Journal Homepage: -www.journalijar.com
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH (IJAR)
Article DOI:10.21474/IJAR01/3733
DOI URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.21474/IJAR01/3733
ISSN NO. 2320-5407

RESEARCH ARTICLE

RATIO ANALYSIS OF TEXTILE INDUSTRY IN TAMIL NADU: (WITH THE SPECIAL REFERENCE TO CMIE LISTED COMPANY)

Dr. Marimuthu KN.
Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, ManonmaniamSundaranar University, Tirunelveli – 627 012.

Manuscript Info

Manuscript History

Received: 15 January 2017
Final Accepted: 08 February 2017
Published: March 2017

Key words:-
Ratio Analysis, CMIE, GLS Method, Textile Industry and Profitability.

Abstract

The financial performance of the textile industry in Tamil Nadu had been analyzed with the help of the financial ratios. The financial structure of a company can show its capacity to generate the funds needed to undertake the desired expansion. The financial performance assessment together with other efficiency criteria, will give an idea of the total efficiency and industry performance. The success of the company ultimately depends upon its future growth and development. The company's future can never be predicted with accuracy without having precise information related to its present financial position and its past earnings. In addition, the present study analyzed the impact of the performance of liquidity, solvency and efficiency on the profitability of the textile industry using CMIE data. The study found the impact of financial ratios, such as return on capital employed and net profit ratio, on the profitability of textile industry in Tamil Nadu, was meticulously studied. From the Generalized Least Square method it was found that absolute liquidity ratio had the highest impact among the financial ratios on the return on net profit ratio as well as creditors' turnover ratio is highest impact on return on capital employed during the study period with statistical significance.

Introduction:-

It presents a detailed analysis of the determinants of financial performance of textile industry in Tamil Nadu using financial ratios. The financial structure of a company can show its capacity to generate the funds needed to undertake the desired expansion. The financial performance assessment together with other efficiency criteria, will give an idea of the total efficiency and industry performance. The success of the company ultimately depends upon its future growth and development. The company's future can never be predicted with accuracy without having precise information related to its present financial position and its past earnings. Ratio Analysis is an age-old technique of financial analysis. The financial position of the textile industry in Tamil Nadu is analyzed with the help of the financial facts and ratios such as: liquidity, solvency, efficiency and profitability. In addition, the present study analyzed the impact of the performance of liquidity, solvency and efficiency on the profitability of the textile industry. Liquidity and profitability are the two desired goals of financial management and they are directly affected by the working capital management. With increase in working capital size beyond the adequacy level, liquidity improves and profitability declines, and vice versa. **Ratio Analysis:** This is an age-old technique of financial analysis. It provides the financial statements in an absolute, historical and static form. It is also designed to show

Corresponding Author:-Dr. Marimuthu KN.
Address:-Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, ManonmaniamSundaranar University, Tirunelveli – 627 012.

how one number is related to another and the meaning of such relationships. A ratio is worked out by dividing one number by another number.

Objectives of the Study:-

- To study the financial performance of the textile industry in Tamil Nadu
- To find out the impact of financial ratios (liquidity, solvency and activity) on the textile industry of profitability ratio

Hypothesis of the Study:-

H1 There is a significant impact of Liquidity, Solvency and Activity ratios on ROCE
H1 There is a significant impact of Liquidity, Solvency and Activity ratio's on the Net Profit Ratio

Research Methodology:-

The study sought to measure the financial performance of textile companies, registered under CMIE list. These industries are spread over the state of Tamil Nadu in India. 234 companies were listed under CMIE and 18 companies were listed under NSE/BSE as well as the availability of data for the last ten years (2005 to 2014), which was chosen for the study.

Review of Literature:-

The SINET report (2007) has briefly discussed about the Indian cotton textile industry and its contribution to our country's export, economy, production and employment. It has also analysed the industry's financial indicators of return on capital employed (ROCE), operating and net margins and also earning stability, etc. Anupkumar&Subhash (2011) measured the level of technical efficiency of firms in the Indian textile industry and identified the factors that account for efficiency variation across firms, using the data envelopment analysis (DEA) in non-parametric methodology. Kunal and Lokinder (2009) sought to understand the impact of liberalisation on the Indian textile industry, by comparing the performance of firms incorporated before and after the liberalisation period. Kataria (1996) analysed the financial position of some selected units of the cotton textile industry of Malwa region to judge their profitability and financial strength. Noel, John and Scott (1990) determinants of industry, firm and business financial performance can be used as measures of individual relationships in models linking various hypothesized causal variables of various performance indicators. Mansur (2003) assessed the financial performance of textile industry, using ratio analysis, to determine the financial and operational efficiency. Ram and Mayank (2002) extend the prior work done on the relation of Indian firm characteristics and their financial performance. Alovsat&Abdulmecit (2001) focused on the profitability margin of the export-oriented textile industry of Turkey in the post crisis period. Manasranjan, et. al, (2005) examined the causal relationship between the three variables, the study used granger causality and co-integration test for the period of 1970-2004. Waqas, et.al, (2013) analyzed the factors affecting firm performance in the textile and food sector of Pakistan, using panel/longitudinal data of companies (non-financial) listed in KSE for the years 2005 to 2010.

Analysis and Interpretations:-

Liquidity Ratios: -

Liquidity ratios measure the capacity of the business to meet its short term financial commitments as and when these become due. Investors regularly take a close look at liquidity ratios when performing fundamental analysis on a company. Since a company consistently having trouble meeting its short-term debt, it is at a higher risk of bankruptcy, liquidity ratios are a good measure of whether the firm will be able to comfortably continue as a going concern (Walker, 2011: Ukessays, 2013: Saravanan&Abarna, 2014).

Current Ratio:-

Current Ratio expresses the precise relation between current assets and current liabilities. It indicates the availability of current assets in rupees for every one rupee of current liabilities. A high current ratio indicates high liquidity; while a low current ratio indicates low liquidity. It is sometimes difficult to decide what should be the satisfactory current ratio of any company. Generally, the manufacturing industry ratio of 2:1 is traditionally considered as a benchmark of adequate liquidity, and, in India, as 1.33:1 (Prasanna Chandra, 2004). The current ratio is a very important tool to the outsiders, as well as to the management. It is a measure of the firm's ability to meet its short-term liabilities to the outsiders. From the management side, this ratio discloses the magnitude of the current assets that the firm carries, in relation to its current liabilities. For an outsider, the larger the ratio, the higher is the liquidity

of the company. A very high ratio means that the firm is having idle assets and, hence, there could be some inefficiency in management of its short term funds. Nevertheless, the current ratio is a quick measure of the company's liquidity, as it tests only the quantity - and not the quality. The constraint of this ratio indicator lies due to size, type of the investor and the quality of the receivables of the enterprise.

Table-1 reveals that the average current ratio of the sample companies varied between 0.90:1 and 4.76:1 during the study period. The current ratio was 1.47:1 in 2005, which increased to 1.66:1 in 2006 and then decreased to 1.42:1 in 2008. Thereafter, it marginally declined to 1.39:1 in 2009. Thereafter, it gradually increased to 1.80:1 and reached the level of 1.42:1 in 2014. The analysis shows that the average ratio was lower than the standard, which indicates that sample companies had maintained a sufficient level of liquidity during the study period since the current ratio was above the benchmark of 1.33:1.This indicates that most of the sample companies have maintained the current ratio, as compared to the benchmark of 1.33:1

An in-depth analysis of Table-1 reveals that the companies VTML, BASL and SCL had a very high current ratio. In contrast, companies SSL, KSML and KGDL had a very low current ratio. SSL, KSML & KGDL are likely to have difficulties in meeting their short term obligations, because most of their current assets consist of inventory. VTML, BASL and SCL are likely to meet their current obligations as and when these become due, because a large portion of their current assets consists of cash and accounts receivables. Normally, accounts receivable are highly liquid and can be converted into cash quickly. The standard deviation is universally used to measure the confidence level in statistical conclusions. Usually, the standard deviation close to zero indicates that the data points tend to be very close to the average/mean of the set, although a high standard deviation indicates that the data points are spread over a wider range of values. In this study, when the standard deviation was high, it indicated that the firm has more deviation from the mean/average. It explains that firms (KGDL, KSML SSML and SSL) had not maintained consistent current assets to meet their obligations.

Quick Ratio:-

Table-2 shows the quick ratios of the sample companies. Quick ratio indicates the direct liquidity of current assets that are easily convertible into cash. Recognising that inventory might not be very liquid, this ratio takes into account the quickly realisable assets and measures these against the current liabilities. This is a more refined and conservative estimate of the company's liquidity than the current ratio, since it establishes a relation between liquid assets and current liabilities. Conventionally, a quick ratio of 1:1 is considered to be a more satisfactory measure of the liquidity position of a concern. While this ratio does not entirely supplement the current ratio and, when used in conjunction with it, tends to give a better picture of the company's ability to meet its claims out of the quick assets.

It is evident from Table-2 that the overall average of the quick ratio was 0.62:1 during the period under study. The quick ratio showed a downward trend throughout the period of ten years. It was 0.58:1 in 2005, which gradually decreased and reached lowest level of 0.70:1 in 2013. It is evident from the Table that the overall quick ratio of the sample companies, taken together, was more than unity. The trend clearly reveals that the sample companies had not improved their overall liquidity position over a period of time. In this study, when the standard deviation was found to be high, it indicated that the firm has more deviation from the mean/average. It explains that firms, VTML and NEPCTL, had not maintained consistent liquid assets to repay their creditors. The coefficient of variation of the sample companies was 35.08%, which shows a lesser variation among the units, indicating that they had followed a uniform policy for quick ratio during the period under study. The coefficient of correlation of the quick assets and current liabilities was +0.99. This reveals that there had been a perfect positive correlation between quick assets and current liabilities. This leads to the conclusion that an increase in current liabilities can trigger an increase in quick assets in the same proportion. An in-depth analysis of Table-2 reveals that companies, VTML and NEPCTL, had very high quick ratios, while companies, ACML and KSML, had very low quick ratios.

Absolute Liquidity Ratio: Cash to Current Liabilities:-

This ratio is also known as cash position ratio. Though current ratio and acid-test ratio are important tools to measure the liquidity position of the company of a going concern, this ratio is appropriate to measure the absolute liquidity of the concern. As it indicates the availability of cash to meet the current obligations immediately. If the firm begins with a shortage of absolute cash in meeting its current obligations and if this trend mounts up to heavy burden on the finances of the company, this may even cause cash insolvency of the business. Early detection of this kind of situation by the management is a sine-qua-non for the continuity of the business. Table-3 exhibits the ratio of cash to current liabilities.

Among the companies, the proportion of cash to current liabilities reveals that this was in the range of 0.96% to 0.02%. The average of all the sample companies was 0.12% in 2005, which decreased to 0.11% in 2008 and then marginally increased to 0.20% in 2010. Thereafter, it decreased to 0.06% in 2011 and reached 0.10% in 2014. Most of the companies were not in a position to meet their current liabilities from their cash balances. The study reveals that, during the study period, on an average, the sample companies had 0.16% of cash against their current liabilities. The acceptable specific norm for this ratio is 0.25:1 or 1:4, i.e., Rs.1 worth of cash is considered adequate to pay Rs. 4 worth of current liabilities in time, as all the creditors are not expected to demand at the same time. The company's cash may also be realised from receivables and inventories. As the selected companies had almost equivalent amounts to the specific norm, it indicates their sound cash position. The overall average of total cash to total current liabilities of the selected companies was 0.16% during the study period. The coefficient of variation of the selected companies was very high, i.e., 73.35%. It clearly indicates that they had not followed a uniform policy of maintaining cash during the period under study. In this study, when the standard deviation was high (VTXIL & BASL), it indicated that the firm has more deviation from the mean/average. It explains that firms were not maintaining a sufficient liquid assets position to meet their quick obligations. A deeper analysis of the Table reveals that the companies, VTML, BASL and STL, had exceptionally high cash balance, whereas companies, RML and SSL, had an exceptionally low cash balance of current liabilities. In addition, absolute liquid assets, such as marketable securities and cash in bank, were found to be high, whereas the current liabilities, such as bank overdraft, sundry creditors, bills payable and creditors for outstanding expenses, were found to be low. High ratio reflects that absolute liquid assets worth one half of the value of current liabilities was sufficient for satisfactory liquidity position of the companies.

Solvency Ratios:-

Solvencyratios throw light on the long-term solvency of a firm, while the liquidity ratios, on the short-term solvency. These measure the long term financial viability of a business and its ability to pay off its long-term obligations such as bank loans and bonds payable. It is critical for banks, government, employees, institutional investors, bond holders, owners, etc. (Obaidullah, 2011). Solvency ratios include: debt-to-equity ratio, fixed charge coverage ratio, debt-to capital ratio, times interest earned ratio, and debt-to assets ratio.

Debt-Equity Ratio:-

Table-4 shows the Debt-Equity ratio, the ratio of total liabilities of a business to its shareholders' equity. It is a leverage ratio and measures the degree to which the assets of the business are financed by the debts and the shareholders' equity in a business. Lower values of the debt-equity ratio are favourable and indicate less risk. A higher debt-equity ratio is unfavourable, because it means that the business relies more on external factors. Thus, it is at higher risk, especially at higher interest rates. A debt-equity ratio of 1.00:1 means that half of the assets of a business are financed by debts and the rest by the shareholders' equity. A value higher than 1.00 means that more assets are financed by debt than by the money of shareholders.

It is evident from Table-4 that the overall average of debt-equity ratio was 2.42:1 during the period under study. The debt-equity ratio showed an upward trend throughout the period of ten years. It was 0.12:1 in 2005, which gradually increased and reached a peak level of 0.25:1 in 2006. It is evident from the Table that the overall debt-equity ratio of the sample companies, taken together, was more than unity, suggesting thereby that the companies were investing more funds from outside, compared with shareholders' funds. If it is more than the ideal ratio, it should meet more obligations from outside with high risk. However, less than the ideal ratio means that the company is utilising own funds with its structure, by avoiding the risk.

The standard deviation close to zero indicates that this data points tend to be very close to the average/mean of the companies, although a high standard deviation indicates that the data points are spread out line over a wider range of values. In this study, when the standard deviation was high (CFL & VTML), it indicated that the firms had more deviation from the mean/average. It explains that the firms were borrowing more funds from the outsiders, rather than utilising their own assets effectively. An in-depth analysis of the Table reveals that companies, SSIL, KPRML and VTML, had a very high debt-equity ratio, while companies, LMCL and GTL, had a very low debt-equity ratio.

Interest Coverage Ratio:-

This ratio measures the debt servicing of a firm, in so far as fixed interest on long term loan is concerned. It is determined by dividing the Net Profit before Interest and Tax by the fixed interest charges. It is also known as "time-interest-earned ratio," or debt service ratio, or net income to debt service ratio, or coverage ratio, or fixed

charges over. The lower the interest coverage ratio, the higher would be the company's debt burden, and greater the possibility of bankruptcy, or default. A lower ICR means less earnings are available to meet interest payments and that the business is more vulnerable to an increase in interest rates. When a company's interest coverage ratio is only 1.5, or lower, its ability to meet interest expenses may be questionable. An interest coverage ratio below 1.0:1 indicates that the business is having difficulties in generating the cash necessary to pay its interest obligations, i.e., the interest payments exceed its earnings (EBIT).

It is evident from Table-5 that the overall average of the interest coverage ratio was 2.08 during the period under study. Interest coverage ratio showed an upward trend throughout the period of ten years. It was 2.83 in 2005, which gradually increased to 3.14:1 in 2006. Thereafter, it decreased to 1.56:1 in 2008, and went up to 2.59 in 2011. It reached 1.77 in 2014. There was an impact of the global meltdown on textile companies during 2008 to 2009. The interest coverage ratio indicates the capacity of an organisation to meet its interest obligations. An interest cover ratio of 2 implies that the entity has sufficient profitability to bear twice the amount of its current financial costs. On the whole, the standard deviation close to zero indicates that this data points tend to be very close to the average/mean of the companies, although a high standard deviation indicates that the data points are spread over a wider range of values. In this study, when the standard deviation was high (as in the case of VTXIL & CFL), it indicated that the firms had more deviation from mean/average. It explains that the firms were not capitalising on the relatively cheaper source of finance (debt). Also, in such instances, an increase in gearing ratio may actually add value to the company. The company expected the least financial risk (low debt financing) and high interest coverage ratio. It explains that the company preferred equity financing through venture capital institutions, rather than loan financing due to the high level of risk. An in-depth analysis of the Table reveals that the VTML and KPRML companies had a very high ICR, while LMCL and GTL companies had a very low ICR.

Any company tries to control it borrowings, to avoid more interest repayment. Due to the impact of a weak ratio, a company may have to face difficulties in raising funds for its operations. Companies operating in plants that are exposed to a high level of business risk and uncertainty would generally prefer to maintain lower levels of financial risk (lower debt financing) and higher interest coverage ratios. Many start-up companies prefer equity financing through venture capital institutions, rather than loan financing, due to the high level of risk involved and such companies would tend to have very high interest ratios. Some industries tend to have higher interest coverage ratios than others, and cyclical companies, in particular, can experience significant swings in their interest coverage ratios (especially during downturns). Thus, comparison of interest coverage ratios is generally most meaningful among companies within the same industry, and the definition of a "high" or "low" ratio should be made within this context.

Activity Ratios:-

Activity ratios are concerned with measuring the efficiency in asset management. It measures the efficiency with which a business utilises its assets, such as accounts receivable, inventories, and fixed assets. The common operating ratios are: the average collection period ratio, the inventory turnover ratio, days of inventory ratio, the fixed asset turnover ratio, and the total asset turnover ratio. The success or failure of the concern too depends much upon proper and judicious use of the resources. This ratio may be defined as a test of the relationship between sales and the various assets of a firm.

Debtors' Turnover Ratio:-

The debtors' turnover ratio indicates the efficiency achieved by using the funds invested in debtors. A high debtors' turnover ratio indicates quick collections and enables the firm to transact a larger volume of business, without an increase in the investment of receivables. As per Spiller and Gosman, the analysis of the receivables turnover ratio supplements the information regarding the liquidity of the receivables. Table-6 shows the debtors' turnover ratio during 2005 to 2014. The overall average turnover ratio of the sample companies registered a fluctuating trend throughout the period under study and was 12.03 times in 2005, which decreased to 9.26 times in 2006 and then showed a upward trend and fell to 11.67 times in 2010 and finally it marginally increased to 32.23 times in 2014. It is evident from Table-6 that the overall average of the debtor's turnover ratio was 18.28 times during the period under study. This shows that the selected companies had efficient management of receivables, as compared to the overall average ratios. The coefficient of variation of 72.71% of the sample companies indicates that they had followed a uniform policy with regard to debtors during the period under study. Out of the eighteen selected textile companies, eight of them were found to have a turnover rate higher than the overall average of 18.28 times, while 10 had a lower overall average debtor's turnover ratio. An in-depth analysis of the Table reveals that companies,

VTML and GTL, had a very high turnover ratio, while companies, VTXIL, KGDL and CTL, had a low turnover ratio.

Inventory Turnover Ratio:-

Inventory Turnover Ratio is one of the efficiency ratios and measures the number of times, on an average, that the inventory is sold and replaced during the fiscal year. It measures a company's efficiency in turning its inventory into sales. Its purpose is to measure the liquidity of the inventory. Inventory Turnover Ratio is figured as "turnover times". Average inventory should be used for inventory level, to minimise the effect of seasonality. Table-7 shows the inventory turnover ratio during 2005 to 2014. The overall average turnover ratio of the sample companies registered a fluctuating trend throughout the period under study and was 4.46 times in 2005; which increased to 4.54 times in 2009, and then showed a downward trend and fell to 3.71 times in 2011. Finally, it marginally increased to 5.29 times in 2014.

It is evident from Table-7 that the overall average Inventory Turnover Ratio was 4.39 times during the period under study. It reflects that the selected companies had an efficient inventory management system, as compared to the overall average ratios. The coefficient of variation of the sample companies is 34.17%, which indicates that they had followed a uniform policy with regard to inventory during the period under study. Out of the eighteen selected textile companies, seven companies had a turnover rate higher than the overall average of 4.39 times, while 11 had a lower overall average inventory turnover ratio. The high variation of coefficient of ACML and BSSL reflects that these companies had not followed the inventories accounting methods properly, which are indicated by: “last in first out (LIFO)” method, which shows higher costs of goods sold and lower inventories than companies using “first in first out (FIFO)” Method. In addition, high variation shows that special promotions, new product introductions can suddenly and somewhat artificially change the company’s inventory ratio. An in-depth analysis of the Table reveals that NEPCTIL and KSML companies had a very high turnover ratio, while ACML, VTXIL and STL companies had a low turnover ratio.

Creditors’ Turnover Ratio:-

This ratio is calculated by taking the total purchases made and dividing it by the average accounts payable during the period. It is used to measure the rate at which a firm pays off its suppliers. It’s also known as an Accounts Payable Turnover Ratio, or Creditors’ Velocity. Accounts payables turnover trends can help a company to assess its cash situation. Just as accounts receivable ratios can be used to judge a company's incoming cash situation, this figure can demonstrate how a business handles its outgoing payments. The higher ratio should indicate that the payments are made promptly. Table-5.8 shows the creditors’ turnover ratios during 2005 to 2014. The overall average turnover ratio of the sample companies registered a fluctuating trend throughout the period under study and was 20.10 times in 2005, which increased to 25.14 times in 2007 and then showed a downward trend and fell to 13.44 times in 2009 and finally marginally increased to 39.78 times in 2014. It is evident from Table-8 that the overall average of the creditor’s turnover ratio was 25.57 times during the period under study. The average payment period was less than the standard. It shows that the payments are made earlier. This may be due to better liquid resources and working capital. The coefficient of variation of 71.11% of the sample companies indicates that they had followed a uniform policy with regard to the creditors’ collections during the period under study. A high ratio (prompt payment) is desirable, but a company should always avail the credit facility allowed by the suppliers.

Out of the eighteen selected textile companies, six were found to have a creditors’ turnover ratio higher than the overall average creditors turnover ratio of 19.80, while 12 had a lower than the overall average creditors’ turnover ratio. The high standard deviation of CFL, GTL and KGDL shows that data sets of the companies were not close to the mean/average. It explains that suppliers and creditors of the companies were not paying the bills in the right time period. It also suggests that new vendors were being paid back very slow. An in-depth analysis of the table reveals that ACML and NEPCTL companies had a very high creditors’ turnover ratio, while VTXIL, SCL and VTML companies had low creditors’ turnover ratios.

Profitability Ratios:-

Profits are the measure of the overall efficiency of a business. Profitability is an indication of the efficiency with which the operations of the business are carried on. Poor operational performance indicates poor sales and poor profit. The higher the profits, the more efficient the business is. A lower profitability may arise due to lack of control over the expenses. It must be remembered that profit is an absolute measure of the earning capacity, and profitability is the relative measure of the earning capacity. Important profitability ratios are: return on capital employed ratio,

gross profit margin ratio, net profit margin ratio, operating profit margin ratio, return on assets ratio and return on equity ratio. It highlights how effectively the profitability of a company is being managed.

Return on Capital Employed:-

Return on capital employed is also known as rate of return. It establishes the relationship between profits and the capital employed. It also reveals the earning capacity of the capital invested in the business. It is widely used to measure the overall profitability and efficiency of the business concern. The main objective of making investments in any business is to obtain a satisfactory return on capital invested in the business. It measures the profitability of a company, by expressing its operating profit, as a percentage of its capital employed. Capital employed is the sum of the stockholders' equity and long-term finance. Alternatively, the capital employed can be calculated as the difference between total assets and current liabilities. This ratio is useful to show the efficiency of the business as a whole.

Table-9 shows the return on capital employed during the period under study and also depicts that the overall average return on capital employed was 12.74%. It was 15.92% in 2005, which increased to 16.44% in 2006. Thereafter, for the next three consecutive years, it showed a declining trend, and fell to 3.55% in 2009, but increased to 16.98% in 2014. The ROCE greater than unity indicates, that the higher efficiency of the sample companies in the utilisation of assets to generate sales. The coefficient of variation of 98.88% of the samples companies shows higher variation among the company ratios', which indicates that these companies had followed different policies for the return on capital employed during the period under study. It reveals that there was a lesser perfect positive correlation between profits and capital employed. This leads to the conclusion that increases in capital employed led to an increase in proportion of profits of the companies. An in-depth analysis of the table reveals that companies SSIL and KPRML had a very high return, while companies GTL and CFL had a very low return on capital employed.

Return on Equity:-

This ratio reveals the relationship between profits of a company and its equity shareholders' funds. Net profit after interest, tax and preference dividend is divided by the equity shareholders' funds. It is a measure of the profitability of the stockholders' investments. It shows the net income as a percentage of shareholder equity. Net income is considered for the full fiscal year, after taxes and preferred stock dividends, but before common stock dividends. Shareholders' Equity does not include preferred stocks. Return on Equity varies substantially across different industries. Therefore, it is recommended to compare returns on equity against company's previous values or return of a similar company. The ratio of return on equity of the sample companies moved in a very wide range - varying from -96.60% to 77.09% during the period under study. This ratio was 15.26 in 2005, which increased to 19.60% in 2006. It then maintained an increasing trend and reached 16.61% in 2014. The companies show the negative - 11.92% in 2009 due to the impact of global meltdown and recovered in the year 2011 and reached a peak level of 21.09. The average percentage of return on equity was 9.07% during the period under study. This shows the conservative policy adopted by the managements of the sample companies.

It is evident from Table-10 that the overall average of the return on equity ratio was 9.07% during the period under study. It is assumed that the assets, without corresponding liabilities, are the direct creation of the shareholder capital that helps the company to grow in the first place. The coefficient of variation of 460.83% of the sample companies indicates that they had not followed a uniform policy with regard to equity returns during the period under study. The high standard deviation of CFL and NEPCTL shows that the data set points were not close to the mean and were away from the mean line. An in-depth analysis of the Table reveals that the companies GTL and SSIL had very high returns on equity ratio, while companies NEPCTL and CFL had low returns on equity ratio.

Operating Profit Ratio:-

The operating profit ratio measures whatever proportion of a company's revenue is left over, after deducting direct costs and overheads, before taxes and other indirect costs, such as interest. It measures a company's pricing strategy and operating efficiency. It gives an idea of how much a company makes (before interest and taxes) on each rupee of sales. The operating margin ratio shows whether the fixed costs are too high for the production or sales volume. The operating cost is equal to the cost of goods sold, plus the operating expenses. Non-operating expenses, such as interest charges and taxes, are excluded from the computations. The operating profit ratio of the sample companies moved in a narrow range varying from 7.95% to 22.34 during the period under study. This ratio was 17.51 in 2005, which reached the peak level of 22.34% in 2006. Thereafter, it declined for the three consecutive years to 7.95% in 2009 and increased to 18.12% in 2011 and reached 20.09% in 2014. The average operating profit ratio was 15.84%

during the study period. This shows the conservative policy adopted by the managements of the sample companies to use's sales revenue to cover the cost of goods sold and operating expenses.

It is evident from Table-11 that the overall average ratio of the operating profit was 15.84% during the period under study. The coefficient of variation of 87.21% of the sample companies indicates that they had not followed a uniform policy with regard to operating profit ratio. The high standard deviation of the companies, CFL and GTL, shows that the data sets of these companies were varying too high and not very close to mean/average. It explains that, the companies were not making enough money from their ongoing operations to pay for their variable and fixed costs. An in-depth analysis of the Table reveals that the companies, ACML and RML, had a very high ratio of the operating profit, while companies, CFL, GTL and CTL, had a low ratio of the operating profit.

Net Profit Ratio:-

This ratio reveals the overall profitability of the concern. Net profit ratio establishes the relationship between net profit (after taxes) and sales. It is expressed as a percentage of sales. It indicates the efficiency of the management in manufacturing, selling, administrative and other activities of the firm. This ratio is very useful to the proprietors, because it reveals the overall profitability of the business concern. It is also called "Net Profit to Net Sales ratio". This ratio indicates the result of overall operations of the firm. The net profit ratio of the sample companies moved in a wide range, varying from -7.27 to 9.45 during the period under study. This ratio was 5.52 in 2005, which increased to the high level of 9.45 in 2006. Thereafter, it decreased for the next three consecutive years to touch -7.27 in 2009, due to the impact of the global meltdown, and recovered within a year, to reach 4.51 in 2011. Once again, it fell to -2.74% in 2012 due to low market price for the raw materials and reached 5.12 in 2014. The average percentage of the net profit ratio was 2.83 during the period 2005 to 2014. This shows the conservative policy adopted by the managements of the sample companies.

It is evident from Table-12 that the overall average ratio of the net profit was 2.83 and the coefficient of variation of the sample companies was negatively placed at 124.84%. The high standard deviation of the companies reflects that the companies were not constantly improving their profitability. Also, they were not comparing the ratio with those of the previous years, the industry's average and the budgeted net profit ratio. An in-depth analysis of the table reveals that BASL and ACML companies had a very high ratio of the net profit, while companies, GTL and CFL, had a low ratio of the net profit.

Impact of Liquidity, Solvency and Activity ratios on Return on Capital Employed using Generalised Least Square Method:-

(OLS) techniques were used due to high correlation. Before going to use OLS, one should consider the impact of independent variables on the ROCE of the profitability ratio. In order to examine the impact of both independent and dependent variables of the textile companies, ordinary least squares tests the stationarity on the variables, if it is a time series data. The study applied the unit root tests as per the augmented Dickey Fuller and Phillips-Perron (PP, 1988) method to avoid spurious regression results. If the first and second difference does not satisfy the stationarity, it would reflect that multi-collinearity, or auto correlation.

$$Y = \alpha + \beta Xi; + e.$$

It has been observed that the correlation is given the multi-collinearity, to avoid more than two variable of multi-collinearity, used in the generalised linear square method.

$$\text{Generalised Least Square } Y^* = \alpha + \beta X^*_i + Ui$$

Here, Y* = Transformed Dependent Variable (Y/σ), X^*_i = Transformed Independent Variables (Xi/ σ), σ = Standard Error

The generalised Linear Square method indicated that the profitability was high, as depicted by its independent variables. It is also evident from the value of R^2 that 0.967 percent of variation in ROCE was accounted for by the joint variation in the independent variables of financial performance. The Adjusted 'R' Square (R^2) signifies that 0.935 percent of the positive variation in the ROCE is explained by the independent variables. The high standard error of the regression coefficients demonstrates that there is really a line of estimates among the variables.

H1 There is a significant impact of Liquidity, Solvency and Activity ratios on ROCE

Generalized Least Square Statistics and Hypotheses Results

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	H
Intercept	1.88	20.09	0.09	0.93	
Current Ratio	96.85	46.23	2.09	0.07	Not Accepted
Quick Ratio	-41.52**	13.20	-2.52	0.03	Accepted
Absolute Liquidity Ratio	23.99	28.09	1.02	0.33	Not Accepted
Debt Equity Ratio	-0.68	5.49	-0.12	0.90	Not Accepted
Interest Coverage Ratio	5.12**	0.81	6.33	0.00	Accepted
Debtors Turnover Ratio	13.37	6.98	1.92	0.09	Not Accepted
Creditors Turnover Ratio	-152.42	72.88	-2.09	0.07	Not Accepted
Inventory Turnover Ratio	1.29	1.87	0.69	0.51	Not Accepted

** = statistically significant at 5% level

It can be observed from the above Table that current ratio is having the high positive impact on the return on capital employed and was statistically insignificant at 5% level. It reflects that the capital employed was the sum of stockholders' equity and long term finance. The capital employed is the difference between total assets and current liabilities. Here, the assets are impacting more on the return on capital employed. On the other hand, the estimated coefficient of quick ratio shows the negative impact on the capital employed, which is statistically significant. The estimates coefficients of absolute liquidity ratio were found to be having a high negative impact on the ROCE, which was statistically insignificant. DER and ICR of the coefficients shows the positive impact on the ROCE, which was statistically insignificant by DER and significant by ICR at the level of 5%. It reflects that debt into a company's total capital provides a more comprehensive evaluation, as well as management's usage of debt and equity disposal. DTR, CTR and ITR were found to be having a positive and negative impact on the ROCE, which was statistically insignificant. During the years 2005 and 2008 to 2010, the stock turnover and the average collection period had shown adverse trends, which indicate the deteriorating level of inventory management and stock collection policy. In the year 2012 all those ratios showed high and low fluctuations. The main reason for that was the availability of raw materials at low cost and the less duty on textile products by the government. An insignificant variation in financial ratios could be the result of the composite effect adopted in the analysis, as well as many other financial ratios-related unexplained variables. Hence, we can agree with the alternative hypothesis *there is no significant impact of Liquidity, Solvency and Activity ratios on ROCE of the textile industry in Tamil Nadu*.

Impact of Liquidity, Solvency and Activity ratios on Net Profit Ratio, using the Generalised Least Squares Method:-

The strength of the relationship between the dependent variable, net profit ratio (NPR) and all the independent variables are taken together to look into the impact of independent variables on the NPR of the profitability ratio. In order to examine the impact of both independent and dependent variables of textile companies, ordinary least squares (OLS) techniques were used, due to the high degree of correlation. Before going to use OLS, one should test the stationarity on the variables, if it is time series data. The study applied the unit root tests as per the augmented Dickey Fuller and Phillips-Perron (PP, 1988) method to avoid spurious regression results. The first and second differences were not satisfying the stationarity, which reflect the multi-collinearity, or auto correlation.

$$Y = \alpha + \beta Xi; + e.$$

It is observed that the correlation given the multi-collinearity, to avoid more than two variable of multi-collinearity, used in the generalized linear square method.

Generalised Least Square $Y^* = \alpha + \beta X^*_i + Ui$

Here, Y* = Transformed Dependent Variable (Y/σ), X^*_i = Transformed Independent Variables (Xi/ σ), σ = Standard Error

The Generalised Least Square method indicates that the profitability was high impacted by its independent variables. It is also evident from the value of R2 that 0.99 percent of variation in NPR was accounted for by the joint variation in independent variables of financial performance. The Adjusted 'R' square (R2) signifies that 9.97 percent of the positive variation in the NPR is explained by the independent variables. The low standard error of the regression coefficients demonstrates that there is really a line of estimates among the variables. Note that the p-values for all the coefficients, with the exception of the coefficient for profitability, are lower than 0.05. This means that we

cannot reject the hypothesis that they are zero or below 0.05 (so it can be eliminated from the model). This is also confirmed from the fact that the 0 lies in the interval between the confidences level of the lower 95% and the upper 95% for each of these coefficients.

H1 There is a significant impact of Liquidity, Solvency and Activity ratio's on the Net Profit Ratio

Generalized Least Square Statistics and Hypotheses Result.

	Coefficients	Standard Error	t Stat	P-value	Hypotheses
Intercept	0.69	1.40	0.49	0.64	
Current Ratio	0.98	0.91	1.08	0.31	Not Accepted
Quick Ratio	11.71**	3.30	3.55	0.01	Accepted
Absolute Liquidity Ratio	-22.96	33.66	-0.68	0.51	Not Accepted
Debt Equity Ratio	-0.26	0.65	-0.40	0.70	Not Accepted
Interest Coverage Ratio	0.03	0.03	1.32	0.22	Not Accepted
Debtors Turnover Ratio	-0.98**	0.26	-3.71	0.00	Accepted
Creditors Turnover Ratio	22.48**	9.66	2.33	0.04	Accepted
Inventory Turnover Ratio	0.00	0.29	-0.01	0.99	Not Accepted

** = statistically significant at 5% level.

It was observed from the above Table that current ratio having the high positive impact on the net profit ratio was insignificant at 5% level. It replicates that an increase or decrease in current assets will impact the net profit ratio of the companies. The estimated coefficients of the QR and ALR were found to be having a positive and high negative impact on the net profit ratio of the textile companies, which was statistically significant at 5% level and insignificant by ALR. On the other hand, the estimated coefficient of ICR and CTR were found to be having a positive impact on the net profit ratio, which is statistically insignificant by ICR. The collection system was found to be faulty, because the debtors were enjoying a credit facility beyond the normal period. The performance of debt collection was found to be poor. It reflects that company were neglecting the increase of the credit position, as also the decreasing debt burden, while making repayment at high interest rates. Two other important indicators of efficiency, DTR and ITR, were having a low negative impact on the net profit ratio of the companies, which are statistically significant at 5% level by DTR and insignificant by ITR. Hence, we can agree with the alternative hypothesis *there is no significant impact of Liquidity, Solvency and Activity ratio's on Net Profit Ratio of the textile industry in Tamil Nadu.*

Findings, Suggestions and Conclusion:-

The financial performance of the textile industry in Tamil Nadu had been analysed with the help of the financial ratios. VTML Company performed better than the other companies throughout the period of the study in the areas of: current ratio, quick ratio and absolute liquidity ratio. As regards debt-equity ratio, CTL and RML Company scored better than the other companies. ACML Company was the best performer in the area of interest-coverage ratio. A higher debt-equity ratio was noticed in SSML. VTML Company better performed in less time to collect the receivables compared with other companies in the debtor's turnover ratio. The inventory turnover ratio of textile industry in Tamil Nadu fluctuated significantly during the period under study. NEPCTL also occupied the first place in inventory turnover ratio. The inventory management was better in KGDL. However, the age of inventory gradually declined during the period of the study. The high accounts payable turnover ratio is not always good enough in the interest of a company. LMCL Company performed better than the other companies during the study period in the area of medium creditor's turnover. The contribution made by shareholders to the capital structure was found to have gradually increased in textile industry of Tamil Nadu. ROCE is a more comprehensive test of profitability and SSIL Company performed with high return among the companies. At the same time, CFL Company's average return on equity fluctuated very badly during the period of the study. The higher operating profit ratio reveals the less net profit ratio. RML Company was found to have a high operating profit among the textile companies. However, BASL Company was earning the highest net profit among the select textile companies during the study period. The impact of financial ratios, such as return on capital employed and net profit ratio, on the profitability of textile industry in Tamil Nadu, was meticulously studied. From the Generalised Least Square method it was found that absolute liquidity ratio had the highest impact among the financial ratios on the return on net profit ratio as well as creditors' turnover ratio is highest impact on return on capital employed during the study period with statistical significance. During the course of the study, it was found that some companies were giving more attention to only liquidity and solvency aspects of the performance and taking more conservative decisions, leading to the

decline in their profitability. There is an urgent requirement to bring about changes in the approach of the management. Each company should give suitable weightage to the performance aspects of liquidity, solvency, and activity and profitability ratios. STL showed good performance in a very short span, as it was able to maintain its aggressive approach towards the working capital. Other companies also need to adopt more aggressiveness in maintaining their current ratio at 2:1 and improving their profitability. Both VTXIL and STL Company were found to be having very huge funds blocked in inventories and receivables. This could be due to the company's size of operation, and also to obviate issues like diseconomies of scale. The selected companies are advised to review their working capital frequently with tools like funds flow and cash flow statement and cash control reports. All the companies were found to have enough resources to meet their obligations over the next business cycle. At the same time, the current ratio values were varying from company to company, due to their respective demand and supply conditions and their own position in the market. However, it is suggested that all the sample companies should maintain the ratios at least equal to the benchmark level of 2:1. Meanwhile, the companies should avoid the idle assets, rather than keeping these as cash/liquidity in the business. Companies should maintain the ideal Absolute liquidity ratio in the business, which is productive and earning, and also taking care of liquidity. If the firm begins with a shortage of absolute cash in meeting its current obligations and if this trend imposes a heavy burden on the finances of the company, this may even cause cash insolvency of the business. Further it is suggested that companies should avoid the sine-qua-non for the continuity of the business. Overall debt-equity ratio of the sample companies, taken together, was more than unity, suggesting thereby that the companies were investing more funds from outside, compared with shareholders' funds. If it is more than the ideal ratio, it should meet more obligations from outside with a risk. However, less than the ideal ratio means that the company is utilizing its own funds within its structure, by avoiding the risk. Companies should maintain the average inventory level, instead of the ending the inventory level, to minimize the adverse impact of seasonal factors. Further, the companies should also solve the negative coefficients of absolute liquidity ratio, debtor's turnover ratio, as well as debt-equity ratio.

References:-

1. AlovsatMuslumov and AbdulmecitKaratas. (2001). The effects of the Asian Crisis to Turkish manufacturing industry: The case of Textile, Food & Cement industries. *Dogus University Dergisi*-4, pp.91-104.
2. AnupkumarBhandari and Subhash C. Ray. (2011). Technical Efficiency in the Indian textiles industry: A non-parametric analysis of firm-level data. *Bulletin of Economic Research* 00:00, 0307-3378.
3. http://www.ukessays.com/essays/finance/financial-statements-analysis-of-kellogg-company-finance-essay.php
4. KunalGaurav&Lokinder Kumar Tyagi. (2009). Indian Cotton Textile Industry: A pre-post liberalization comparative study. *The Indian Journal of Management*, Vol.2, ISS2, July-Dec-2009.
5. ManasranjanDashmishra, HitendraBargal, NitishGhune, BhanuSaxena, Manish Santosh Kumar Yadav. (2005). An Empirical Analysis of pre-post liberalization period of export growth in India. http://www.wbiconpro.com/215-Hitendra.pdf
6. Mansur A Mulla (2003). Forecasting the Viability and Operational Efficiency by use of ratio analysis-A Case Study. *Finance India*, Vol.17, 3, pp.893-897.
7. Marimuthu, KN (2012) Financial Performance of Textile Industry: A Study on Listed Companies of Tamil Nadu", International Journal of Research in Management, Economics and Commerce, Vol.2. (11), pp: 365-377.
8. Marimuthu, KN (2012), Financial Performance Analysis on Indian Textile Industry (A Study on Bombay Dyeing & Manufacturing Company), JM International Publishers- Madurai. ISBN: 978-81-925487-9-1, Dec-2012.
9. Marimuthu, KN (2013), Liquidity Management Efficiency of Indian Textile Industry: (A Study on Listed Companies from Tamil Nadu), National Conference on Paradigm for Sustainable Business: People, Planet and Profit organized by Department of Management Studies, Indian Institute of Technology Roorkee, ISBN: 978-93-81583-94-4, (Mar-2013), PP: 1-7.
10. Marimuthu, KN (2013), Liquidity Management Efficiency of Indian Textile Industry (Study on Listed Company of Tamil Nadu), International Conference on Changes, Challenges and Strategic Reforms in Management organized by Department of Management Studies, Mohamed Sathak College of Arts and Science, Sholinkanallur, Chennai. Published by Mohamed Sathak Trust, ISBN: 978-81-926248-0-8 (Apr-2013), PP: 24-26.
11. Marimuthu, KN (2015), Impact of Working Capital Management on Firm's Profitability and Liquidity: An Empirical Study of Lakshmi Mills Company Limited, Research Issues in Applied Economics Edited by Dr. KakaliMajumdar and Dr. Pabitra Kumar Jena, published byMcGraw Hill Education, ISBN (13): 978-93-392-2429-5, ISBN (10): 93-392-2429-9 (Dec-2015), PP: 270-282.

12. Marimuthu, KN and Mary Jessica (2014), Financial Performance of Indian Textile Industry: An Empirical Study on KG Denim Limited, "Corporate Finance and Financial Services-Emerging Trends" Edited by Dr.K.Ramulu, School of Management Studies, University of Hyderabad, Published by Spectrum, ISBN: 978-93-82829-42-3 (April-2014), PP: 45-56.
13. Noel Capon, John U Farley and Scott Hoening. (1990). Determinants of Financial performance: A Meta-Analysis. *Management Science*, Vol.36, No.10, pp-1143-1159.
14. Obaidullah Jan (2011). Financial Ratio Analysis on Accounting Explained.
15. Phillips, P. C. B and Perron, P (1988). Testing for Unit Root in Time Series Regression, *Biometrica*, 335-46.
16. Prasanna Chandra, (2004). Financial Management Theory and Practice. *Tata McGrew-Hill Publication*, New Delhi, 6th Edition.
17. Ram Kumar Kakani and MayankKaul. (2002). Firm performance and size in liberalized era: The Indian Case. Working paper: 2002-06 on XLRI Jamshedpur, *School of Business and Human Resource*.
18. Saravanan, S.S &Abarna, J (2014). A Study on Liquidity Analysis of Selected Automobile Companies in India. *Indian Journal of Applied Research*, Vol-4 (2), pp: 6-8.
19. SINET (2007). Indian Cotton Textile Sector Network Report Sector Overview & SWOT Analysis.
20. Suresh Kataria (1996). Analysis of published statements of Accounts of corporate Units (Cotton Textile Industry of Malwa Region-A Case Study). *Finance India*, Vol.X, No.1, Mar-1996.
21. Walker, R (2011). Liquidity Analysis. Fundamental Focus of CI Staff, the American Association of Individual Investors, Alabama.
22. Waqas Tariq, Imran Ali, Hafiz Muhammad Usman, Jawad Abbas and Zahid Bashir. (2013). Empirical Identification of Determinants of Firm's Financial Performance: A Comparative Study on Textile and Food Sector of Pakistan. *Business and Economic Research*, Vol-3 (1), pp 487-497.

Appendix:-

S. No	CMIE Listed Companies in Tamil Nadu	Code
1	Ambika Cotton Mills Limited	ACML
2	Bannari Amman Spinning Mills Limited	BASL
3	Celebrity Fashions Limited	CFL
4	Cheslind Textiles Limited	CTL
5	Gangotri Textiles Limited	GTL
6	K G Denim Limited	KGDL
7	K P R Mill Limited	KPRML
8	Kandagiri Spinning Mills Limited	KSML
9	Lakshmi Mills Company Limited	LMCL
10	N E P C Textiles Limited	NEPCTL
11	Rajapalayam Mills Limited	RML
12	SalonaCotspin Limited	SCL
13	Sambandam Spinning Mills Limited	SSML
14	Shiva Texyarn Limited	STL
15	Super Sales India Limited	SSIL
16	Super Spinning Mills Limited	SSL
17	V T M Limited	VTML
18	V T X Industries Limited	VTXIL
	CMIE = Centre for Monitoring and Indian Economy	

Annexure:-

Table 1:- Current Ratio Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014.

CR	Mar-05	Mar-06	Mar-07	Mar-08	Mar-09	Mar-10	Mar-11	Mar-12	Mar-13	Mar-14	Min	Max	Avg	SD	CV
ACML	1.3	1.6	1.55	1.48	1.38	1.32	1.28	1.25	1.41	1.56	1.25	1.6	1.41	0.13	9.03
BASL	2.83	4.51	2.42	1.61	1.86	1.65	1.4	1.23	1.58	1.27	1.23	4.51	2.04	1.01	49.41
CFL	1.27	2.76	1.25	1.04	0.99	1.25	0.97	0.9	0.91	0.9	0.9	2.76	1.22	0.56	45.77
CTL	1.3	1.26	1.1	1.14	0.76	1.61	1.41	1.31	1.27	1.25	0.76	1.61	1.24	0.22	17.73
GTL	0.79	1.66	1	1.2	0.84	1.87	1.72	0.82	0.69	0.6	0.6	1.87	1.12	0.47	41.78
KGDL	1.11	1.37	1.25	1.14	1.03	1.02	1.02	1.02	0.97	0.9	0.9	1.37	1.08	0.14	12.88
KPRML	1.08	1.41	1.66	1.41	1.68	1.36	1.6	0.8	0.86	1.41	0.8	1.68	1.33	0.31	23.68
KSML	1.15	1.04	1.06	1.01	0.91	1.06	1.24	0.69	1.07	0.97	0.69	1.24	1.02	0.15	14.43
LMCL	0.79	0.73	0.81	1	0.83	3.02	2.76	2.41	2.44	2.18	0.73	3.02	1.70	0.94	55.40
NEPCTL	2.58	1.11	1.67	2.34	2.05	0.61	0.6	0.72	0.93	0.93	0.6	2.58	1.35	0.75	55.06
RML	1.48	1.68	1.68	1.57	0.96	1.19	1.38	1	1.06	0.95	0.95	1.68	1.30	0.30	22.99
SCL	2.01	1.7	1.59	1.47	1.59	1.46	1.56	1.79	2.3	1.72	1.46	2.3	1.72	0.26	15.21
SSML	1.09	1.18	1	1.39	0.95	1.12	1.21	0.83	1.17	1.05	0.83	1.39	1.10	0.15	14.09
STL	2.39	1.95	1.9	1.68	1.37	1.27	1.58	1.13	1.12	1.23	1.12	2.39	1.56	0.42	26.82
SSIL	1.17	1.29	1.39	1.38	1.53	1.64	1.23	0.81	0.95	1.12	0.81	1.64	1.25	0.25	20.22
SSL	1.1	1.47	1.02	1.1	0.81	0.82	0.95	0.48	0.55	0.68	0.48	1.47	0.90	0.30	32.86
VTML	2.11	2.17	3	1.96	4.18	4.32	3.73	7.81	12.01	6.33	1.96	12.01	4.76	3.17	66.62
VTXIL	0.93	1.04	1.73	1.67	1.28	1.3	1.35	1.17	1.19	0.51	0.51	1.73	1.22	0.35	28.90
Min	0.79	0.73	0.81	1.00	0.76	0.61	0.60	0.48	0.55	0.51					
Max	2.83	4.51	3.00	2.34	4.18	4.32	3.73	7.81	12.01	6.33					
MEAN	1.47	1.66	1.50	1.42	1.39	1.55	1.50	1.45	1.80	1.42			1.52		30.72
SD	0.63	0.85	0.55	0.35	0.80	0.86	0.71	1.65	2.59	1.29					
CV	0.43	0.51	0.36	0.25	0.58	0.55	0.47	1.13	1.44	0.91					

Table 5:-Quick Ratio Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014

QR	Mar -05	Mar -06	Mar -07	Mar -08	Mar -09	Mar -10	Mar -11	Mar -12	Mar -13	Mar -14	Min	Max	Mean	SD	CV
ACML	0.17	0.19	0.19	0.4	0.21	0.29	0.24	0.24	0.32	0.28	0.17	0.4	0.25	0.07	28.01
BASL	0.43	1.72	1	0.56	0.63	0.66	0.38	0.5	0.76	0.47	0.38	1.72	0.71	0.40	56.01
CFL	0.55	1.52	0.32	0.29	0.45	0.67	0.5	0.53	0.72	0.61	0.29	1.52	0.62	0.35	56.17
CTL	0.51	0.41	0.37	0.54	0.39	0.42	0.31	0.71	0.66	0.64	0.31	0.71	0.50	0.14	27.74
GTL	0.39	1.01	0.4	0.61	0.45	0.84	0.75	0.38	0.47	0.29	0.29	1.01	0.56	0.24	42.14
KGDL	0.31	0.45	0.38	0.39	0.41	0.41	0.39	0.29	0.34	0.34	0.29	0.45	0.37	0.05	13.41
KPRML	0.45	0.61	0.84	0.62	1.01	0.56	0.7	0.44	0.52	0.74	0.44	1.01	0.65	0.18	27.56
KSML	0.34	0.2	0.33	0.31	0.5	0.27	0.31	0.34	0.4	0.25	0.2	0.5	0.33	0.08	25.42
LMCL	0.23	0.25	0.18	0.45	0.39	0.44	0.46	0.45	0.49	0.41	0.18	0.49	0.38	0.11	29.75
NEPCTL	2.22	0.75	1.16	1.68	1.46	0.73	0.53	0.2	0.26	0.26	0.2	2.22	0.93	0.69	74.06
RML	0.64	0.56	0.78	0.79	0.64	0.71	0.75	0.46	0.42	0.3	0.3	0.79	0.61	0.17	27.53
SCL	0.85	0.56	0.69	0.57	0.73	0.46	0.28	0.57	0.89	0.74	0.28	0.89	0.63	0.18	29.04
SSML	0.26	0.31	0.27	0.55	0.53	0.32	0.33	0.57	0.56	0.42	0.26	0.57	0.41	0.13	31.21
STL	0.8	0.53	0.43	0.68	0.65	0.53	0.55	0.46	0.66	0.43	0.43	0.8	0.57	0.12	21.36
SSIL	0.33	0.49	0.58	0.55	0.78	0.77	0.48	0.49	0.61	0.67	0.33	0.78	0.58	0.14	24.21
SSL	0.5	0.53	0.38	0.45	0.42	0.49	0.41	0.26	0.28	0.33	0.26	0.53	0.41	0.09	22.85
VTML	1.01	1.03	1.23	1.32	2.39	2.57	2.15	2.28	3.75	4.2	1.01	4.2	2.19	1.11	50.60
VTXIL	0.37	0.5	1.02	0.62	0.45	0.38	0.36	0.39	0.48	0.25	0.25	1.02	0.48	0.21	44.28
Min	0.17	0.19	0.18	0.29	0.21	0.27	0.24	0.20	0.26	0.25					
Max	2.22	1.72	1.23	1.68	2.39	2.57	2.15	2.28	3.75	4.20					
MEAN	0.58	0.65	0.59	0.63	0.69	0.64	0.55	0.53	0.70	0.65			0.62		35.08
STDEV	0.47	0.42	0.34	0.35	0.51	0.51	0.43	0.46	0.78	0.90					
CV	0.81	0.66	0.58	0.55	0.73	0.80	0.78	0.86	1.12	1.40					

Table3:-Absolute Liquidity Ratio Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014.

ALR	**Mar -05**	**Mar -06**	**Mar -07**	**Mar -08**	**Mar -09**	**Mar -10**	**Mar -11**	**Mar -12**	**Mar -13**	**Mar -14**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**STDEV**	**CV**
ACML	0.1	0.06	0.06	0.13	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.04	0.02	0.02	0.13	0.05	0.04	74.21
BASL	0.06	1.39	0.62	0.19	0.05	0.14	0.02	0.05	0.14	0.02	0.02	1.39	0.27	0.43	161.35
CFL	0.14	1.04	0.05	0.02	0.12	0.18	0.11	0.13	0.15	0.11	0.02	1.04	0.21	0.30	144.91
CTL	0.07	0.06	0.11	0.09	0.04	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.07	0.04	0.04	0.11	0.06	0.02	38.19
GTL	0.06	0.13	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.14	0.03	0.02	0.13	0.03	0.02	0.14	0.06	0.05	84.11
KGDL	0.1	0.1	0.07	0.06	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.07	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.1	0.07	0.02	25.97
KPRML	0.18	0.11	0.17	0.27	0.17	0.26	0.1	0.17	0.26	0.16	0.1	0.27	0.19	0.06	32.56
KSML	0.11	0.07	0.03	0.01	0.05	0.03	0.02	0.05	0.03	0.12	0.01	0.12	0.05	0.04	71.84
LMCL	0.16	0.2	0.15	0.31	0.12	0.16	0.12	0.12	0.16	0.12	0.12	0.31	0.16	0.06	35.97
NEPCTL	0.04	0.02	0.01	0.01	0.06	0.09	0.1	0.12	0.08	0.17	0.01	0.17	0.07	0.05	74.69
RML	0.06	0.1	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.03	0.03	0.04	0.03	0.03	0.01	0.1	0.04	0.02	61.24
SCL	0.07	0.05	0.18	0.06	0.12	0.1	0.06	0.12	0.13	0.26	0.05	0.26	0.12	0.07	56.54
SSML	0.13	0.2	0.03	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.02	0.06	0.06	0.02	0.02	0.2	0.07	0.06	80.68
STL	0.18	0.13	0.13	0.34	0.45	0.24	0.16	0.25	0.24	0.26	0.13	0.45	0.24	0.10	41.73
SSIL	0.11	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.14	0.06	0.06	0.14	0.16	0.05	0.16	0.09	0.04	45.20
SSL	0.01	0.01	0.03	0.02	0.02	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.04	0.01	0.04	0.02	0.01	47.35
VTML	0.59	0.7	1.15	0.26	2.05	1.73	0.15	1.05	1.73	0.15	0.15	2.05	0.96	0.70	73.34
VTXIL	0.03	0.01	0.6	0.08	0.03	0.1	0.03	0.03	0.1	0.03	0.01	0.6	0.10	0.18	170.46
Min	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.01	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.02					
Max	0.59	1.39	1.15	0.34	2.05	1.73	0.16	1.05	1.73	0.26					
MEAN	0.12	0.25	0.20	0.11	0.20	0.20	0.06	0.13	0.20	0.10			0.16		73.35
STDEV	0.13	0.39	0.30	0.11	0.47	0.39	0.05	0.24	0.39	0.08					
CV	1.04	1.57	1.53	1.00	2.42	1.95	0.75	1.76	1.95	0.81					

Table4:-Debt-Equity Ratio Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014.

DER	Mar -05	Mar -06	Mar -07	Mar -08	Mar -09	Mar -10	Mar -11	Mar -12	Mar -13	Mar -14	Min	Max	Mean	SD	CV
ACML	4.18	4.22	3.51	2.44	1.74	2.44	4.88	1.48	0.78	0.43	0.43	4.88	2.61	1.54	58.82
BASL	3.66	1.11	4.24	3.15	1.67	2.15	4.26	2.17	1.79	1.85	1.11	4.26	2.61	1.13	43.51
CFL	3.94	3.84	0.51	0.16	5.48	0.2	1.04	1.21	1.67	1.13	0.16	5.48	1.92	1.84	95.90
CTL	1.13	2.17	0.75	0.4	3.08	0.7	2.22	3.6	2.77	2.6	0.4	3.6	1.94	1.12	57.68
GTL	2.04	1.78	1.55	0.26	0.9	0.35	0.15	0.81	0.76	0.43	0.15	2.04	0.90	0.67	74.01
KGDL	2.45	4.35	0.43	0.39	0.04	1.01	1.47	2.24	1.91	1.89	0.04	4.35	1.62	1.27	78.46
KPRML	8.93	5.73	6.19	1.51	3.69	4.07	3.87	1.21	0.92	0.9	0.9	8.93	3.70	2.68	72.26
KSML	2.22	2.44	2.36	1.69	0.59	1.46	2.58	6.01	4.13	3.23	0.59	6.01	2.67	1.52	56.79
LMCL	0.47	1.59	0.16	1.5	0.14	0.31	1.2	2.57	2.93	2.05	0.14	2.93	1.29	1.02	78.59
NEPCTL	4	1.33	3	2.25	0.65	3.84	1.81	0.14	0.14	0.14	0.14	4	1.73	1.51	87.04
RML	2.64	3.26	2.94	1.92	1.15	1.5	2.35	1.89	1.62	1.79	1.15	3.26	2.11	0.67	31.93
SCL	1.99	2.29	3.72	1.37	1.44	1.99	2.35	3.67	2.6	1.65	1.37	3.72	2.31	0.83	35.99
SSML	2.96	3.44	2.68	1.45	0.59	1.51	2.42	5	3.05	2.33	0.59	5	2.54	1.22	48.03
STL	1.8	1.51	3.6	2.82	2.1	1.73	3.07	2.7	1.8	2	1.51	3.6	2.31	0.69	29.85
SSIL	2.94	5.97	4.72	3.34	1.16	6.41	5.94	1.76	1.28	0.89	0.89	6.41	3.44	2.17	63.20
SSL	2.05	3.54	2.33	1.13	0.31	0.87	1.43	2.28	1.89	1.9	0.31	3.54	1.77	0.90	50.74
VTML	2.46	5.6	2.43	0.71	7.78	4.09	4.18	0.11	0.23	1.02	0.11	7.78	2.86	2.53	88.58
VTXIL	1.06	2.29	3.14	1.65	0.33	1.36	1.43	2.49	2.61	2.34	0.33	3.14	1.87	0.85	45.35
Min	0.47	1.11	0.16	0.16	0.04	0.20	0.15	0.11	0.14	0.14					
Max	8.93	5.97	6.19	3.34	7.78	6.41	5.94	6.01	4.13	3.23					
MEAN	2.83	3.14	2.68	1.56	1.82	2.00	2.59	2.30	1.83	1.59			2.23		61.93
STDEV	1.84	1.56	1.60	0.97	2.04	1.64	1.51	1.54	1.06	0.83					
CV	0.65	0.50	0.60	0.62	1.12	0.82	0.58	0.67	0.58	0.52					

Table 5:-Interest Coverage Ratio Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014.

ICR	Mar-05	Mar-06	Mar-07	Mar-08	Mar-09	Mar-10	Mar-11	Mar-12	Mar-13	Mar-14	Min	Max	Mean	STDEV	CV
ACML	4.18	4.22	3.51	2.44	1.74	2.44	4.88	4.66	3.02	3.39	1.74	4.88	3.45	1.04	30.25
BASL	3.66	1.11	4.24	3.15	1.67	2.15	4.26	-0.08	2.07	2.22	-0.08	4.26	2.45	1.40	57.07
CFL	3.94	3.84	0.51	0.16	5.48	0.2	1.04	0	-0.14	0.72	-0.14	5.48	1.58	2.04	129.50
CTL	1.13	2.17	0.75	0.4	3.08	0.7	2.22	-0.65	1.75	1.21	-0.65	3.08	1.28	1.07	83.76
GTL	2.04	1.78	1.55	0.26	0.9	0.35	0.15	-0.67	-0.73	-0.75	-0.75	2.04	0.49	1.05	215.11
KGDL	2.45	4.35	0.43	0.39	0.04	1.01	1.47	1.47	1.91	1.36	0.04	4.35	1.49	1.25	83.70
KPRML	8.93	5.73	6.19	1.51	3.69	4.07	3.87	1.7	3.46	3.93	1.51	8.93	4.31	2.19	50.77
KSML	2.22	2.44	2.36	1.69	0.59	1.46	2.58	-0.44	1.67	1.51	-0.44	2.58	1.61	0.93	58.08
LMCL	0.47	1.59	0.16	1.5	0.14	0.31	1.2	-0.76	1.22	2.37	-0.76	2.37	0.82	0.92	111.62
NEPCTL	4	1.33	3	2.25	0.65	3.84	1.81	2.01	1.98	1.67	0.65	4	2.25	1.07	47.28
RML	2.64	3.26	2.94	1.92	1.15	1.5	2.35	0.85	2.43	2.44	0.85	3.26	2.15	0.78	36.27
SCL	1.99	2.29	3.72	1.37	1.44	1.99	2.35	-0.58	1.89	3.39	-0.58	3.72	1.99	1.18	59.31
SSML	2.96	3.44	2.68	1.45	0.59	1.51	2.42	-0.17	1.96	2	-0.17	3.44	1.88	1.09	57.98
STL	1.8	1.51	3.6	2.82	2.1	1.73	3.07	-0.11	2.25	2.5	-0.11	3.6	2.13	1.02	47.90
SSIL	2.94	5.97	4.72	3.34	1.16	6.41	5.94	-0.78	2.52	2.91	-0.78	6.41	3.51	2.30	65.36
SSL	2.05	3.54	2.33	1.13	0.31	0.87	1.43	-1.51	1.11	1.05	-1.51	3.54	1.23	1.32	107.63
VTML	2.46	5.6	2.43	0.71	7.78	4.09	4.18	4.75	2.63	4.04	0.71	7.78	3.87	1.97	50.86
VTXIL	1.06	2.29	3.14	1.65	0.33	1.36	1.43	0.68	1.06	-4.06	-4.06	3.14	0.89	1.92	214.29
Min	0.47	1.11	0.16	0.16	0.04	0.20	0.15	-1.51	-0.73	-4.06					
Max	8.93	5.97	6.19	3.34	7.78	6.41	5.94	4.75	3.46	4.04					
MEA	2.83	3.14	2.68	1.56	1.82	2.00	2.59	0.58	1.78	1.77			2.0		83.

N													8		71
STDEV	1.84	1.56	1.60	0.97	2.04	1.64	1.51	1.77	1.02	1.89					
CV	0.65	0.50	0.60	0.62	1.12	0.82	0.58	3.08	0.57	1.06					

Table6:-Debtors' Turnover Ratio Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014.

DTR	**Mar-05**	**Mar-06**	**Mar-07**	**Mar-08**	**Mar-09**	**Mar-10**	**Mar-11**	**Mar-12**	**Mar-13**	**Mar-14**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**STDEV**	**CV**
ACML	4.75	2.78	6.34	37.69	35.81	37.31	43.91	25.45	14.78	7.77	2.78	43.91	21.66	16.09	74.27
BASL	54.24	19.93	19.9	22.94	11.04	11.38	18.5	27.62	25.19	29.18	11.04	54.24	23.99	12.24	51.01
CFL	6.95	7.24	10.3	5.81	6.82	7.97	6.04	44.71	34.42	52.83	5.81	52.83	18.31	18.29	99.88
CTL	5.86	5.62	6.34	7.13	7.5	7.57	14.04	12.31	32.35	20.24	5.62	32.35	11.90	8.56	72.00
GTL	35.1	25.72	18.57	9.57	6.02	7.48	7.33	43.61	85.87	79.94	6.02	85.87	31.92	29.73	93.12
KGDL	8.51	4.39	4.94	4.34	3.89	3.34	4.13	22.97	21.74	24.66	3.34	24.66	10.29	8.99	87.37
KPRML	4.69	6.61	6.25	14.22	8.13	7.02	15.23	33	30.84	31.06	4.69	33	15.71	11.51	73.30
KSML	8.51	8.21	8.67	5.73	7.61	9.71	9.01	40.11	25.72	21.75	5.73	40.11	14.50	11.16	76.96
LMCL	7.14	12.14	10.56	9.4	13.35	13.47	12.27	32.87	39.84	40.12	7.14	40.12	19.12	13.04	68.24
NEPCTL	9.99	8.72	7.92	27.13	17.1	7.07	7.09	39.45	12.69	17.69	7.07	39.45	15.49	10.54	68.06
RML	6.05	3.15	4.51	6.65	7.13	7.96	10.27	44.45	36.79	32.57	3.15	44.45	15.95	15.55	97.47
SCL	16.42	15.28	29.87	38.17	27.65	16.88	13.23	27.4	31.77	38.02	13.23	38.17	25.47	9.40	36.92
SSML	4.72	6.09	6.9	7.08	9.08	8.4	5.88	25.77	37.62	34.53	4.72	37.62	14.61	12.84	87.87
STL	7	8.44	15.06	26.95	17.08	14.9	20.51	38.04	27.19	28.63	7	38.04	20.38	9.78	47.97
SSIL	3.95	4.18	5.23	5.71	9.53	16.15	8.65	33.53	41.01	47.73	3.95	47.73	17.57	16.73	95.21
SSL	4.69	5.36	6.87	5.93	4.91	4.73	4.78	34.1	31.83	29.41	4.69	34.1	13.26	12.84	96.86
VTML	24.61	19.88	21.8	33.09	37.74	25.59	34	58.42	44.86	39.52	19.88	58.42	33.95	11.86	34.94
VTXIL	3.43	2.97	4.1	3.66	3.83	3.16	5.99	9.57	8.76	4.43	2.97	9.57	4.99	2.36	47.36
Min	3.43	2.78	4.10	3.66	3.83	3.16	4.13	9.57	8.76	4.43					
Max	54.24	25.72	29.87	38.17	37.74	37.31	43.91	58.42	85.87	79.94					
MEAN	12.03	9.26	10.79	15.07	13.01	11.67	13.38	32.97	32.40	32.23			18.28		72.71
STDEV	13.33	6.70	7.28	12.29	10.43	8.48	10.55	11.87	16.61	17.18					
CV	1.11	0.72	0.67	0.82	0.80	0.73	0.79	0.36	0.51	0.53					

Table7:-Inventory Turnover Ratios Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014.

ITR	Mar-05	Mar-06	Mar-07	Mar-08	Mar-09	Mar-10	Mar-11	Mar-12	Mar-13	Mar-14	Min	Max	Mean	STDEV	CV
ACML	1.24	1.12	1	1.36	1.5	1.4	1.96	2.13	3.27	4.59	1	4.59	1.96	1.14	58.24
BASL	2.03	1.55	1.62	1.8	2.59	3.42	2.56	3.49	5.62	6.28	1.55	6.28	3.10	1.66	53.51
CFL	3.25	2.18	2.99	2.38	5.36	5.79	7.48	9.26	8.19	6.02	2.18	9.26	5.29	2.52	47.72
CTL	4.79	3.5	4.18	3.28	4.12	4.34	3.6	4.39	5.12	4.08	3.28	5.12	4.14	0.57	13.79
GTL	5.68	5.15	4.04	2.7	5.2	4.57	4.98	6.31	4.28	3.89	2.7	6.31	4.68	1.02	21.80
KGDL	8.88	2.94	2.97	3.48	3.41	4.02	3.94	4.27	5.28	7.19	2.94	8.88	4.64	1.96	42.18
KPRML	0.9	4.87	3.74	2.45	3.13	6.14	3.49	2.78	4.87	5.07	0.9	6.14	3.74	1.53	40.96
KSML	3.59	3.38	4.89	3.43	3.66	9.73	4.44	8.73	6.82	5.98	3.38	9.73	5.47	2.30	42.08
LMCL	6.06	6.38	5.26	4.74	6.2	0.99	1.14	2.89	5.23	6.72	0.99	6.72	4.56	2.14	46.86
NEPCTL	13.25	13.07	10.7	11.06	12.67	11.83	10.88	14.27	16.23	13.64	10.7	16.23	12.76	1.73	13.57
RML	4.6	2.73	3.29	3.27	3.61	3.1	2.58	3.34	3.68	5.23	2.58	5.23	3.54	0.81	22.95
SCL	4.58	3.46	3.88	4.31	4.73	2.68	1.8	2.45	3.87	4.82	1.8	4.82	3.66	1.04	28.49
SSML	2.52	3	3.09	3.41	5.91	2.76	1.95	3.12	2.89	3.18	1.95	5.91	3.18	1.04	32.71
STL	1.8	1.63	1.97	2.62	3.33	2.84	2.83	3.14	3.72	2.37	1.63	3.72	2.63	0.68	26.07
SSIL	3.1	3.12	3.66	2.13	5.3	3.8	2.72	4.83	4.13	3.23	2.13	5.3	3.60	0.96	26.63
SSL	4.25	2.89	4.32	3.35	4.81	6.31	3.19	7.17	6.23	5.28	2.89	7.17	4.78	1.45	30.43
VTML	7.42	4.85	5.06	3.12	4.91	3.74	5.9	6.27	5.28	4.59	3.12	7.42	5.11	1.23	23.99
VTXIL	2.26	1.93	2.01	1.41	1.24	1.11	1.28	3.76	3.06	2.98	1.11	3.76	2.10	0.91	43.05
Min	0.90	1.12	1.00	1.36	1.24	0.99	1.14	2.13	2.89	2.37					
Max	13.25	13.07	10.70	11.06	12.67	11.83	10.88	14.27	16.23	13.64					
MEAN	4.46	3.76	3.82	3.35	4.54	4.37	3.71	5.14	5.43	5.29			4.39		34.17
STDEV	3.05	2.70	2.09	2.12	2.46	2.82	2.42	3.11	3.02	2.48					
CV	0.69	0.72	0.55	0.63	0.54	0.65	0.65	0.60	0.56	0.47					

Table 8:-Creditors' Turnover Ratios Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014.

CTR	Mar-05	Mar-06	Mar-07	Mar-08	Mar-09	Mar-10	Mar-11	Mar-12	Mar-13	Mar-14	Min	Max	Mean	STDEV	CV
ACML	69.9	53.32	38.68	34.99	31.33	14.02	14.34	88.64	55.88	55.51	14.02	88.64	45.66	23.68	51.85
BASL	30.87	30.71	29.31	22.19	17.31	14.79	16.81	35.96	34.21	25.37	14.79	35.96	25.75	7.63	29.61
CFL	5.94	6.18	8.78	5.82	4.77	5.65	4.44	62.45	68.2	54.43	4.44	68.2	22.67	27.15	119.79
CTL	15.72	14.13	14.76	8.44	6.42	11.09	30.9	12.2	60.33	40.35	6.42	60.33	21.43	17.25	80.47
GTL	8.15	7.78	9.2	7.37	6.97	10.98	10.31	79.91	27.46	43.03	6.97	79.91	21.12	23.74	112.44
KGDL	12.5	11.23	9.79	7.84	8.3	9.77	11.77	81.44	76.69	79.48	7.84	81.44	30.88	33.40	108.14
KPRML	11.05	13.4	9.64	7.68	6.97	7.37	8.58	61.97	69.28	43.65	6.97	69.28	23.96	24.57	102.57
KSML	12.5	12.82	12.95	8.63	7.37	8.85	10.83	33.15	12.12	19.8	7.37	33.15	13.90	7.59	54.57
LMCL	18.1	23.01	22.85	12.4	9.6	11.85	14.43	50.6	52.45	53.05	9.6	53.05	26.83	17.95	66.88
NEPCTL	43.8	47.19	186.43	168.63	76.69	79.48	98.33	42.31	74.17	76.04	42.31	186.43	89.31	50.02	56.01
RML	29.34	22.32	20.32	12.94	11.08	11.74	10.05	35.14	30.57	31.99	10.05	35.14	21.55	9.72	45.10
SCL	8.03	6.58	7.31	7.58	8.13	8.26	12.04	21.88	12.97	12.87	6.58	21.88	10.57	4.65	43.99
SSML	15.99	17.92	14.54	8.44	5.83	7.6	8.53	62.41	37.91	47.24	5.83	62.41	22.64	19.61	86.62
STL	12.1	11.54	14.47	11.91	6.52	7.83	11.29	30.25	40.41	42.89	6.52	42.89	18.92	13.62	71.99
SSIL	12.91	13.48	12.14	9.11	8.97	9.52	10.16	61.34	36.03	28.84	8.97	61.34	20.25	17.14	84.66
SSL	21.72	19.26	18.95	14.71	13.68	17.6	22.94	50.33	49.44	44.76	13.68	50.33	27.34	14.71	53.81
VTML	29.8	20.58	18.81	12.53	9.54	7.22	7.73	8.7	8.05	7.54	7.22	29.8	13.05	7.60	58.22
VTXIL	3.29	2.92	3.51	2.68	2.44	2.91	4.12	4.73	7.91	9.21	2.44	9.21	4.37	2.33	53.30
Min	3.29	2.92	3.51	2.68	2.44	2.91	4.12	4.73	7.91	7.54					
Max	69.90	53.32	186.43	168.63	76.69	79.48	98.33	88.64	76.69	79.48					
MEAN	20.10	18.58	25.14	20.22	13.44	13.70	17.09	45.75	41.89	39.78			25.57		71.11
STDEV	16.21	13.46	41.13	37.73	17.01	16.78	21.24	25.16	22.84	20.48					
CV	0.81	0.72	1.64	1.87	1.27	1.23	1.24	0.55	0.55	0.51					

Table9:-Return On Capital Employed Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014

ROCE	Mar-05	Mar-06	Mar-07	Mar-08	Mar-09	Mar-10	Mar-11	Mar-12	Mar-13	Mar-14	Min	Max	Mean	STDEV	CV
ACML	13.25	14.58	9.73	11.72	11.93	14.85	20.52	20.57	22.78	25.48	9.73	25.48	16.54	5.37	32.45
BASL	30.18	9.07	6.44	6.54	7.22	9.41	15.15	5.27	16.97	15.45	5.27	30.18	12.17	7.61	62.52
CFL	19.47	7.9	4.88	2.54	-45.92	7.49	1.74	25.36	14.62	26.22	-45.92	26.22	6.43	20.47	318.32
CTL	9.97	13.45	11.69	5.08	-12.04	12.27	23.29	0.53	13.82	21.65	-12.04	23.29	9.97	10.25	102.85
GTL	13.37	11.86	5.9	3.75	-3.22	1.84	6.25	0.07	-19.95	-1.89	-19.95	13.37	1.80	9.37	521.50
KGDL	14.23	19.07	8.21	9.02	7.07	16.94	20.69	27.68	31.16	24.97	7.07	31.16	17.90	8.40	46.92
KPRML	23.56	17.17	13.18	10.2	15.68	18.14	15.81	13.98	27.26	25.42	10.20	27.26	18.04	5.61	31.08
KSML	17.26	16.53	17.49	13.05	7.24	12.54	15.35	1.18	17.86	16.38	1.18	17.86	13.49	5.40	40.01
LMCL	8.87	10.34	9.2	1.35	4.1	6.92	9.46	0.53	21.79	14.30	0.53	21.79	8.69	6.25	71.92
NEPCTL	6.65	35.06	8.1	6.76	-2.13	0.57	-0.49	1.70	3.97	3.97	-2.13	35.06	6.42	10.61	165.30
RML	15.59	14.17	16.56	12.7	11.2	13.86	16.42	12.22	17.75	16.92	11.20	17.75	14.74	2.23	15.14
SCL	13.42	15.64	19.07	13.83	15.8	14.53	19.67	4.61	23.14	28.96	4.61	28.96	16.87	6.48	38.41
SSML	22.06	19.74	18.53	12.23	7.59	11.87	15.04	3.34	18.56	18.54	3.34	22.06	14.75	5.94	40.28
STL	10.21	14.02	14.44	11.42	5.49	7.32	14.54	4.21	19.77	15.72	4.21	19.77	11.71	4.93	42.05
SSIL	22.64	26.51	25.04	20.76	15.28	27.65	26.53	4.62	26.69	26.21	4.62	27.65	22.19	7.23	32.58
SSL	15.71	18.48	14.99	11.75	4.88	14.8	17.61	-7.18	22.92	20.03	-7.18	22.92	13.40	8.73	65.19
VTML	21.14	11.83	15.91	10.09	11.97	13.44	25.57	15.43	21.42	21.09	10.09	25.57	16.79	5.19	30.92
VTXIL	9.03	20.43	10.87	10.25	1.7	6.44	9.72	4.84	14.62	-13.83	-13.83	20.43	7.41	9.07	122.49
Min	6.65	7.90	4.88	1.35	-45.92	0.57	-0.49	-7.18	-19.95	-13.83					
Max	30.18	35.06	25.04	20.76	15.80	27.65	26.53	27.68	31.16	28.96					
MEAN	15.92	16.44	12.79	9.61	3.55	11.72	15.16	7.72	17.51	16.98			12.74		12.74
STDEV	6.23	6.50	5.41	4.69	14.28	6.29	7.51	9.46	11.14	11.00					
CV	0.39	0.40	0.42	0.49	4.03	0.54	0.50	1.23	0.64	0.65					

Table10:-Return On Equity Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014.

ROE	Mar-05	Mar-06	Mar-07	Mar-08	Mar-09	Mar-10	Mar-11	Mar-12	Mar-13	Mar-14	Min	Max	Mean	STDEV	CV
ACML	19.64	19.17	2.57	12.88	9.23	12.73	19.24	17.34	12.19	14.06	2.57	19.64	13.90	5.34	38.40
BASL	34.65	10.96	10.92	7.17	5.02	8.72	18.68	-8.56	12.71	13.00	-8.56	34.65	11.33	10.86	95.92
CFL	18.95	6.03	-3.66	-14.99	-96.6	-35.41	64.67	31.18	10.40	35.70	-96.60	64.67	1.63	44.38	2728.15
CTL	-1.84	5.68	-2.33	-7.56	-16.89	-14.24	37.24	34.98	16.87	10.82	-16.89	37.24	6.27	18.87	300.83
GTL	10.25	9.31	4.2	-11.72	-16.12	12.55	17.76	77.09	64.58	24.56	-16.12	77.09	19.25	29.99	155.80
KGDL	12.3	26.92	-13.43	-12.53	-28.61	0.4	9.54	14.10	24.54	9.74	-28.61	26.92	4.30	17.75	412.98
KPRML	33.63	17.56	15.6	1.98	9.36	12.28	12.8	5.39	15.21	17.18	1.98	33.63	14.10	8.54	60.59
KSML	18.72	24.67	24.7	19.93	-12.95	13.78	29.2	-69.15	23.86	13.46	-69.15	29.20	8.62	29.75	345.07
LMCL	38.07	37.37	23.24	-28.63	-15.55	6.27	19.35	-91.46	45.12	28.78	-91.46	45.12	6.26	41.77	667.64
NEPCTL	-1.94	29.24	2.41	-8.58	-14.48	-12.97	-0.57	3.95	4.51	4.51	-14.48	29.24	0.61	12.33	2027.57
RML	9.74	11.73	15.65	9.75	5.74	9.23	18.13	0.84	13.54	14.23	0.84	18.13	10.86	5.02	46.24
SCL	8.17	19.1	24.91	9.48	1.12	16.98	25.94	-39.66	20.00	27.56	-39.66	27.56	11.36	19.85	174.75
SSML	30.6	30.87	40.35	18.17	-13.09	13.74	28.14	-47.93	23.32	19.72	-47.93	40.35	14.39	26.16	181.79
STL	6.51	16.93	15.06	6.26	4.44	4.97	20.95	-18.05	17.58	14.42	-18.05	20.95	8.91	11.19	125.69
SSIL	16.96	28.98	30.79	19.75	1.86	29.31	26.96	-21.64	14.04	18.56	-21.64	30.79	16.56	16.07	97.05
SSL	11.7	19.69	11.39	1.42	-30.82	0.35	13.18	-8.66	10.73	4.53	-30.82	19.69	3.35	14.45	431.23
VTML	9.57	1.06	7.03	0.48	3.99	4.72	12.97	6.54	11.74	10.01	0.48	12.97	6.81	4.29	63.00
VTXIL	-0.92	37.51	11.3	6.4	-10.14	2.92	5.49	-23.82	0.75	18.07	-23.82	37.51	4.76	16.28	342.32
Min	-1.94	1.06	-13.4	-28.6	-96.6	-35.4	-0.57	-91.4	0.75	4.51					

			3	3	0	1		6							
Max	38.07	37.51	40.35	19.93	9.36	29.31	64.67	77.09	64.58	35.70					
MEAN	15.26	19.60	12.26	1.65	-11.92	4.80	21.09	-7.64	18.98	16.61			9.07		460.83
STDEV	12.37	10.85	13.31	13.34	24.56	14.27	14.16	39.26	14.82	8.29					
CV	0.81	0.55	1.09	8.10	-2.06	2.98	0.67	-5.14	0.78	0.50					

Table11:-Operating Profit Margins Of The Tamil Nadu Textile Companies During The Period 2005 To 2014.

OPM	**Mar-05**	**Mar-06**	**Mar-07**	**Mar-08**	**Mar-09**	**Mar-10**	**Mar-11**	**Mar-12**	**Mar-13**	**Mar-14**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**STDEV**	**CV**
ACML	26.17	33.08	22.03	29.26	26.84	27.68	30.84	30.91	23.03	22.81	22.03	33.08	27.26	3.81	13.97
BASL	44.09	26.77	26.9	20.66	15.99	19	22.04	7.85	20.48	17.00	7.85	44.09	22.08	9.48	42.95
CFL	11.86	13.89	4.89	2.53	-34.87	5.04	1.13	12.82	8.36	11.17	-34.87	13.89	3.68	14.26	387.23
CTL	9.61	15.29	12.88	8.14	-12.95	11.05	16.4	0.22	13.81	9.62	-12.95	16.40	8.41	8.78	104.41
GTL	10.97	14.45	15.45	12.33	-12.86	6.08	13.89	0.15	-8.05	-6.20	-12.86	15.45	4.62	10.57	228.60
KGDL	9.03	18.23	7.94	8.44	5.76	11	10.43	12.03	11.89	8.76	5.76	18.23	10.35	3.38	32.61
KPRML	29.7	26.98	25.7	14.86	20.08	23.03	22.31	15.80	24.32	19.31	14.86	29.70	22.21	4.76	21.45
KSML	18.53	21.76	22.89	21.87	13.56	19.68	19.07	1.53	17.17	12.87	1.53	22.89	16.89	6.35	37.60
LMCL	9.58	11.16	11.75	2.93	8.49	11.63	12.19	0.78	26.37	13.14	0.78	26.37	10.80	6.84	63.30
NEPCTL	10.06	36.31	10.34	7.71	-2.12	0.46	-0.41	18.58	54.84	54.84	-2.12	54.84	19.06	21.90	114.91
RML	22.95	27.65	29.45	24.66	25.22	28.26	30.64	20.49	26.43	22.57	20.49	30.64	25.83	3.25	12.58
SCL	12.83	20.39	21.75	15.82	15.94	17.48	20.19	3.72	16.43	15.82	3.72	21.75	16.04	5.09	31.74
SSML	22.45	21.9	24.41	19.51	15.35	20.69	20.67	4.27	18.28	15.77	4.27	24.41	18.33	5.70	31.09
STL	23.42	33.26	29.57	24.54	17.85	16.97	19.31	5.57	18.69	14.80	5.57	33.26	20.40	7.81	38.30
SSIL	15.17	24.98	30.72	31.8	19.1	32.08	29.9	6.30	26.52	22.03	6.30	32.08	23.86	8.38	35.13
SSL	11.64	18.09	15.27	12.18	4.74	11.6	11.91	-4.14	11.31	8.57	-4.14	18.09	10.12	6.13	60.59
VTML	17.21	12.27	15.15	10.75	11.95	15.1	20.7	13.78	16.91	14.97	10.75	20.70	14.88	2.93	19.69
VTXIL	9.85	25.6	19.78	22.89	5.02	22.43	25.03	10.53	34.85	-72.6	-72.	34.85	10.34	30.46	294.70

										1	61				
Min	9.03	11.16	4.89	2.53	-34.87	0.46	-0.41	-4.14	-8.05	-72.61					
Max	44.09	36.31	30.72	31.80	26.84	32.08	30.84	30.91	54.84	54.84					
MEAN	17.51	22.34	19.27	16.16	7.95	16.63	18.12	8.96	20.09	11.40			15.84		87.27
STDEV	9.29	7.54	7.87	8.70	15.50	8.49	8.89	8.82	12.66	24.01					
CV	0.53	0.34	0.41	0.54	1.95	0.51	0.49	0.98	0.63	2.11					

Table12:-net profit margins of the tamilnadu textile companies during the period 2005 to 2014.

NPM	**Mar-05**	**Mar-06**	**Mar-07**	**Mar-08**	**Mar-09**	**Mar-10**	**Mar-11**	**Mar-12**	**Mar-13**	**Mar-14**	**Min**	**Max**	**Mean**	**STDEV**	**CV**
ACML	14.56	17.61	1.77	8.55	6.21	8.02	13.23	13.23	6.10	7.73	1.77	17.61	9.70	4.80	49.46
BASL	21.61	18.84	16.38	5.64	2.81	4.24	7.07	-3.56	4.88	4.51	-3.56	21.61	8.24	8.00	97.02
CFL	4.31	6.05	-1.68	-6.1	-45.58	-4.14	-10.08	-6.47	-2.35	3.43	-45.58	6.05	-6.26	14.75	-235.64
CTL	-0.81	2.67	-1.14	-4.25	-27.9	-2.32	6.27	-12.38	4.47	1.33	-27.90	6.27	-3.41	10.05	-295.18
GTL	1.81	1.94	1.95	-5.87	-41.45	-23.06	-7.55	-8.30	-12.19	-13.70	-41.45	1.95	-10.64	13.44	-126.26
KGDL	2.63	7.22	-3.21	-3.12	-5.21	0.06	1.3	1.75	3.00	1.11	-5.21	7.22	0.55	3.62	655.03
KPRML	17.15	11.76	13.26	1.36	6.1	6.9	7.98	2.63	6.75	6.58	1.36	17.15	8.05	4.79	59.56
KSML	3.84	5.39	4.92	5.11	-2.84	2.9	5.7	-9.75	3.41	1.88	-9.75	5.70	2.06	4.84	235.55
LMCL	2.74	4.12	3.81	-4.81	-1.74	1.07	3.03	-8.78	6.70	4.26	-8.78	6.70	1.04	4.77	458.25
NEPCTL	-1.32	26.94	2.76	-8.75	-12.7	-9.01	-0.21	8.58	34.84	24.84	-12.70	34.84	6.60	16.74	253.81
RML	5.49	6.82	8.16	4.87	2.82	4.52	8.28	0.44	6.92	6.13	0.44	8.28	5.44	2.43	44.61
SCL	1.91	5.04	6.41	2.3	0.26	4.06	5.54	-6.22	3.63	5.32	-6.22	6.41	2.83	3.70	130.81
SSML	5.47	5.56	8.13	4.37	-3.19	3.23	5.92	-7.73	4.19	3.66	-7.73	8.13	2.96	4.77	161.09
STL	5.77	17.62	16.01	6.63	4.6	2.67	6.7	-5.85	5.31	4.13	-5.85	17.62	6.36	6.60	103.82
SSIL	5.41	10.0	11.6	9.51	0.84	14.0	11.9	-	5.60	7.68	-	14.	6.7	6.94	103.

		3	6			8	7	9.71			9.71	08	1		47
SSL	2.98	6.05	3.53	0.44	-7.48	0.08	2.91	11.27	1.73	0.64	-7.48	11.27	2.21	4.76	214.95
VTML	6.15	0.78	5.1	0.39	3.39	4.77	9.01	5.38	8.60	6.69	0.39	9.01	5.03	2.89	57.47
VTXIL	-0.31	15.65	10.34	6.13	-9.83	3.07	4.24	-13.88	3.47	15.94	-13.88	15.94	3.48	9.72	279.25
Min	-1.32	0.78	-3.21	-8.75	-45.58	-23.06	-10.08	-13.88	-12.19	-13.70					
Max	21.61	26.94	16.38	9.51	6.21	14.08	13.23	13.23	34.84	24.84					
MEAN	5.52	9.45	6.01	1.24	-7.27	1.17	4.52	-2.74	5.28	5.12			2.83		124.84
STDEV	6.19	7.13	5.81	5.55	15.55	7.80	5.91	8.22	8.69	7.46					
CV	1.12	0.75	0.97	4.46	-2.14	6.64	1.31	-3.00	1.65	1.46					