International Journal of Management, IT & Engineering

Vol. 8 Issue 4, April 2018, ISSN: 2249-0558 Impact Factor: 7.119

Journal Homepage: http://www.ijmra.us, Email: editorijmie@gmail.com

Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Refereed Open Access International Journal - Included in the International Serial Directories Indexed & Listed at: Ulrich's Periodicals Directory ©, U.S.A., Open J-Gage as well as in Cabell's Directories of Publishing Opportunities, U.S.A

# AN ANALYSIS OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF COROMANDEL SUGARS LTD., MANDYA

# VENKATESHAGOWDA K.P \*

Dr. M.K. PURUSHOTHAM\*\*

# ABSTRACT

The quality and sucrose percentage of the cane grown in the region decide the performance of a sugar factory. Mandya called as the land of sugar because it is famous for sugarcane cultivation. It is considered one of the fertile districts of Karnataka. The present paper aims to study the financial performance of the choromandel sugars ltd., K.R.Pet, Mandya District. Secondary data for five years for 2010-11 to 2014-15 was collected and analysed through ratio analysis. The study found that profitability in relation to investment of owned funds and ability to earn profits after meeting all direct and indirect cost of business was not satisfactory which indicate the inefficient management of the factory in operations and in controlling of costs. On the basis of observation made, suggestion have been made at the end of the study.

KEY WORDS: Financial Ratio, Profitability, Financial Performance Indicators, Ratio Analysie.

<sup>\*</sup> Research scholar at Bharathiyar University, Coimbatore and Assistant Professor, Govt. First Grade College, Pandavapura.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Associate Professor, Vivekananda First Grade College, Bangalore and Research Supervisor at Bharathiyar University, Coimbatore.

#### **INTRODUCTION**

The performance of the firm can be measured by its financial results, i.e., by its sizeof earnings riskiness and profitability are two major factors which jointly determine value of the concern. Financial decisions which increase risks will decrease the value of the firm and on the other hand, financial decisions which increase the profitability will increase value of the firm. Risk and profitability are two essential ingredients of a business concern. There has been a considerable debate about the ultimate objective of firmperformance, whether it is profit maximization or wealth maximization. It is observed that while considering the firm performance, the profit and wealth maximization arelinked and are effected by one-another. In Indian context, where an analyst has to rely upon the audited financial statement of a particular company, the performance is to be judged from the financial statementonly.

The quality and sucrose percentage of the cane grown in the region decide the performance of asugar factory. Mandya called as the land of sugar because it is famous for sugarcane cultivation. It is considered one of the fertile districts of Karnataka. The major industries in Mandya district aresugar mill, several khandasari sugar units, jaggery producing units, rice, oil and solvent extract units. The sugar factory at Mandya is one of the biggest in India and others in Pandavapura, K.R. Pet, K.M. doddi and Koppa.

# BACKGROUND

Karnataka sugar industry ranks third in terms of its contribution of sugar in the total sugar production in the country. The sugar industry in Karnataka is able to manufacture sugar in such huge quantities due to the fact that sugarcane is abundantly available in the state. In fact, Karnataka stands fourth in the cultivation of sugarcane and third largest producer of sugar (12%) in India after Uttar Pradesh (35%) and Maharashtra (24%). The sugar industry in Karnataka has around 57 sugar factories spread over the state. The major benefits of Karnataka sugar industry are that it has generated many facilities in the state such as communication, employment and transport. It has also benefited the state by helping in the development of the rural areas of the state by mobilizing the various resources of the villages.Karnataka is the second state to establish a sugar factory in the country. Mysore Sugar Company Ltd., Mandya, is the first sugar factory established in the year 1933-34 in public sector.

#### **NEED FOR THE STUDY**

The need for the study has arisen because the sugar mills across the board have to perform consistently. Further the factors that affect the profitability of the sugar industry need to be identified. This study is unique and it covers the performance analysis of Coromandel Sugars Factory, K.R. Pet, Mandya. The study provides insight into the growth over the years on the basis of itsbusiness volume. Keeping the above said points in view, the presentstudy was carried out with an overall objective of analysing theperformance of sugar industry in Karnataka.

#### LITERATURE REVIEW

Baliyanet al. (1998) in their study on costs and returns insugarcane production vis-à-vis its competing crops in Muzaffarnagardistrict, Western Uttar Pradesh estimated that per hectare cost ofproduction of sugarcane was Rs. 9118, Rs. 19,681 and Rs. 20,229 onsmall, medium and large farms, respectively. The major components of cost of production were operational cost, rental value of land andmaterial cost. The major component of operational cost were transportation, harvesting and intercultural operations in all the threesize of farms with 40 per cent share in total cost of production, while themajor components of the material cost were manure and fertilizers, seedand irrigation on all the three size group of farms, (18.32% to 2.44% intotal cost of production).Malik and Singh (1999) analyzed the cost and returns of sugarcaneproduction in Haridwar district of Western Uttar Pradesh. In case of reserve area (< 10 kms from sugar mills) cost A1, A2, B1, B2, C1, C2, gross income from main product and by-product were Rs. 21,605, Rs.21,605, Rs. 24,724, Rs. 33,908, Rs. 28,231, Rs. 37,415, Rs. 45,002 and Rs. 4419, respectively. In far area (>10 kms from sugar mills) the costswere Rs. 21,366, Rs. 21,366, Rs. 24,498, Rs. 33,293, Rs. 28,009, Rs.42,758, and Rs. 4416, respectively.Lohar et al. (2000) estimated per tonnes cost of production of sugarcane, per quintal production of jaggery, per quintal manufacturing of sugar and profitability of production of jaggery and sugar. The studywas conducted with sample of 30 jaggery producers from six villages inKarveer, Tahsil, Kolhapur district. Maharashtra, India revealedthat profitability is and it more in jaggeryproduction.Nagpure et al. (2004) in their study on economics of sugarcaneproduction in Vidarbha region of Maharashtra estimated the per hectarecost of cultivation in suru crop at cost A, B and C as to Rs. 35,178.86,Rs. 53,207.91 and Rs. 54,011.11, respectively. In the case of ratooncrop, it was estimated to be Rs. 25,612.88, Rs. 42,326.52 and Rs.43,162.62, respectively.

The net income per hectare of Rs. 15,766 wasfound out to be higher in the case of ratoon crop as against Rs. 11,334from suru main crop. The efficiency of per rupee investment in thecultivation of ratoon vis-à-vis sole crop of suru at cost C was estimated tobe 1.36 and 1.21, respectively.Namadev (2008) analyzed the quantum of cost 'B' incurred in thetotal cost of sugarcane cultivation was found to be the highest whoincurred an amount of again for small farmers (Rs. 75,520.13 per ha)followed by large and medium farmers with Rs. 70,698.01 per hectareand Rs. 70,329.82 per hectare, respectively.Anwar and Naeem (2011) analyzed the average per acre cost wascalculated as Rs. 35,450 for all varieties of sugarcane. The major costelements were; land rent, labor input, seed, manure, irrigation, landpreparation, fertilizer and hand weeding. The net revenue of variety-77/400, 44, Mardan-92, 48, 310 and 722082 were observed as Rs.54,550, 48,550, 48,550, 45,550, 48,550, and 45,550, respectively.Sugarcane crop was characterized by increasing returns to scale.

# **PROBLEM STATEMENT**

The performance of sugar mills across the board has not been consistent, with the result that the stakeholders are left dissatisfied. Several factors that affect the profitability of the sugar industry are left unaddressed. In this context, it is pertinent to study the financial performance of sugar factory particularly, coromandel sugars ltd., Mandya.

# **OBJECTIVES**

1. To analyze the overall financial performance indicators of sugar factory.

2. To compare the last five years financial performanceby different ratio.

3. To provide useful suggestions to improve the financial performance of the factory selected for the study.

# **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

The present study is descriptive in nature and includes the analysis of secondary data. The secondary data was collected from the five yearsAnnual reports (2010-11 to 2015-16) of the Coromandel Sugars Limited, K. R. Pet., Mandya. To analyse the financial performance of selected sugar factory, Liquidity Ratios, Activity Ratios and Profitability Ratios are calculated based on the financial and related statement like: Profit& Loss account and Balance Sheet.

# DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

# a) Financial indicators of Coromandal Sugars Ltd, Mandya

Table 1 shows that reservefund was Rs. 34.85 crores in 2010-11 increased to 81.19 crores in2011-12 at an average rate of Rs. 64.22 crores. The owned fund was Rs. 48.85 crores in2010-11 increased to 96.19 crores in 2014-15 at an average rate of Rs. 78.42 crores. Current assets showed increasing trend over the study period. Itwas increased from Rs. 102.12 crores in 2010-11 to Rs. 206.33 crores in 2013-14 anddecreased to Rs. 188.80 crores in 2014-15. Fixed assets were increased from Rs.57.06 crores in 2010-11 to Rs.291.62 crores in 2014-15 at an average rate of Rs. 187.84. Total asset was Rs. 216.46 crores in 2010-11 increased to Rs.522.83 crores in 2014-15 at an average rate of Rs.388.18. Current liabilities were Rs. 35.85 crores in 2010-11 increased toRs. 231.80 crores in 20014-15. Total borrowingwas Rs.109.41 crores in 2010-11 increased to Rs. 269.84 croress in 2014-15. Total liabilities were Rs. 167.61 crores in 2010-11 increased to Rs. 426.64 croress in 2014-15 at an average rate of Rs. 309.76 Crores. Total sales was Rs.205.52 crores in 2010-11 and increased to Rs.266.09 crores in 2014-15 with the average rate of 225.43 crores. Total incomeshowed varying trend over the study period. It was Rs. 207.34 crores in2010-11 and decreased to Rs. 198.85 crores in 2013-14 again increasedto Rs. 259.54 crores in 2014-15. Total expense was Rs. 184.31 crores in 2010-11 and increased to Rs.259.16crores in 2014-15. Inventory was Rs. 81.39 crores in 2010-11 and increased to147.08 crores in 2013-14 again decreased to Rs. 113.43 crores.Net profit was Rs. 17.21 crores in 2010-11 and increased to Rs. 147.08 crores in 2013-14 and decreased to Rs. 113.43 crores in 2014-15 with the average rate of Rs.13.11 crores.

Sl.	Particulars	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Average
No							
1	Share Capital	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00	14.00
2	Reserve Funds	34.85	53.11	75.68	76.27	81.19	64.22
3	Owned Funds	48.85	67.11	89.69	90.27	96.19	78.42
4	Current Assets	102.12	124.17	134.96	206.33	188.80	151.28
5	Fixed Assets	57.06	172.70	191.08	226.75	291.62	187.84
	Total assets	216.46	334.55	392.81	474.25	522.83	388.18

Table 1: Financial Performance Indicators of Coromandel Sugars Ltd., Mandya.(Rs. in Crores)

6	Current Liabilities	35.85	125.02	134.96	190.47	231.80	143.62
7	Total Borrowings	109.41	198.74	229.05	269.47	269.84	215.30
	Total Liabilities	167.61	267.44	303.12	383.98	426.64	309.76
8	Total Sales	205.52	227.66	231.25	196.62	266.09	225.43
9	Total Income	207.34	228.44	234.35	198.85	259.54	225.70
10	Total Expenses	184.31	208.74	219.92	198.61	259.16	214.15
11	Inventory	81.39	89.62	122.92	147.08	113.43	110.89
	Net Profit	17.21	18.26	22.57	0.59	6.93	13.11

#### **Source: Annual Reports**

#### b) Financial ratio analysis of Sugar Factory

Ratios are the measurement of results obtained from a business. In order to know the performance of the sugar factory in Mandya district, financial ratios analysis is the process of identifying the solvency, liquidity, profitability, efficiency and strengths and weakness of the companies by properly establishing relationship between the items ofbalance sheet and the profit and loss account. The nature of the analysiswas to analyze the companies financially from management perspective. To highlight each of the above aspects, different ratios under each category have been worked out. The secondary data drawn from the audited annual statements of the sugar factory for a period of five years from 2010-11 to2014-15 were subjected to rigorous financial ratio analysis. The financial ratios used for the analyses are presented in table 2 and described below.

# **Test of liquidity**

The liquidity ratios/balance sheet ratios are used to measure the ability of sugar factory to meet its immediate maturing liabilities out of its owned short term resources. The degree of liquidity of the sugar factory wasdetermined by employing the current ratio, Acid Test ratio and Inventory ratio. The table 2 shows the overall weighted average current ratio; acid test ratio and inventory for the sugar factory were found to be 1.35, 0.32 and -5.32 respectively.

# **Test of solvency**

The solvency ratios would reflect on the medium term and longterm solvency position of the sugar factory, indicating its ability to meetthe medium term and long term obligations and these ratios wouldprovide basis for measuring the leverage effect on the performance of thesugar factory. The solvency position of sugar factory was computed by employing the total liabilities to owned funds ratio, fixed assets to owned funds average ratio and debt -equity average ratio. The Table 2 shows thatoverall average total liabilities to owned funds ratio be 3.90. Fixed assets to Owned Funds average ratio was 2.27 and debt -equity average ratio was found to be 1.87.

# Test of financial strength

These measures were employed to assess the real worth of thesugar factory. The results of these tests are presented in Table 2. The tableindicated that overall weighted average net – worth was Rs. 78.42 croresover the study period. The overall weighted average net capital ratio was1.26 over the study period.

# 4.2.10.4 Fixed assets ratios

The importantfixed assets ratios considered in the present study are net profit to owned funds ratio, net profit to total assets ratio, fixed assets to total assets ratio, fixed assets to net worth ratio and Fixed assets to total sales ratio. The average net profit to owned fund ratio found to be 0.19. Thenet profit to total sales ratio for all five years is almost same i.e., 0.06, over the study period. The overall fixed assets to total assets ratio wasfound to be 0.65. The average fixed assets to net worth ratio was found tobe 2.28 and the overall average fixed assets to total sales ratio were found to be 0.82.

# Table 2: Test of Liquidity, Solvency, Financial Strength and

Fixed Assets Ratios of Co	promandel Sugars Ltd., Mandya
---------------------------	-------------------------------

SI.	Particulars	2010-11	2011-12	2012-13	2013-14	2014-15	Average	
No								
Ι	Test of Liquidity Ratios							
1	Current Ratio	2.85	0.99	1.00	1.08	0.81	1.35	
2	Acid Test Ratio	0.58	0.28	0.09	0.31	0.33	0.32	

3	Inventory Ratio	66.27	-105.22	0	9.23	3.10	-5.32		
II	Test of Solvency Ratios								
4	Total Liabilities to Owned Funds Ratio	3.43	3.99	3.38	4.25	4.44	3.90		
5	Fixed Assets to Owned Funds Ratio	1.12	2.57	2.13	2.51	3.03	2.27		
6	Debt Equity Ratio	1.65	1.96	1.77	2.04	1.95	1.87		
III	Test of Financial Strength Ratios								
7	Net Worth	48.85	67.11	89.69	90.27	96.19	78.42		
8	Net Capital Ratio	1.29	1.25	1.30	1.24	1.23	1.26		
IV	Fixed Assets Ratios	L			-	-			
9	Net Profit to Owned Funds Ratio	0.35	0.27	0.25	0.01	0.07	0.19		
10	Net Profit to Total Sales Ratio	0.08	0.08	0.10	0	0.03	0.06		
11	Fixed Assets to Total Assets Ratio	0.26	0.52	1.42	0.48	0.56	0.65		
12	Fixed Assets to Net Worth Ratio	1.17	2.57	2.13	2.51	3.03	2.28		
13	Fixed Assets to Total Sales Ratio	0.28	0.76	0.83	1.15	1.10	0.82		

# Source: Annual Reports.

# **MAJOR FINDINGS**

Current ratio is high in the year 2010-11andtoo low in the year 2014-15 then the standard norms 2:1.

 $\succ$  Acid test ratio for five years is below the standardnorms and it could be considered as unsatisfactory situation.

> Inventory ratio shows fluctuating trend during the period 2010-11 to 2014-15. It meant that net working capital of the sugar factory was not tied up in inventory.

 $\succ$  The amount institution owes to creditors within the amount of money which is invested in the institution is not satisfactory.

> Debt – Equity Ratio of all the years showsfluctuating trend during the period 2010-11 to 2014-15and highest debt equity ratio is in the year 2013-14 which shows the too much dependence of sugar factory on borrowings.

> Net worth of sugar factory is very good as it has the wider positive difference.

> The margin of safety against the decline in the prices of major assets of the sugar factory is satisfactory as the net capital ratio is high.

Profitability in relation to investment of owned funds and ability to earn profits after meeting all direct and indirect cost of business was not satisfactory as the net profit to owned funds and net profit to total sales ratios were low.

# SUGGESTIONS AND CONCLUSION

The present study was an attempt to analyze the performance of coromandelsugar mill by using ratio analysis for the period of 2010-11 to 2014-15. The results showed that profitability in relation to investment of owned funds and ability to earn profits after meeting all direct and indirect cost of business was not satisfactorywhichindicates the inefficient management of the companies in operations and in controlling of costs. It can be improved by the companies by improving their asset turnover. There is lot of scope for sugar factory to increase profitability by use of by-products by manufacturing other products like bio-compost and ethyl alcohol.

# LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The study based on secondary data which is gathered only for five financial years of a sugar factory which is insufficient to justify the analysis to the financial performance of a sugar factory. Further, the study did not encompass various other issues connected with the operation of a selected sugar factory.

# REFERENCES

- Anwar Hussain and Naeem-Ur-RehmanKhattak., 2011,Economic analysis of sugarcane crop in
- districtCharsadda.Journal of Agricultural Research, 49(1):153-163.
- Baliyan, S. P., Bhogal, T. S. and Archana., 1998, A study of costsand returns in sugarcane

- production vis-à-vis its competing cropsin Muzaffarnagar district, Western Uttar
- Pradesh. AgriculturalSituation in India, 55(4):209-214.
- Gireesh, N. M., 2006, An analysis of sugarcane cultivation practicesfollowed by sugarcane
- growers in Karnataka. M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis(unpubl.), University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad.
- Herekar, P. M., 1995, Correlation analysis of financial and operational factors of sugar
- industry. Indian Co-operative Review, 33(1):33-48.
- Iqbal, M., Sumathi, P. and Alagesan, U., 1996, Constraints inadopting the IPM practices by the
- farmers. Journal of ExtensionEducation, 6&7 (4&1):1372-1374.
- Malik, S. K. and Singh, R. P., 1999, Break-up of costs and returns of sugarcane production in
- reserve and free areas of sugar mills. Agricultural Situation in India, 55(12):749-751.
- Nagpure, S. C., Jhakare, A. B., Khandare, A. P. and Patil, R. K.,2004, Economics of sugarcane
- production in Vidarbha region of Maharashtra state. Rural India, 67(6-7):123-125.
- Namadev, A. S., 2008, Economics of sugarcane based intercroppingsystems in Raibag taluk.
- M. Sc. (Agri.) Thesis (unpubl.), University of Agricultural Sciences, Dharwad.
- Prashant PrabhakarInamdar., 2001, Economic of scale in cooperativesugar industry of
- Maharashtra. Ph. D Thesis (Unpubl.), University of Mahatma PhuleKrishiVidyapeeth, Rahuei, Maharashtra. pp:1-151.
- Snehashree. G.S., 20013, "Business PerformanceAnalysis of NSL Sugar Factory, Mandya - A
- Case Study". Ph. D Thesis., University of Agricultural Sciences, Bengaluru, Karnataka. pp:1-111.
- Thyagarajan, S. And Vasantkumar, J., 2000, Constraints to highlields in rice at farm level.
- Indian Journal of Extension Education, 11(2):2747-2753.