

Testing The Pecking Order Theory Of Capital Structure: A Comparative Study Of India And China

VANDANA BHAMA (NEE VERMA)



**DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT STUDIES
INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY DELHI**

OCTOBER 2016

© Indian Institute of Technology Delhi (IITD), New Delhi, 2016

Testing The Pecking Order Theory Of Capital Structure: A Comparative Study Of India And China

by

VANDANA BHAMA (NEE VERMA)

Department of Management Studies

Submitted

**in fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
to the**



Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

OCTOBER 2016

CERTIFICATE

The thesis entitled, “**Testing the Pecking Order Theory of Capital Structure: A Comparative Study of India and China**”, being submitted by **Ms. Vandana Bhama (Nee Verma)** to the **Indian Institute of Technology Delhi**, for the award of the degree of **Doctor of Philosophy** is a record of bonafide research work carried out by her. She has worked under our guidance and supervision, and has fulfilled all the requirements for the submission of this thesis, which has attained the standard required for a Ph.D. degree of this institute. The results presented in this thesis have not been submitted elsewhere for the award of any degree or diploma.

(Dr. P. K. Jain)

Professor

Department of Management Studies

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

New Delhi.

(Dr. Surendra S. Yadav)

Professor

Department of Management Studies

Indian Institute of Technology Delhi

New Delhi.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The present study has been accomplished with the help, encouragement, cooperation and guidance of many people and I convey my heartfelt thanks to all of them. At the outset, I would like to thank the Almighty for His blessings which helped me to achieve this academic endeavour.

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to respected guides Prof. P. K. Jain and Prof. Surendra S. Yadav for their valuable guidance, inspiration, motivation and efforts to develop an independent researcher out of me. Moreover, I would like to thank them from the core of my heart for involving me in different academic activities and their continuous fatherly support which helped me to grow as an academic as well as an individual.

I would also take this opportunity to sincere indebtedness to Prof. S. K. Jain (Chairman, SRC), Dr. Shveta Singh (internal expert), Prof. V. Upadhyaya (Department of Humanities) and all the faculty members of DMS who spared their valuable time for providing useful insights in this research effort.

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Prof. Trilochan Sastry (Dean Academics, IIM Bangalore) and Prof. Madhu Vij (FMS, Delhi University) for permitting me to access the Bloomberg database for the collection of secondary data.

I am grateful to Prof. David Michayluk (University of Technology, Sydney and the Editor, International Journal of Managerial Finance) and Prof. Vidhan K. Goyal (Hong Kong University

of Science and Technology, Hong Kong) who spared their valuable time for providing useful inputs to improve the quality of this research.

I am deeply obliged to all the respondents of the survey, who took out the time from their busy schedule to provide data for this research.

I express my heartfelt thanks to my husband Jai and daughter Hiya for being my pillar of strength at all times. Their continuous support and encouragement at every step made this work possible. I take this opportunity to thank my grandparents, parents, in-laws, Late Sh. Pyare Lal, brothers (Manoj and Ravi) and sisters (Monika and Meenu), who understood my need to do this work.

I express my sincere thanks to Ms. Sadaf Anwar, Ms. Neetu Yadav and Mr. Nilesh Ware for providing valuable insights and continuous friendly support. I am also thankful to all the research scholars in the department and all my friends for providing their continuous support.

Vandana Bhama (Nee Verma)

ABSTRACT

Capital structure has proved to be a lasting puzzle in corporate finance (Myers, 1984). The pecking order theory outlines the most desired financing hierarchy – internal funds, debt and equity. In general, firms prefer internal to external funds and debt issues to equity (Myers, 1984). Most often, firms either have funds deficiency or availability of surpluses. Pecking order theory proposes that firms should give preference to debt issues during deficiency and when the limits are exhausted, equity should be the last resort. In surplus situations, the preference should be given to retire debt using surpluses instead of equity buybacks.

In literature, most studies tested the pecking order for whole set of firms using net debt issues. They find a common homogenous pecking order coefficient value. Evidently, a common coefficient exhibits a distorted picture of firm's financing hierarchy. During deficit situation, preference should be given to gross debt issues and in surplus conditions, firms should retire debt than equity (as suggested by pecking order theory). This approach provides a better picture on the firms' extent to issue or retire debt in both situations.

Based on the above perspective and limited literature on the pecking order theory of emerging economies, a comprehensive study has been carried out to test the pecking order theory of Indian and Chinese firms during deficit and surplus situations separately. The study also examines the extent to which deficit firms redeem existing debt during deficiency using new proceeds and issue new debt in surplus conditions either to retire old debt or retain funds for future needs. The study has used secondary as well as primary data to analyze the financing patterns as outlined by the pecking order theory (POT). The secondary data analysis has been carried out using a

conceptual framework to classify firms into deficit and surplus groups. Further, both a basic and an extended model of pecking order have been used in the present study. Ordinary least square regression and other descriptive statistics have been used to test the results. Besides, a survey amongst the corporate finance managers from India has also been conducted to supplement the findings from the secondary data analysis.

The notable findings of the secondary data is that Indian as well as Chinese firms issue debt when deficiency arises, indicating adherence to the pecking order. The debt issues are exceptionally higher in the case of China. Chinese firms prefer more short-term debt, while Indian firms generally keep more long-term debt in their capital structure. Despite large debt issues, Indian and Chinese firms have satisfactory debt ratios. Thus, both set of firms during deficit conditions follow a ‘modified pecking order’ where both the pecking order and trade-off theory are followed. A major chunk of new debt proceeds is used to finance deficits in the case of India. Whereas, Chinese firms redeem debt faster (using new debt proceeds) due to shorter tenure of most of the debt.

In surplus conditions, the pecking order adherence is strong among Chinese firms but weak in the case of Indian firms. Chinese firms do not retain sizeable funds; the overwhelming proportion of these funds is more often utilised to retire the existing debt (short-term debt). In contrast, Indian firms are reluctant to retire debt at a fast pace when they have surpluses. The reasons are: (i) surplus firms typically have low debt to equity ratios, and (ii) due to more long-term debt in their capital structure, firms may prefer to redeem debt at the time of maturity and therefore retain most of the funds for future investments.

The survey findings indicate that Indian firms have marked preference for internal to external funds and banks constitute the second important source to finance their needs. Between sources of external financing, deficit firms as well as firms with both deficit and surpluses prefer debt to equity, while majority of surplus firms prefer equity. The major reasons of debt preference are its being cheaper than equity, flexibility in debt component and easier to raise. During deficiency, firms avoid future capital expenditures and issue long-term debt. In contrast, surplus firms primarily prefer to deposit surpluses with banks for a short-period for their future financing requirements and then, redeem debt (to some extent) to reduce their existing debt levels. Majority of the firms indicate their preference to maintain target capital structure by keeping their debt-equity ratios equal to or less than 1.

Based on the findings of the research, the following recommendations have been made: (i) There is a need of redemption clause in debt agreements between banks and corporate firms. In the case of China, liquidity risks should be assessed while granting additional loans (ii) Indian firms to finance deficits should opt for equity financing during very high or extremely high debt levels. (iii) Chinese firms should opt for more long-term debt to decrease their liquidity risks (iv) The initiatives should be taken by government to encourage equities and should also strengthen corporate bond markets in the financial system of both countries.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page No.
Certificate	i
Acknowledgements	ii
Abstract	iv
Table of contents	vii
List of figures	xiv
List of tables	xv
List of appendices	xxi
Abbreviations	xxiii
Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study	1-12
1.1 Introduction to Indian financial system	1
1.2 Introduction to Chinese financial system	2
1.3 Introduction to the pecking order theory	4
1.4 Description of the problem	6
1.5 Objectives and significance	7
1.5.1 Objectives of the study	7
1.5.2 Significance of the study	8
1.6 Scope of the study	9
1.7 Methodology of the study	9
1.8 Organization of the thesis	11
1.9 Concluding observations	12

Chapter 2: Review of Literature	13-61
2.1 Introduction	13
2.2 The pecking order theory (POT)	15
2.2.1 Mixed evidences on the pecking order theory	18
2.2.1.1 International evidences related to POT	19
2.2.1.2 Asian evidences related to POT (specifically India and China)	21
2.2.2 Pecking order theory, internal funds and investment levels	27
2.3 Pecking order theory and debt levels	29
2.4 Pecking order theory versus trade-off theory	32
2.5 Modified pecking order theory	37
2.6 Pecking order theory – disaggregated aspects	41
2.6.1 Pecking order theory and firm’s size	41
2.6.2 Pecking order theory and firm’s age	45
2.6.3 Pecking order theory and industry affiliation	48
2.6.4 Pecking order theory and information asymmetry	52
2.6.5 Pecking order theory and survey evidences	56
2.7 Concluding observations	60
 Chapter 3: Research Methodology	 62-83
3.1 Introduction	62
3.2 Gaps from the literature, research objectives, propositions and hypotheses	63
3.2.1 Gaps from the literature	63
3.2.2 Research objectives	65
3.2.3 Propositions of the study	65
3.2.4 Hypotheses of the study	67

3.3	Secondary data and analysis	67
3.3.1	Selection of accounting standard	69
3.3.2	Conceptual framework	71
3.3.3	Testing the pecking order of deficit and surplus firms separately	74
3.3.4	Extension of the pecking order model	75
3.3.5	Pecking order theory and disaggregated aspects	77
3.3.6	Tools used for secondary data analysis	80
3.4	Primary data	80
3.5	Research methodology and scope	81
3.5.1	Research methodology	81
3.5.2	Scope of the study	83
3.6	Concluding observations	83
Chapter 4: Testing the Pecking Order Theory of Indian Firms		84-130
4.1	Introduction	84
4.2	Objective	85
4.3	Methodology of the study	85
4.4	Pecking order tests of deficit and surplus firms (on aggregative basis)	87
4.4.1	Descriptive results of deficit and surplus firms	87
4.4.2	Empirical results of deficit and surplus firms	90
4.5	Pecking order test, size-wise	93
4.5.1	Descriptive and empirical results of deficit firms, size-wise	93
4.5.2	Descriptive and empirical results of surplus firms, size-wise	97
4.6	Pecking order test, age-wise	100
4.6.1	Descriptive and empirical results of deficit firms, age-wise	100

4.6.2	Descriptive and empirical results of surplus firms, age-wise	103
4.7	Pecking order test at varying levels of deficits and surpluses	106
4.7.1	Descriptive and empirical evidences of firms at varying levels of deficits	106
4.7.2	Descriptive and empirical evidences of firms at varying levels of surpluses	109
4.8	Pecking order test, industry-wise	112
4.8.1	Descriptive and empirical results of industries (having deficiencies)	112
4.8.2	Descriptive and empirical results of industries (having surpluses)	117
4.9	Concluding observations	122
	Appendices	123-130
Chapter 5: Testing the Pecking Order Theory of Chinese Firms		131-175
5.1	Introduction	131
5.2	Objective	132
5.3	Methodology of the study	133
5.4	Pecking order tests of deficit and surplus firms (on aggregative basis)	134
5.4.1	Descriptive results of deficit and surplus firms	134
5.4.2	Empirical results of deficit and surplus firms	137
5.5	Pecking order test, size-wise	140
5.5.1	Descriptive and empirical results of deficit firms, size-wise	140
5.5.2	Descriptive and empirical results of surplus firms, size-wise	144
5.6	Pecking order test, age-wise	147
5.6.1	Descriptive and empirical results of deficit firms, age-wise	147
5.6.2	Descriptive and empirical results of surplus firms, age-wise	149
5.7	Pecking order test at varying levels of deficits and surpluses	151

5.7.1	Descriptive and empirical evidences of firms at varying levels of deficits	152
5.7.2	Descriptive and empirical evidences of firms at varying levels of surpluses	155
5.8	Pecking order test, industry-wise	158
5.8.1	Descriptive and empirical results of industries (having deficiencies)	158
5.8.2	Descriptive and empirical results of industries (having surpluses)	165
5.9	Concluding observations	169
	Appendices	171-175
Chapter 6: Pecking Order of Indian and Chinese Firms: A Comparative Analysis		176-213
6.1	Introduction	176
6.2	Objective	176
6.3	Methodology of the study	177
6.4	Comparing the pecking order of Indian and Chinese firms	177
6.5	Comparing the pecking order of Indian and Chinese firms, size-wise	182
6.6	Comparing the pecking order of Indian and Chinese firms, age-wise	187
6.7	Comparing the pecking order of Indian and Chinese firms at varying levels of deficit and surpluses	191
6.8	Comparing the pecking order of Indian and Chinese industries	197
6.9	Concluding observations	204
	Appendices	207-213
Chapter 7: Testing the Pecking Order Theory and Trade-off Theory at Varying Debt Levels		214-233
7.1	Introduction	214

7.2	Objective	216
7.3	Methodology of the study	216
7.4	Frequency distribution of Indian and Chinese firms at different debt levels	217
7.5	Empirical results of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese firms with different debt levels	222
7.6	Concluding observations	231
	Appendix	233
Chapter 8: Survey Analysis and Findings		234-257
8.1	Introduction	234
8.2	Survey methodology	235
	8.2.1 Questionnaire development, scales used in the questionnaire and identification of the target population	235
	8.2.2 Data collection	236
8.3	Segregation of respondents based on their profile and situation	236
	8.3.1 Profile of respondents	236
	8.3.2 Segregation of respondents based on deficit or surplus situations	237
8.4	Survey analysis and results	238
	8.4.1 Financing decisions during deficit and surplus conditions	238
	8.4.2 Firm's choice on financing sources	244
	8.4.3 Debt-equity ratio of firms	250
	8.4.4 Target capital structure	253
8.5	Concluding observations	255
Chapter 9: Summary and Conclusions		258-267
9.1	Introduction	258

9.2	Major findings of the research	259
9.2.1	Findings related to the pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese firms	259
9.2.2	Findings related to the comparison of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese firms	261
9.2.3	Findings related to the pecking order tests and debt levels of Indian and Chinese firms	262
9.2.4	Findings related to survey evidences	263
9.3	Recommendations from the study	264
9.3.1	Recommendations for banks/investors	264
9.3.2	Recommendations for corporate managers	264
9.3.3	Recommendations for policy makers	265
9.4	Contribution of the study	265
9.5	Limitations of the study	266
9.6	Scope for future research	266
9.7	Concluding observations	266
References		268-284
Annexure		285-291
Curriculum Vitae		292-294

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure No.	Title	Page No.
Figure 1.1	Lending interest rates in China, 2003-2014	3
Figure 2.1	Literature review segregated into different sections	14
Figure 3.1	Outline of research methodology	82
Figure 8.1	Percentages of firms having deficit and surpluses	238
Figure 8.2	Key reasons leading to deficits	239
Figure 8.3	Key reasons leading to surpluses	239
Figure 8.4	Reasons attributed to capital structure adjustments	240
Figure 8.5	Reasons for debt preference	247
Figure 8.6	Sources of funds during high debt equity situation	252

LIST OF TABLES

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 2.1	Summary of studies related to the pecking order	18
Table 2.2	Summary of studies related to the pecking order behaviour of firms	25
Table 2.3	Summary of studies related to the pecking order theory, internal funds and investment levels	29
Table 2.4	Summary of studies related to the pecking order theory and debt levels	31
Table 2.5	Summary of studies in support of pecking order and trade-off theory	38
Table 2.6	Summary of studies related to the modified pecking order theory	41
Table 2.7	Summary of studies related to the pecking order theory and firm's size	44
Table 2.8	Summary of studies related to the pecking order theory and firm's age	47
Table 2.9	Summary of studies related to the pecking order theory and industry affiliation	51
Table 2.10	Summary of studies related to the pecking order theory and information asymmetry	54
Table 2.11	Summary of survey studies related to the capital structure of firms	59
Table 3.1	Pecking order test of Indian and Chinese firms (using net debt issues), 2003-2014	72
Table 3.2	Pecking order test of deficit and surplus firms separately (using net debt issues), 2003-2014	73
Table 3.3	Industry-wise classifications of sample companies from India and China	78
Table 4.1	Relative proportion of deficit and surplus firms of the sample size from Indian corporate sector, 2003-2014	88
Table 4.2	Mean values of the pecking order variables of Indian deficit and surplus firms, 2003-2014	88
Table 4.3	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian deficit and surplus firms, 2003-2014	89

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 4.4	Pecking order tests of Indian deficit firms, 2003-2014	91
Table 4.5	Pecking order tests of Indian surplus firms, 2003-2014	92
Table 4.6	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian deficit firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	94
Table 4.7	Pecking order tests of Indian deficit firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	95
Table 4.8	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian surplus firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	98
Table 4.9	Pecking order tests of Indian surplus firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	99
Table 4.10	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian deficit firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	101
Table 4.11	Pecking order tests of Indian deficit firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	102
Table 4.12	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian surplus firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	104
Table 4.13	Pecking order tests of Indian surplus firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	105
Table 4.14	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian firms at varying levels of deficits, 2003-2014	107
Table 4.15	Pecking order tests of Indian firms at varying levels of deficits, 2003-2014	108
Table 4.16	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian firms at varying levels of surpluses, 2003-2014	110
Table 4.17	Pecking order tests of Indian firms at varying levels of surpluses, 2003-2014	111
Table 4.18	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian deficit industries, 2003-2014	113
Table 4.19	Pecking order tests of Indian deficit industries, 2003-2014	115
Table 4.20	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian surplus industries, 2003-2014	118
Table 4.21	Pecking order tests of Indian surplus industries, 2003-2014	119
Table 5.1	Relative proportion of deficit and surplus firms of the sample size from Chinese corporate sector, 2003-2014	135
Table 5.2	Mean values of the pecking order variables of Chinese deficit and surplus firms, 2003-2014	135

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 5.3	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Chinese deficit and surplus firms, 2003-2014	137
Table 5.4	Pecking order tests of Chinese deficit firms, 2003-2014	138
Table 5.5	Pecking order tests of Chinese surplus firms, 2003-2014	139
Table 5.6	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Chinese deficit firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	141
Table 5.7	Pecking order tests of Chinese deficit firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	143
Table 5.8	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Chinese surplus firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	144
Table 5.9	Pecking order tests of Chinese surplus firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	145
Table 5.10	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Chinese deficit firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	148
Table 5.11	Pecking order tests of Chinese deficit firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	148
Table 5.12	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Chinese surplus firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	150
Table 5.13	Pecking order tests of Chinese surplus firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	150
Table 5.14	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Chinese firms at varying levels of deficits, 2003-2014	152
Table 5.15	Pecking order tests of Chinese firms at varying levels of deficits, 2003-2014	153
Table 5.16	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Chinese firms at varying levels of surpluses, 2003-2014	156
Table 5.17	Pecking order tests of Chinese firms at varying levels of surpluses, 2003-2014	157
Table 5.18	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Chinese deficit industries, 2003-2014	159
Table 5.19	Pecking order tests of Chinese deficit industries, 2003-2014	161
Table 5.20	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Chinese surplus industries, 2003-2014	164
Table 5.21	Pecking order tests of Chinese surplus industries, 2003-2014	166
Table 6.1	Comparison of percentages of Indian and Chinese deficit and surplus firms, 2003-2014	178

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 6.2	Comparison of debt equity ratios of Indian and Chinese firms, 2003-2014	178
Table 6.3	Comparison of pecking order variables of Indian and Chinese firms, 2003-2014	179
Table 6.4	Comparison of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese firms, 2003-2014	181
Table 6.5	Comparison of debt equity ratios of Indian and Chinese firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	183
Table 6.6	Comparison of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese deficit firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	185
Table 6.7	Comparison of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese surplus firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	186
Table 6.8	Comparison of debt equity ratios of Indian and Chinese firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	188
Table 6.9	Comparison of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese deficit firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	190
Table 6.10	Comparison of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese surplus firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	191
Table 6.11	Comparison of debt equity ratios of Indian and Chinese firms at varying levels of deficits and surpluses, 2003-2014	192
Table 6.12	Comparison of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese firms at varying levels of deficits, 2003-2014	194
Table 6.13	Comparison of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese firms at varying levels of surpluses, 2003-2014	196
Table 6.14	Comparison of debt equity ratios of Indian and Chinese firms across varying industries, 2003-2014	198
Table 6.15	Comparison of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese deficit industries, 2003-2014	202
Table 6.16	Comparison of pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese surplus industries, 2003-2014	203
Table 7.1	Category/designation of firms based on their debt-equity ratio	216
Table 7.2	Expected coefficient values of firms during high or low debt levels	217
Table 7.3	Frequency distribution of long-term debt to equity ratio of deficit firms from India and China, 2003-2014	218

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 7.4	Frequency distribution of short-term debt to equity ratio of deficit firms from India and China, 2003-2014	219
Table 7.5	Frequency distribution of total debt to equity ratio of deficit firms from India and China, 2003-2014	220
Table 7.6	Frequency distribution of long-term debt to equity ratio of surplus firms from India and China, 2003-2014	221
Table 7.7	Frequency distribution of short-term debt to equity ratio of surplus firms from India and China, 2003-2014	222
Table 7.8	Frequency distribution of total debt to equity ratio of surplus firms from India and China, 2003-2014	223
Table 7.9	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian and Chinese deficit firms at varying debt levels, 2003-2014	224
Table 7.10	Pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese deficit firms at varying debt levels, 2003-2014	226
Table 7.11	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian and Chinese surplus firms at varying debt levels, 2003-2014	228
Table 7.12	Pecking order tests of Indian and Chinese surplus firms at varying debt levels, 2003-2014	229
Table 8.1	Respondents' profile	237
Table 8.2	Firm's preference to carry out capital structure adjustments	240
Table 8.3	Firms' decision during deficiency of funds	241
Table 8.4	Firms' decision during surplus funds availability	241
Table 8.5	Firms' preference to issue new debt in surplus situation	242
Table 8.6	Key reasons to issue new debt in surplus situation	242
Table 8.7	Firms' preference to redeem debt prior to the maturity period	243
Table 8.8	Prior debt redemptions facility available to firms by lenders	243
Table 8.9	Firms' preference to issue new equity to redeem the existing obligations	244
Table 8.10	Preference ranking of different sources of funds by the corporate firms in India	245

Table No.	Title	Page No.
Table 8.11	Firms' preference for internal to external funds	246
Table 8.12	Firms' preference for debt to equity	246
Table 8.13	Firms' preference for long-term and short-term debt	247
Table 8.14	Cash management options used by firms during cash shortages/emergency requirements	248
Table 8.15	Change in the capital structure, post-recession period	249
Table 8.16	Movement of capital structure in post-recession phase	250
Table 8.17	Firms' preference to follow stable dividend policy in view of changing scenarios	250
Table 8.18	Firms' preference to maintain long-term debt level	251
Table 8.19	Firm's preference to raise debt to a maximum extent	251
Table 8.20	High long-term debt to equity ratio faced by firms	252
Table 8.21	Firms' preference to maintain target capital structure	253
Table 8.22	Type of capital structure that fits best to firms	254
Table 8.23	Factors affecting the target capital structure of a firm	255

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix No.	Title	Page No.
Appendix 4.1	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian deficit firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	123
Appendix 4.2	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian surplus firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	123
Appendix 4.3	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian deficit firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	124
Appendix 4.4	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian deficit lower and upper middle age firms, 2003-2014	124
Appendix 4.5	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian deficit lower and upper middle age firms, 2003-2014	125
Appendix 4.6	Pecking order tests of Indian deficit lower and upper middle age firms, 2003-2014	125
Appendix 4.7	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian surplus firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	126
Appendix 4.8	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian surplus lower and upper middle age firms, 2003-2014	126
Appendix 4.9	Pecking order tests of Indian surplus lower and upper middle age firms, 2003-2014	127
Appendix 4.10	Descriptive statistics of debt equity ratios pertaining to Indian surplus lower and upper middle age firms, 2003-2014	127
Appendix 4.11	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian firms at varying levels of deficits, 2003-2014	128
Appendix 4.12	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian firms at varying levels of surpluses, 2003-2014	128
Appendix 4.13	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian deficit industries, 2003-2014	129
Appendix 4.14	Mean values of pecking order variables of Indian surplus industries, 2003-2014	130
Appendix 5.1	Mean values of pecking order variables of Chinese deficit firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	171

Appendix No.	Title	Page No.
Appendix 5.2	Mean values of pecking order variables of Chinese surplus firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	171
Appendix 5.3	Mean values of pecking order variables of Chinese deficit firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	172
Appendix 5.4	Mean values of pecking order variables of Chinese surplus firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	172
Appendix 5.5	Mean values of pecking order variables of Chinese firms at varying levels of deficits, 2003-2014	173
Appendix 5.6	Mean values of pecking order variables of Chinese firms at varying levels of surpluses, 2003-2014	173
Appendix 5.7	Mean values of pecking order variables of Chinese deficit industries, 2003-2014	174
Appendix 5.8	Mean values of pecking order variables of Chinese surplus industries, 2003-2014	175
Appendix 6.1	Comparison of pecking order variables of Indian and Chinese deficit firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	207
Appendix 6.2	Comparison of pecking order variables of Indian and Chinese surplus firms, size-wise, 2003-2014	208
Appendix 6.3	Comparison of pecking order variables of Indian and Chinese deficit and surplus firms, age-wise, 2003-2014	209
Appendix 6.4	Comparison of pecking order variables of Indian and Chinese firms at varying levels of deficits, 2003-2014	210
Appendix 6.5	Comparison of pecking order variables of Indian and Chinese firms at varying levels of surpluses, 2003-2014	211
Appendix 6.6	Comparison of pecking order variables of Indian and Chinese deficit industries, 2003-2014	212
Appendix 6.7	Comparison of pecking order variables of Indian and Chinese surplus industries, 2003-2014	213
Appendix 7.1	Debt equity ratios of deficit and surplus firms from India and China, 2003-2014	233

ABBREVIATIONS

ADR	American Depository Receipts
ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
BSE	Bombay Stock Exchange
CAS	Chinese Accounting Standard
CEO	Chief Executive Officer
CFO	Chief Financial Officer
DEF	Deficit
DI	Debt Issues
DR	Debt Redemption
GDR	Global Depository Receipt
IAS	Indian Accounting Standard
IFRS	International Financial Reporting System
LTD	Long-term Debt
MCA	Ministry of Corporate Affairs
MFI	Micro Finance Institutions
NBFC	Non-Banking Finance Companies
NSE	National Stock Exchange
OLS	Ordinary Least Square
POT	Pecking Order Theory
PSD	Performance Sensitive Debt
PSE	Public Sector Enterprises
SDF	Surplus and Debt Funds
SEBI	Securities and Exchange Board of India
SME	Small and Medium Enterprises
SPSS	Statistical Package for Social Sciences
SSE	Shanghai Stock Exchange
STD	Short-term Debt

SUR	Surplus
TD	Total Debt
TFA	Total Funds Available
TFI	Total Funds Issued
TFR	Total Funds Required
UK	United Kingdom
USA/US	United States of America