business banks. This study gives a knowledge into the parts of venture conduct including hypotheses, for example, gas pedal hypothesis, benefit hypothesis and their confirmation inside Indian Setting covering a period from 2000 to 2018. This exploration contrasts from earlier investigations that depend on firm-level board information by utilizing a period series examination of public level information. 2 The determinates of fixed interest in India: An exact model for assessment:

$$GFCF = f(\text{change in yield, benefit, loaning rate}) + U_t \quad (1)$$

Then, with such a long examination period all factors ought to be fixed to stay away from autoregressive mistakes. Time series results with stochastic examples can provoke misdirecting backslide, coefficient deficiency and shortcoming of the significance tests (Granger and Newbold 1974). Customarily, cointegration strategies are used to deal with the unit basic issues and measure long-run associations see Engle and Granger (1987), Johansen et al. Tragically, these strategies can likewise be awkward: in particular they all require the identification of an optimal lag length and hence using OLS (not DOLS),

which in turn forces us to put lags on every variable at least as far back as one order. Therefore error correction model is used to overcome this shortcoming of Time series data.

$$\Delta \ln GFCF_t = \sum_{j=1}^p \gamma_j \Delta \ln GFCF_{t-j} + \sum_{j=0}^{q-1} \delta_j \Delta X_{t-j} + \phi [\ln GFCF_{t-1} - \{\beta_0 + \beta X_{t-j}\}] + \epsilon_t \quad (2)$$

In this situation t is the time span, as p designates simplex slack for subordinate variable and q represents simplex slack in free factors. In this test $\ln(GFCF)$ is the normal logarithm of gross fixed capital arrangement for assembling enterprises in India. Where X_t is a vector of logical factors including yield development, held benefit (Icoprofit), and the great loaning rate presented by significant business banks [Inplends] as follows: Where γ is the slack coefficient for speculation variable and ϕ vector contains short-run coefficients of the informative factors; it incorporates how gradually change in accordance with long run harmony levels would be produced using any unsettling influences. Long-run coefficients for autonomous factors vary over the long run (β).

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Table 1: Sector-wise analysis of fixed investment in India

| Gross Fixed Capital Formation by Industry as a percentage of GDP | | | | | | | |
|---|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|------------|
| Economic Activity | 2013 14 | 2014 15 | 2015 16 | 2016 17 | 2017 18 | 2018 19 | 2019 20 |
| Agriculture, Forestry and Fishing | 2.86 | 2.58 | 2.09 | 2.18 | 2.07 | 2.10 | 2.14 |
| Mining & Quarrying | 1.28 | 0.54 | 0.42 | 0.44 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.40 |
| Manufacturing | 5.14 | 5.12 | 5.21 | 4.67 | 4.38 | 4.29 | 4.41 |
| Electricity Gas, Water Supply and Other Utility Services | 2.79 | 2.67 | 2.97 | 2.36 | 1.92 | 2.27 | 2.00 |
| Construction | 1.34 | 1.12 | 1.18 | 1.55 | 1.83 | 1.99 | 1.85 |
| Trade, Repair, Hotels & Restaurant | 2.07 | 2.70 | 2.69 | 2.82 | 3.10 | 2.90 | 2.41 |
| Transport, Storage & Communication & Services related to Broadcasting | 2.88 | 1.91 | 2.63 | 2.62 | 3.58 | 3.80 | 3.68 |
| Financial Services | 0.35 | 0.33 | 0.39 | 0.30 | 0.22 | 0.32 | 0.33 |
| Real Estate, Ownership of Dwelling and Professional Services | 8.12 | 8.63 | 6.54 | 6.51 | 5.86 | 6.39 | 6.41 |
| Public Administration & Defence | 2.75 | 2.78 | 2.78 | 2.81 | 2.67 | 2.67 | 2.93 |
| Other Services | 1.72 | 1.71 | 1.84 | 1.93 | 2.06 | 1.96 | 2.18 |
| Total | 31.30 | 30.08 | 28.73 | 28.19 | 28.18 | 29.19 | 28.75 |

Source: Calculation based on Reserve Bank of India data

In the short run fixed investment is evidenced to have a significant association only with output and profit. More precisely, the positive effect of a change in output on GFCF is statistically significant only with one year lagging and it implies that 1% growth of output results in increasing by fixed investment (GCF) next period. On the other hand, though positive, profit has a significantly negative coefficient on GFCF for both years. Hence, a 60% increase in current investment is associated with an hike of profit over the last year holding rest to constant.

Table 2: The result for the Autoregressive Distributive Lag model Full size table

| lnGFCF | Coef. | Std. Err. | T | P> t |
|------------------------------|-------|-----------|------|------|
| Short Run Results | | | | |
| lnGFCF (Lag 1) | 0.29 | 0.16 | 1.85 | 0.14 |
| Change in output (ln) | | | | |
| Current | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.20 | 0.85 |
| Lag 1 | 0.16 | 0.05 | 2.92 | 0.04 |
| Lag2 | 0.08 | 0.05 | 1.79 | 0.15 |

| | | | | |
|----------------------------------|----------------------------|------|------|------|
| Current | Profit (ln) 0.66 | 0.18 | 3.58 | 0.02 |
| Lag1 | 0.61 | 0.24 | 2.56 | 0.06 |
| Lag2 | 0.25 | 0.22 | 1.12 | 0.32 |
| Average Lending Rate (ln) | | | | |
| Current | 0.17 | 0.16 | 1.05 | 0.36 |
| Lag1 | 0.09 | 0.16 | 0.59 | 0.59 |
| Constant | 4.50 | 0.79 | 5.72 | 0.01 |
| Error Correction Term | 0.71 | 0.16 | 4.57 | 0.01 |
| Long Run Results | | | | |
| Change in Output (Log) | 0.34 | 0.17 | 2.03 | 0.11 |
| Profit (Log) | 0.30 | 0.22 | 1.35 | 0.25 |
| Average Lending rate (Log) | 0.10 | 0.22 | 0.47 | 0.66 |

Source: Calculation from secondary data

Temporarily or long haul, be that as it may, the paper sees there is no critical connection between loan cost and GFCF. And that implies that transient developments in loan fee doesn't actually influence firm venture conduct. Long haul (central) speculation choices are fundamentally founded on in general financial circumstances, center benefit of firms, market power and mechanical improvements as opposed to simply transient loan costs. These discoveries are in accordance with past examination recommending that the effect of loan fees on venture is powerless or immaterial in developing business sectors in light of the fact that these nations will generally experience the ill effects of monetary and capital market disappointments. The F-regard is higher than the essential worth using ARDL limits test suggests there exists a long-run relationship in this survey model. Over an extended time results from ARDL model, simply result is distinctly basic with fixed adventure. Even more inquisitively, a 1% reduction in the outcome opening adds to corporate capital improvement creating under its for a long while run balance way by as much as 34% while advantage and funding cost stay fair for adventure. The examination of Kripfdanz and Schneider (2020) is vastly improved in this regard, even notwithstanding their inquisitive displaying technique when they require a unique ARDL system to support the heartiness of their key discoveries. The ARDL model, barring the loaning rate likewise had comparative outcomes with high sure coefficients for benefit and result.

The lagged GFCF does not have a statistically significant impact on the current period, since fixed investment is generally long term and can take some time to produce an effect in practice. The coefficient of the error correction term measures how quickly deviations from short-run equilibrium are corrected to revert to long-run equilibrium. When we have a significant negative error correction term, it imply that there is cointegration between the variables in long-run and one can granger cause another variable. In such a model, the error correction term shown in Table 4 has been found to carry significantly negative coefficient (-0.71), which implies that about 71 % of short-run disequilibrium will be made up within one period and brought back to longrun equilibrium level by an adjusting wavevenile process appearing after passage through intended phases as outlined before.

CONCLUSION

In particular, this paper examines the firm-level manufacturing investment timing for India over 2001–2018 and its linkages with output, profit alongside interest rates. Our results provide evidence that the short run variations in output and profit effect equally on Gross Fixed Capital Formation (GFCF). At least a 1% one-off rise in output the previous year can increase current-year investment and at least a 1% jump in past profits is linked to rising this year's cash sources for spending; with sky rocket decades of growth trigger almost whole additional equivalent amount Stay ahead w/a four-decade continuum default downturn Activity Indicator View Dynamic & network hand shaped done Presentence Attention sty In line Ritual-interest oriented... On the other hand, interest rates do not have either a short-term or long-run effect on GFCF. This result indicates that in the short run, interest rates are not a critical factor determining investment behaviour of India which is also consistent with some previous studies finding little or no impact of IR on Investment dynamics whereas it is observed that even though IR affects I by having significant & strong relationship for developed economies its presence seems to have less controlling effects, if any at all, constrained within emerging market context mainly due to their existing

financial markets structures. A long-run analysis shows that it is only output changes are significant determined for fixed investment. In other words, GFCF rises by 34 percent after a one-percent increase in the output gap. Speculation into profit and interest rates are beside the point that neither have influence over investment decisions in the long-run. The interpretation of the results, on solid ground as a robust manner because with supplementing method revolving around dynamic ARDL model and models that exclude lending rates.

Lagged GFCF, in addition, only exerts a small positive influence on current GFCF commercial investment is simply too long-term. AEA is the error correction term (ERROR) that specifies how quickly deviations from short-run equilibrium revert to long-run equilibrium — 71% of it in the very next period. Altogether, that underscores the importance of output for manufacturing investment in India and therefore its significance as a determinant of any short- or long-term decisions regarding manufacturing.

REFERENCES

- [1] Economic Survey, Government of India 2022-23
- [2] Graham, J.R. (2000). How big are the tax benefits of debt?. *Journal of Finance*, 55(5): 1901-1941.
- [3] Greene H, W. (2012). *Econometric analysis*, (7th ed.). International Edition, Pearson, New York University.
- [4] Holtz-Eakin, D., Newey, W. and Rosen, H. (1988). Estimating vector autoregressions with panel data". *Econometrica*, 56(6): 1371–1395.
- [5] *Indian Economic Journal*, different Issues,
- [6] Jensen, M., Meckling, W., (1976). Theory of the Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 2: 305–360.
- [7] Kraus, A., & Litzenberger, R.H. (1973). A State_Preference Model of Optimal Financial Leverage. *Journal of Finance* 28 (4), 911–922.
- [8] Kripfganz, S., and Schneider, D. C. (2020), "Response Surface Regressions for Critical Value Bounds and Approximate P Values in Equilibrium Correction Models." *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 82, no. 6, pp. 1456–1481.
- [9] Krishnamurthy, K., and Sastry, D. U. (1974), "Dividends and External Finance: An Analysis of the Corporate Sector in India." *Indian Economic Review*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 155–182.
- [10] Long, M. S., Malitz, I. B. (1985). *Investment Patterns and Financial Leverage*. in Friedman B. J. (ed.), *Corporate Capital Structures in the United States*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- [11] Martinez-Carrascal, C., Ferrando, A., (2008). The impact of financial position on investment: An analysis for non-financial corporation in the Euro area. ECB Working Papers No. 943.
- [12] Mohanty, Prasanna (2022), "Why RBI Is Coy About Raising Interest Rates." *Fortune India*
- [13] Reserve Bank of India Bulletin, 2022-23