

# What do we know about changing economic activity of firms?

No. 249

22-January-2019

Radhika Pandey, Amey Sapre and Pramod Sinha



National Institute of Public Finance and Policy  
New Delhi

# What do we know about changing economic activity of firms?

**Radhika Pandey**  
radhesp@gmail.com

**Amey Sapre**  
amey07@gmail.com

**Pramod Sinha**  
pramod.sinha@gmail.com

30th December, 2018  
Revised 19th July, 2019

---

## Abstract

Identification of primary economic activity of firms is a prerequisite for compiling several macro aggregates. In this paper we take a statistical approach to understand the extent of changes in primary economic activity of firms over time and across different industries. We use the history of economic activity of over 46000 firms spread over 25 years from CMIE Prowess to identify the number of times firms change the nature of their business. Using the count of changes, we estimate Poisson and Negative Binomial regression models to gain predictability over changing economic activity across industry groups. We show that a Poisson model accurately characterizes the distribution of count of changes across industries and that firms with a long history are more likely to have changed their primary economic activity over the years. Findings show that classification can be a crucial problem in a large dataset like the MCA21 and can even lead to distortions in value addition estimates at the industry level.

**JEL:** E00, E01

**Keywords:** Economic Activity, Manufacturing, India, Poisson Distribution

## 1 Introduction

In this paper we take a statistical approach to understand changes in the economic activity undertaken by firms. The purpose is two fold; first to quantify the extent of changes at an industry level, and second to gain predictability over changes across different industries and time period. Identification and classification of economic activity are at the core of any statistical information system and are also important pre-requisites for compiling industry and macro aggregates. In the Indian case, some routinely used classification systems are the National Industrial Classification (NIC) for classifying economic activity of firms, National Product Classification for Service Sector (NPCSS), Indian Trade Clarification Harmonized System ITC-HS codes for trade in products, etc. that are often integrated with entity level identifiers such as Corporate Identity Number (CIN) for identification purposes.

The problem of identification gains importance when existing classification systems may not entirely serve the purpose for various statistical exercises. For instance, identification of the primary economic activity of a firm is of crucial importance from a national accounting perspective since macro aggregates such as Gross Value Addition (GVA), savings, capital stock etc., are required to be computed at a disaggregated industry level. While it may seem straight forward to compute an aggregate at the industry level, the issues with any given classification system are of accuracy and reliability. Problems emerge because firms can have multiple economic activities and even diversify across industries as part of their usual business strategy. There is a large body of literature explaining the motivation behind firm's decision to diversify their business activities (see for instance Seddon et al., 2004, Mishra & Akbar, 2007). Typically, over the years, firms may have lower growth opportunities in their current activities and thus may choose to move into other sectors. Hyland & Diltz (2002) suggest that firms may have accumulated a reserve of liquid cash which they can use to diversify. In the Indian context, in the post liberalization period, many companies shifted to high growth sectors such as information technology, retail, real estate and telecommunications. Thus, from an information system point of view, existing classification systems may not be dynamic enough to capture actual changes in firms' business activities that frequently and lead to a misclassification problem when the data is used for other purposes.

In India classification of economic activity at the firm level primarily follows the NIC system. Firms are assigned different NIC codes at the time of their incorporation which eventually serves the basis for classifying them into industries for any estimation exercise. However, it is well known that such codes once assigned do not change even when the firm changes its economic activity or undertakes activities in other industries. This process poses several challenges for the statistical system as the task of relying on NIC codes for identification may lead to misclassification of firms for computing any industry level aggregate. If firms are misclassified, the outcome can have several inconsistencies, such as (i) incorrect inclusion or exclusion of firms in an industry, (ii) distortion in industry level value addition (GVA) estimates and (iii) incorrect diagnosis and policy formulation for industries. In addition, the consequences are; (i) mis-classified firms introduce volatility in levels and growth rates that is spurious as it does not reflect actual movements in value addition, (ii) it leads to a mis-representation of the GVA-to-Output (GVA/GVO) ratio for various industries.

In recent years, particularly after the introduction of the 2011-12 series of the National Accounts, the problem of identification of economy activity has taken a new dimension. In the 2011-12 series the Gross Value Addition (GVA) estimates of Private Corporate Sector i.e. the organized part of manufacturing and services are computed using the MCA21 dataset which was introduced in 2008. The current identification of primary economic activity

of firms rests on; (See CSO 2015b for additional information) (i) identifying top three revenue generating products (ii) information from reported ITC-HS product codes wherever available, (iii) product details available in the MGT-7/9 forms submitted along with annual financial statements, (iv) checking websites of firms in absence of product information and finally, (v) using NIC codes contained in the CIN of the firms to assign them in a particular sector. The issues with such a strategy are well known and have been a part of the debate on the manufacturing sector (See CSO (2015a), CSO (2015b), Nagaraj (2015a), Nagaraj (2015b), Sapre & Sinha (2016), Manna (2017), NSC (2018) for a brief survey of issues). What is unknown is the extent of misclassification and the impact it may have on industry level GVA estimates.

We take the debate further by highlighting first the extent of the classification problem, which may be one of the sources of inaccuracies in GVA estimation. Second, in absence of any information on how frequently firms change their economic activity, gaining some predictability of changing economic activity can be useful in formulating an identification strategy for sectors that may require reclassification of firms. The approach here is different from explaining the reasons for changes in economic activity as that requires a detailed investigation of firm and industry level characteristics. Thus, as a first step to assess the frequency of change, we build a simple empirical model to estimate the count of changes across different size classes and industries.

## 1.1 Classifying Economic Activity: The Extent of the Problem

In principle, there are two main reasons why classification of economic activity is a concern. First, based on assigned NIC codes, the initial and current activity of any firm may be different. Second, firms may change their nature of business at any point in time and also repeatedly. Taken together, the impact of changes in economic activity on any estimation process cannot be assumed to be negligible. Firms of different sizes move in and out of any industry, which makes it complicated to have an error-free list of firms that are currently and have always been in one economic activity. In such a situation, data users may naively believe that industry level aggregates are based on firms that have their *primary* economic activity in one particular industry and ignore the possibility that current and past business of the firms could be different. Classifying firms requires studying (i) industry in which the firm was registered at the time of incorporation, (ii) the history of economic activities undertaken by the firm, (iii) diversification into other industries and (iv) top revenue generating products of the firm.

Within the available avenues to classify a firm in any industry, it is widely accepted to assign the *primary* economic activity based on the criterion of maximum revenue contribution of *products*. In other words, if a firm has revenue coming from multiple products, the firm is assigned the economic activity (such as manufacturing or services) based on the product that contributes the maximum revenue within all available sources of revenue [See Note 1]. For the organized manufacturing and services sector firms in the MCA21 database, this process is based on the identifiers as mentioned earlier in CSO (2015b) along with their financial statements. Part of problem with this strategy is that the reported ITC-HS are product level codes that do not distinguish between manufacturing and trading as an economic activity.

The criterion of maximum revenue contribution despite being the most practical also has its own limitations. For example, if changes in revenue sources are frequent, the entire enterprise is likely to either get included or excluded on a yearly basis in any industry. These changes can lead to abrupt shifts in levels and growth rates of value addition. Given these problems, the relevant question in this context is: what is the extent of the problem in the Indian scenario?

As earlier, the MCA21 dataset which is used for estimation of value addition in the organized part of manufacturing and service sector has more than 11 lakh firms (See MCA (2019) and Note 5 for details). The extent of changes in economic activity of large and small firms available in the dataset is presently unknown. The task at hand is to first understand the extent of changes in firms' primary economic activity and attempt to gain some

predictability of such changes. We build on this premise to show the extent of changes that happen at a firm level, which can later be used on a large dataset to test for accuracy.

Presently, the MCA21 dataset is unavailable in public domain. To draw a parallel, we use a comparable dataset from CMIE Prowess to explore data of nearly 46000 listed/unlisted Private and Public Ltd. firms spanning over 25 years (1988-2018). The dataset covers a substantial part of firms that submit financial returns in the eXBRL format in the MCA and also has a wide span in terms of coverage across sectors. In addition, a history of economic activity of each firm is generated for each year of data availability based on the details in their product schedule. Given the *maximum revenue contribution* criteria for assigning primary economic activity in any given year, the question that follows is: how frequently does primary activity change? Since businesses can change their primary activity in any year, we begin by arranging firms as per years of data availability. Table 1 shows the number of times primary activity changed for firms with different years of data availability.


Table 1: Changes in primary economic activity of firms over time

Data Avail. (Yrs)	Change in primary activity (number)					Total	At least 1 change	% (D/C)	Cum (Col. D)
	0	1	2	3	4				
A	B					C	D	E	F
1	1025	0	0	0	0	1025	0	0	0
2	5126	296	0	0	0	5422	296	5	296
3	4314	536	26	0	0	4876	562	12	858
4	2957	553	38	0	0	3548	591	17	1449
5	3883	823	66	2	0	4774	891	19	2340
6	2697	755	72	0	0	3524	827	23	3167
7	2014	625	95	7	0	2741	727	27	3894
8	1787	669	109	6	0	2571	784	30	4678
9	1851	762	120	5	0	2738	887	32	5565
10	1605	716	129	7	0	2457	852	35	6417
11	1150	499	91	6	0	1746	596	34	7013
12	1097	463	93	11	0	1664	567	34	7580
13	795	363	85	7	0	1250	455	36	8035
14	646	306	56	5	0	1013	367	36	8402
15	513	240	48	7	0	808	295	37	8697
> 15	3850	1946	627	84	1	6508	2658	41	11355
Total	35310	9552	1655	147	1	46665	11355	24	-

For firms with one year of data, the primary activity is their current activity and hence shows no change. Next, out of 5422 firms with two years of data, 296 firms showed a change as compared to their previous year's activity. Similarly, in case of firms with four years of data, 553 show a change once, while 38 firms changed primary activity twice. As we consider more number of years, changes become more frequent and the extent of the problem appears clearly. In Columns D and E we add the number of firms with changes in primary activity (i.e. excluding no change) for each year and compute its share to get a sense of the magnitude.

The numbers reveal some interesting aspects of firms' businesses; (i) over time, firms are frequent in changing their business activities and such changes are not apparent in any aggregate exercise such as GVA estimation or industry level growth rates, (ii) sources of revenue keep changing, which from a data point of view alters the primary business of the firm, (iii) with a longer time span, the possibility of a large number of firms having repeatedly changed their primary activity increases.

Figure 1: Percentage share of firms with at least one change in primary activity



If we consider the simplest case, Figure 1 plots the share of firms that have changed their primary activity at least once over the years. As earlier, the percentage of firms that show a change increases substantially once we have a longer time span. For example, firms that have eight years data, 30% of them have changed their activity once. To delve deeper at the industry level, we explore firms that have ten years of data and changed their primary activity once. Table 2 shows a cross tabulation of firms changing their primary economic activity from their initial year to their present one over a period of 10 years.

Table 2: Changes in economic activity across industries

Previous Ind.	Industry changed to						Total
	Constr.	Electr.	Fin. Serv.	Manuf.	Mining	NF.Serv.	
Construction	20	0	22	8	0	18	68
Electricity	0	4	9	4	0	1	18
Fin. Serv.	24	3	62	15	3	85	192
Manuf.	7	2	41	68	3	99	220
Mining	0	0	4	0	2	3	9
NF. Serv	8	2	82	57	3	57	209
Total	59	11	220	152	11	263	716

Fin. Serv. is Financial Services, NF.Serv is Non-Financial Services, Manuf. is Manufacturing

As an illustrative case, out of the 220 firms in manufacturing, 99 had moved to non-financial services, while 57 moved into manufacturing from non-financial services at least once in the past 10 years. Over the years, it is possible for firms to move in and out an activity or return to their original activity after having ventured into multiple industries. If we were to include multiple changes, the task becomes unmanageable as it is difficult to track the economic activity in absence of its historic data. The situation would be further accentuated in case of a large dataset like the MCA21, which currently may not have a detailed history of classification of firms. Thus, as a precursor, in what follows, using data from CMIE Prowess, we attempt to predict the number of changes in primary economic activity using basic information such as years of data availability, industry classification and size at the firm level.

## 2 Gaining Predictability Over Changing Economic Activity

One possible approach to predict the number of events is to estimate a Poisson regression on a variable that follows a Poisson distribution. It is well known that the Poisson is a discrete probability distribution that expresses the probability of independent occurrences of a given number of events over a time interval. Rare events, accidents, etc. typically follow a Poisson process and can be modeled using suitable control variables in a regression framework. Similarly, the count of changes in economic activity of firms can be taken as events spread across industries and time. To formulate the basic distribution, suppose that an event can occur 1, 2, ...,  $m$  times in a given interval and the average number of events in that interval is denoted by a parameter ( $\lambda$ ). Given the average value, the probability of observing  $m$  events in the interval is given by the expression;

$$f(m, \lambda) = \Pr(X = m) = \frac{\lambda^m e^{-\lambda}}{m!} \quad (1)$$

The Poisson distribution is characterized by a single parameter ( $\lambda$ ), which can also be used to denote the rate or intensity of the occurrence of the event. In the present case, we can denote the events of change ( $C$ ) in a particular time period as following a Poisson distribution, i.e.

$$C \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda); \lambda > 0 \quad (2)$$

In order to estimate the count of changes, we re-group the data as follows. First, given the heterogeneity of firms, we classify each firm into a size decile based on the distribution of the initial size of firms. We use the three year average of total income plus total assets as a measure of size. Second, we assign each firm into an industry group based on their initial primary economic activity [See Note 1 for details]. Thus, as a starting point of the history, each firm  $f_{ij}$  is classified into an initial size ( $i$ ) and industry ( $j$ ) group. The Poisson distribution can be extended to group data, which is relevant in our case. Using information available in Table 1, if  $C_{ij}$  denotes the total number of changes observed in the  $i$ th size decile and the  $j$ th industry, then extending the Poisson over count in each group, i.e.  $C_{ij} \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda_{ij})$ , we can denote the group total as  $C_{ij} \sim \text{Pois}(n_{ij}\lambda_{ij})$   $j = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . In other words, if individual counts  $C$  are a Poisson process with mean  $\lambda$ , then the group total  $C_{ij}$  is also a Poisson process with the expected count given by  $n_{ij}\lambda_{ij}$ . With  $C \sim \text{Pois}(\lambda)$ , the count of changes ( $C$ ) can be expressed in a Poisson regression as;

$$C = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1,j} + \dots + \beta_k x_{k,j} \quad (3)$$

where  $x$ s are explanatory variables. The response variable can also be expressed as a 'rate' over time or 'incidence' within a given quantity. Thus, ( $C$ ) can be re-expressed as;  $C/t$  or  $C/n$  where ( $n$ ) is a measure of quantity. The log-linear version can be written as;  $\ln(C/n) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1,j} + \dots + \beta_k x_{k,j}$ , which can be rearranged as;

$$\ln(C) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1,j} + \dots + \beta_k x_{k,j} + \ln(n) \quad (4)$$

In the literature, the term  $\ln(n)$  is called an *offset* effect (See Casella & Berger (2002), Cameron and Trivedi (2010) for details and related cases). The offset variable is introduced to account for over-dispersion that makes the mean and variance of the Poisson variable unequal. The variable  $\ln(n)$  is also similar to the notion of 'exposure' and can be explicitly added as a control variable in the regression. The inclusion of the offset variable makes the count equal to;

$$C = e^{\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_{1,j} + \dots + \beta_k x_{k,j} + \ln(n)} = (n) \cdot e^{\beta_0} \cdot e^{\sum_k \beta_k x_{k,j}} \quad (5)$$

thereby making the mean proportional to ( $n$ ). The equation is estimated using the log-link specification with two main variables of interest; years of data availability and dummies for size decile. Findings from Table 1 show that over time, firms are frequent in changing their economic activity. Thus, number of years of data availability becomes an important predictor which is expected to show a positive relation to number of changes. As a

precursor to obtaining the Poisson distribution parameters, we can also formulate a simple linear probability model to quantify the effect of size and years of data availability on changes in economic activity. (See Note 4 for details). However, the Poisson remains the most suitable choice for predicting the total count of changes and rests on two other aspects. First, the spread of the events is always in context to a certain population or exposure. In this particular case, the number of firms in each size decile and industry serve as a measure of exposure. Second, alternate specifications need to be considered in cases of over-dispersion, i.e. where mean and variance of the Poisson variable are unequal. We use two variants of Poisson and Negative Binomial models as alternate specifications [see note 2 for details]. Using (5), the estimated equation is of the type;

$$C_{ij} = \ln(n_{ij}) + \sum_k \beta_k x_{ij} + v_{ij} \quad (6)$$

where ( $C$ ) is the count of changes, ( $n$ ) is the number of firms and ( $x$ )'s include dummies for size decile. Table 3 shows the parameter estimates of four models followed by the predicted counts and descriptive statistics for each group.

Table 3: Parameter estimates of Poisson and Negative Binomial Model

Dep. Var (count)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Variables	Pois	NB	PoisGLM	NBGLM
ln(Avg. years)	0.347*** (0.0814)	0.419*** (0.132)	0.347*** (0.127)	0.419*** (0.129)
ln(nfirms)	0.886*** (0.0247)	0.915*** (0.0229)	0.886*** (0.0285)	0.915*** (0.0200)
Size Dec. (2)	0.0877 (0.114)	0.0940 (0.113)	0.0877 (0.0819)	0.0940 (0.102)
Size Dec. (3)	0.0225 (0.114)	0.0455 (0.117)	0.0225 (0.0851)	0.0455 (0.105)
Size Dec. (4)	0.00723 (0.113)	0.0367 (0.113)	0.00723 (0.0879)	0.0367 (0.107)
Size Dec. (5)	-0.0621 (0.112)	-0.0836 (0.134)	-0.0621 (0.0928)	-0.0836 (0.110)
Size Dec. (6)	-0.106 (0.112)	-0.0780 (0.126)	-0.106 (0.0948)	-0.0780 (0.111)
Size Dec. (7)	-0.273** (0.119)	-0.185 (0.144)	-0.273*** (0.0982)	-0.185* (0.110)
Size Dec. (8)	-0.282** (0.128)	-0.148 (0.144)	-0.282*** (0.0975)	-0.148 (0.110)
Size Dec. (9)	-0.363*** (0.118)	-0.300** (0.136)	-0.363*** (0.0955)	-0.300*** (0.108)
Size Dec. (10)	-0.581*** (0.144)	-0.480*** (0.156)	-0.581*** (0.100)	-0.480*** (0.109)
Constant	-1.043*** (0.218)	-1.430*** (0.345)	-1.043*** (0.236)	-1.430*** (0.257)
N	62	62	62	62
exp(Constant)	0.352	0.239	0.352	0.239
ln( $\alpha$ )		0.020***		
LR $\chi^2$	1754	2317	6525	2316
Prob < $\chi^2$	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Pseudo $R^2$	0.958			
Deviance GoF	241.00		241.00	73.47

Robust standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1



Model 1 is the basic Poisson regression with a log-link specification. As hypothesized, the avg. number of years of data availability shows a positive and significant impact on count of changes. Similarly, the offset variable (number of firms) also suggests that the count of changes increase with an increase in number of firms. To quantify the impact, first, the coefficient on  $\ln(\text{Avg. years})$  can be interpreted as an Incidence Rate Ratio (IRR), i.e.  $[\exp(0.347) \approx 1.414]$  which shows that on average, a year increase in available data increases the probability of change by around 41%  $[\exp(0.347) - 1 \times 100 \approx 41.4]$ . These estimates are fairly consistent with the result in Table 1 and can further be improved with changes in specifications.

The coefficients on size decile dummies suggests that larger sized firms are more likely to change their activity as the net effect of their coefficients and the constant value is positive, i.e.  $[e^c + e^{sd_i}]$  where  $c$  is the value of the constant and  $sd_i$  are the coefficients on respective size decile dummies. In Model 2, we formulate a Negative Binomial model to account for over-dispersion in count. The result is similar to the Poisson case but improves the magnitudes of the parameters. The coefficient on  $\ln(\text{Avg. years})$  shows a much larger impact  $[\exp(0.419) - 1 \times 100 \approx 52.0]$  which confirms the earlier premise that number of changes increase with a longer history of the firm. The Negative Binomial model also suggests that count shows over dispersion as the parameter  $(\alpha) = \exp(0.020) \approx 1.021$  is positive and statistically significant. The counts predicted by these models are tabulated in Tables 4 and 5.

Before we conclude on the results, we can change model specifications to verify if parameter estimates are sensitive to changes in over-dispersion. In the Poisson model over-dispersion  $(\alpha)$  was set to zero, while in the Negative Binomial case it is equal to the mean. In Models 3 and 4 we allow for the variation to be proportional to the size of the exposure instead of the mean. We use the Generalized Linear Model (GLM) that has a link function to allow the variance of each group to be a function of its predicted value [See Note 3]. The model provides us two additional outcomes, i.e. a scale parameter to understand the difference between the mean and variance and the extent to which standard errors are inflated. The estimated scale parameter for Model 3 is 4.69 suggesting that the variance in count is nearly 4 times the mean and thus the standard errors are inflated nearly 2 times  $(\sqrt{4.69} \approx 2.1)$ . Correcting for the standard error also gives us reliable parameter estimates and thus these models can be used to predict the count and a comparison can be drawn to choose the best fitting model.

Tables 4 and 5 show the predicted values along with the information on variables used in the model. The figures include number of firms, average years of data and the average of initial size. Predictions of Model (3) are the closest to the actual count values (nchanges) and is therefore most suitable for drawing inferences from the results. Across size deciles, the predicted values are much closer for higher deciles and particularly for lower count values. The results also reveal interesting facets about firm level data. Across industries, in comparison to sectors such as construction or mining, we expect a larger number of firms in manufacturing or financial services. Thus, in terms of exposure, these sectors are more likely to experience changes in primary economic activity. To delve deeper, in Table 6 we tabulate the descriptive statistics by different size decile.

Descriptive statistics of predicted counts show that the GLM Poisson model predicts closest to actual count in most of the deciles. At the aggregate, the model closely follows the actual distribution and predicts within the range [max–min] of the actual count variable.

Table 4: Predicted count of change for each size decile &amp; industry using Poisson &amp; Negative Binomial Regression

Size. Dec	First industry	N.firms	Avg. Yrs.	Avg. F.size	E(Change)	nchanges	Pois	NB	PoisGLM	NBGLM
1	Construction and Real estate	569	5.62	0.35	0.35	202	177	164	177	164
1	Electricity	201	6.07	0.34	0.18	37	72	65	72	65
1	Financial services	990	7.15	0.44	0.28	281	314	300	314	300
1	Manufacturing	1668	6.21	0.36	0.36	603	475	457	475	457
1	Mining	26	7.19	0.34	0.38	10	13	11	13	11
1	Non-financial services	1375	6.00	0.42	0.23	312	395	377	395	377
2	Construction and Real estate	311	5.89	3.03	0.32	100	115	105	115	105
2	Electricity	108	6.06	2.75	0.30	32	45	41	45	41
2	Financial services	1512	8.93	2.96	0.38	573	539	534	539	534
2	Manufacturing	1096	7.48	3.08	0.36	395	381	369	381	369
2	Mining	17	7.82	3.07	0.53	9	10	8	10	8
2	Non-financial services	1524	6.65	3.02	0.31	470	490	475	490	475
3	Construction and Real estate	331	5.97	8.88	0.31	102	114	107	114	107
3	Electricity	57	6.26	8.72	0.25	14	24	22	24	22
3	Financial services	1417	8.98	9.04	0.34	487	477	480	477	480
3	Manufacturing	1269	8.49	9.10	0.36	457	425	424	425	424
3	Mining	31	10.45	9.20	0.71	22	17	15	17	15
3	Non-financial services	1503	7.27	9.01	0.29	443	467	464	467	464
4	Construction and Real estate	365	6.33	19.50	0.30	111	125	119	125	119
4	Electricity	55	6.53	19.81	0.36	20	24	21	24	21
4	Financial services	1327	9.76	19.24	0.35	466	457	464	457	464
4	Manufacturing	1442	9.45	19.57	0.36	516	486	494	486	494
4	Mining	33	9.39	20.75	0.61	20	17	16	17	16
4	Non-financial services	1440	7.28	19.51	0.29	419	443	443	443	443
5	Construction and Real estate	341	6.97	36.57	0.32	110	114	103	114	103
5	Electricity	50	6.46	35.72	0.08	4	20	17	20	17
5	Financial services	1017	9.46	35.45	0.33	340	333	319	333	319
5	Manufacturing	1800	10.65	37.03	0.33	599	575	564	575	564
5	Mining	27	11.85	35.32	0.52	14	14	13	14	13
5	Non-financial services	1438	7.92	36.25	0.29	415	425	406	425	406

N.Firms is number of firms, Avg. years is the average of years of data availability, Avg. F.size is the average value of initial size\*

E(Change) is the probability of change, i.e. [Nchanges/Nfirms], Nchanges is the total number of changes in primary economic activity

Table 5: Predicted count of change for each size decile & industry  
 using Poisson & Negative Binomial Reg

Size. Dec	First industry	N.firms	Avg. Yrs.	Avg. F.size	E(Change)	nchanges	Pois	NB	PoisGLM	NBGLM
6	Construction and Real estate	321	6.40	65.57	0.36	115	100	95	100	95
6	Electricity	45	7.09	66.48	0.20	9	18	16	18	16
6	Financial services	854	8.95	63.90	0.31	269	268	267	268	267
6	Manufacturing	2082	11.36	65.82	0.31	644	641	666	641	666
6	Mining	24	12.92	63.04	0.54	13	13	12	13	12
6	Non-financial services	1339	7.81	65.37	0.28	370	380	380	380	380
7	Construction and Real estate	307	6.97	117.97	0.39	121	84	85	84	85
7	Electricity	67	8.00	114.38	0.31	21	23	22	23	22
7	Financial services	628	8.34	114.56	0.28	173	169	176	169	176
7	Manufacturing	2330	11.49	116.95	0.25	576	601	667	601	667
7	Mining	40	8.90	119.65	0.30	12	15	15	15	15
7	Non-financial services	1296	7.62	116.10	0.23	299	310	328	310	328
8	Construction and Real estate	342	7.01	224.46	0.31	107	92	97	92	97
8	Electricity	74	6.24	209.65	0.26	19	23	23	23	23
8	Financial services	511	8.37	215.10	0.38	193	139	151	139	151
8	Manufacturing	2392	11.19	216.26	0.23	556	604	701	604	701
8	Mining	35	11.14	221.59	0.63	22	14	15	14	15
8	Non-financial services	1305	7.51	216.57	0.22	283	308	341	308	341
9	Construction and Real estate	398	6.12	482.36	0.27	108	92	91	92	91
9	Electricity	78	6.36	465.53	0.12	9	22	21	22	21
9	Financial services	451	7.64	476.62	0.30	135	111	111	111	111
9	Irrigation	2	8.50	541.95	0.50	1	1	1	1	1
9	Manufacturing	2307	10.53	473.87	0.21	495	528	568	528	568
9	Mining	17	13.76	471.49	0.47	8	7	7	7	7
9	Non-financial services	1414	7.07	482.59	0.22	305	298	307	298	307
10	Construction and Real estate	483	6.35	3286.66	0.27	129	89	92	89	92
10	Electricity	171	9.05	16545.27	0.19	33	40	41	40	41
10	Financial services	636	9.82	7093.53	0.26	167	133	142	133	142
10	Irrigation	6	12.83	13953.82	0.50	3	2	2	2	2
10	Manufacturing	1944	9.30	2971.76	0.15	289	350	385	350	385
10	Mining	47	14.02	9487.74	0.28	13	15	15	15	15
10	Non-financial services	1379	6.83	4300.76	0.16	227	232	247	232	247
	Total	46665	-	-	-	13307	13307	13479	13307	13479

N.Firms is number of firms, Avg. years is the average of years of data availability, Avg. F.size is the average value of initial size\*

E(Change) is the probability of change, i.e. [Nchanges/Nfirms], Nchanges is the total number of changes in primary economic activity

Within the descriptive statistics for each size decile, the primary interest is in comparing the mean of the Poisson variable. Since the essence of the model is in this single parameter, accurately modeling the mean is of a greater priority. Thus, if we compare the results jointly on mean and variance after allowing for over dispersion in the variance, the GLM Poisson model gives us the most desired result.

Table 6: Descriptive statistics of predicted counts by size decile

Size Dec.	Stat.	Actual Count	Predicted			
			Pois	NB	PoisGLM	NBGLM
1	Mean	240.83	240.83	228.94	240.83	228.94
1	SD	216.42	183.51	177.50	183.51	177.50
1	Min	10.00	12.53	10.78	12.53	10.78
1	Max	603.00	474.50	456.56	474.50	456.56
2	Mean	263.17	263.17	255.35	263.17	255.35
2	SD	245.28	234.36	231.65	234.36	231.65
2	Min	9.00	9.67	8.32	9.67	8.32
2	Max	573.00	538.66	533.74	538.66	533.74
3	Mean	254.17	254.17	252.07	254.17	252.07
3	SD	230.54	224.86	226.49	224.86	226.49
3	Min	14.00	17.05	15.50	17.05	15.50
3	Max	487.00	477.26	480.13	477.26	480.13
4	Mean	258.67	258.67	259.43	258.67	259.43
4	SD	232.66	226.42	230.86	226.42	230.86
4	Min	20.00	17.10	15.56	17.10	15.56
4	Max	516.00	485.97	494.14	485.97	494.14
5	Mean	247.00	247.00	236.93	247.00	236.93
5	SD	242.03	232.45	227.51	232.45	227.51
5	Min	4.00	14.48	12.65	14.48	12.65
5	Max	599.00	575.25	564.32	575.25	564.32
6	Mean	236.67	236.67	239.28	236.67	239.28
6	SD	245.52	245.41	254.96	245.41	254.96
6	Min	9.00	12.87	11.84	12.87	11.84
6	Max	644.00	640.53	666.07	640.53	666.07
7	Mean	200.33	200.33	215.28	200.33	215.28
7	SD	212.38	225.06	250.02	225.06	250.02
7	Min	12.00	15.04	14.53	15.04	14.53
7	Max	576.00	601.38	666.52	601.38	666.52
8	Mean	196.67	196.67	221.21	196.67	221.21
8	SD	203.32	226.42	263.30	226.42	263.30
8	Min	19.00	14.32	14.66	14.32	14.66
8	Max	556.00	604.34	700.86	604.34	700.86
9	Mean	151.57	151.57	157.85	151.57	157.85
9	SD	185.86	195.32	209.32	195.32	209.32
9	Min	1.00	0.95	0.82	0.95	0.82
9	Max	495.00	528.47	567.51	528.47	567.51
10	Mean	123.00	123.00	132.00	123.00	132.00
10	SD	111.76	127.55	140.05	127.55	140.05
10	Min	3.00	2.34	2.22	2.34	2.22
10	Max	289.00	349.82	384.96	349.82	384.96
Total	Mean	214.63	214.63	217.42	214.63	217.42
Total	SD	203.19	202.35	209.64	202.35	209.64
Total	Min	1.00	0.95	0.82	0.95	0.82
Total	Max	644.00	640.53	700.86	640.53	700.86


Based on the results we note that statistically, one can gain predictability over changes in economic activity with a high degree of accuracy. A Poisson model with modifications to allow for over dispersion sufficiently characterizes the actual distribution of changes in economic activity across industry and size deciles. Qualitatively, the results have implications for firm and industry level analysis. First, changes in primary economic activity are driven by the maximum revenue contribution criteria. If frequent changes in sources of major revenue are not captured on a year-to-year basis, it can lead to classification problems and hence present an inaccurate picture at the industry level.

The analysis also shows that firms with longer history and larger size are more likely to face a classification problem. It is also meaningful to ask how would these results translate into identifying the problem in practice? In the context of GVA estimation in the private corporate sector the information from the MCA21 database can be used to get a sense of the magnitude of the classification problem. In Table 7 we tabulate the number of active companies by broad industry group as available in 2019 from the MCA [See Note 5].

Since individual firm level information is unavailable such as age, size or the history of its economic activity, we cannot apply the size decile and other classifiers. Nevertheless, the expected count as given by the Poisson parameter ( $\lambda$ ) can still be used on the aggregate numbers, with some assumptions. We select four major industry groups, namely; manufacturing, construction, mining and non-financial services from the active companies. To get a close mapping of industry groups as available in Tables 4 and 5, we include construction and real estate under one head, and remove finance, insurance and real estate from overall number of service sector companies.

At the aggregate, manufacturing, construction, real estate and non-financial services add up to nearly 10 Lakh companies or 90% of the total active companies. Second, in absence of any knowledge on the size distribution of the companies, we use the Poisson parameters of the middle i.e. 5th Decile as an illustrative case. Thus, in case of manufacturing, if the total number of companies are taken as 2,29,094 we can fit a Poisson distribution;  $Pois \sim (n, \lambda)(229094, 0.33)$  and estimate the count of companies for different number of changes, i.e.  $m = 1, 2, ..M$ . Using values from Table 4, we plot the expected count of firms for different number of changes in economic activity. Figure 2 plots the expected number for the manufacturing and construction sector.


Figure 2: Expected number of firms with changes in economic activity - I



Source: Computed from number of firms by industry, MCA Bulletin, 2019

Given a large number of companies, one would expect a considerable number of companies to have changed their economic activity in the past. The number in case of the manufacturing sector comes to approximately 40,000 companies that may have observed one change. Similarly, Figure 3 describes the magnitude for mining and non-financial services companies.

Figure 3: Expected number of firms with changes in economic activity - II



Source: Computed from number of firms by industry, MCA Bulletin, 2019

Overall, the Poisson parameter when applied even on the aggregate numbers (Table 7) closely approximates the results of the previous exercise (Table 1) as the number of companies taper-off and tends to zero after four changes. Thus, with a large number of companies the problem of misclassification can be a serious challenge, particularly for GVA estimation in the private corporate sector and will require a detailed history of economic activity so as to achieve a proper classification of firms. The predictive results can be significantly improved if other necessary details such as age, year of incorporation, initial and current activity and size characteristics are available on a routine basis. The information coupled with the history of activity can be used to devise an identification strategy that can help in locating firms across size deciles, industry and over time that may require re-classification.

While this exercise is limited to a statistical analysis of changes in economic activity, the reasons behind why and when firms change their business need to be explored both qualitatively and quantitatively. The literature in this domain points to several factors that could influence changes in business activity of firms. Typically, business cycle conditions may drive firms to diversify into other sectors or firms may themselves choose to move to sectors with high growth potential or the sunrise sectors such as renewable energy, multi brand retail, etc. In the post liberalization period sectors such as communication and information technology, retail, real estate saw major expansion and a variety of traditional and new firms entering into this space. On the other hand, the motivation behind diversification and entering new areas of business are also multiple; such as hedging risks, building forward and backward linkages, maximizing assets value and reviving brands.

### 3 Conclusion

In this paper we take a look at how frequently firms change their primary economic activity and discuss issues related to classification of firms. Identification of economic activity of firms is a prerequisite for building several aggregates at the industry level. In the Indian context, systems such as the National Industrial Classification (NIC), ITC-HS codes for trade in products, among other are used for assigning and classifying firms into various economic activities. While such systems serve solely as a means for identification, their use for classification of economic activity of firms can have unintended consequences for any estimation exercise or building industry level aggregates.

In practice, firms are known to diversify and move across industries as part of their usual business strategy. In addition, multiple and frequent changes in economic activity over time makes it difficult for any statistical information system to have an error-free list of firms are currently and have always been in one economic

activity. In such situations, data users may naively believe that industry level aggregates are based on firms that have their *primary* economic activity in one particular industry and ignore the possibility that current and past business of the firms could be different. The impact of changes in economic activity on any estimation process cannot be assumed to be negligible. There are two main consequences of such changes; (i) misclassification introduces spurious volatility in levels and growth rates as it does not represent actual movements in value addition in a sector, and (ii) it distorts the value added-to-output (GVA/GVO) ratio which is significantly different for manufacturing and services.

To identify changes in economic activity, we use data from CMIE for over 46000 firms spread over a period of 20 years. Based on the history of the economic activity of firms, we count the number of times firms change the nature of their business and thus move in and out of different industries. We show that firms with longer history are more likely to have changed their business more than once and such changes are not apparent while dealing with industry level aggregates. Considering a period of over 25 years, findings also show that the share of firms in total that have changed their activity at least once is close to 30%. The history of classification also reveals interesting facets about firms' businesses. Firms are frequent in changing in their nature of business and thus a classification system has to be dynamic to capture such frequent changes. Sources of revenue keeps changing for a firm, which from a data point of view alters the classification of a firm, say from manufacturing to service or vice-versa.

Based on the frequency of changes in economic activity, we use Poisson and Negative Binomial regression models to gain predictability over number of changes. We show that a Poisson model after controlling for over dispersion in variance is nearly accurate in predicting the count of changes across different size deciles of firms. Results also show that changes higher size deciles are more likely than others which can eventually lead to a greater distortion in industry level estimates. Classification has a practical relevance and to get a sense of the magnitude of the problem, we illustrate by using the aggregate number of firms as shown in the MCA bulletin and use the Poisson parameters to get an expected number of firms that may have changed their primary economic activity in the past. Presently, the MCA21 has close to 11 Lakh active companies. As a conservative estimate, even if 30% of companies may have changed their activity at least once in the past, the extent of misclassification can be of significant proportion. The size of the database also describes the scale of the problem as it would require a much detailed analysis of history of economic activity to classify firms correctly as per their past and current economic activity.

Identification of economic activity remains amongst the finer aspects of measurement and accuracy of macro aggregates. Identifying primary activity of firms continues to be a challenge and may well require new systemic thinking in addition to current efforts and practices. NSC (2018) had raised similar concerns about the classification problem and findings of our exercise gives a dimension to visualize the problem in detail. Historic data of firms can reveal changes in economic activity and the analysis can further aid in understanding the reasons for why and how firms change or diversify their business activity.

## Notes

### 1. Data and Variable description:

- Data were sourced from CMIE Prowessdx database vintage as of March 2018. The information used covered the History of Classifications which provides company-wise time-series details on the industry in which the company operates. In turn the information on the product/industry was sourced from various company documents such as Annual report, websites, Red herring prospectus etc. Data were taken without winsorization (i.e. trimming on either ends based on a chosen variable) as it was leading to loss of information on changes in economic activity and thus the frequency of change.
- Years of data availability: Number of years for which data is available for a firm.
- Size: Three year average of the total income and assets of a firm and should be greater than zero.

- Industry: A firm is classified as belonging to a particular industry, if the industry accounts for more than half the sales of the company. The industry classification of companies is facilitated by disclosure requirements in Section 3(i), (ii) and 4(D) of Part II of Section VI of the Companies Act, 1956. The Act mandates that all companies disclose, in their Annual Reports, quantitative details of all products purchased, produced or traded by them. [See CMIE Knowledge Base for details]

2. In cases of over dispersion, we can add a random term to the Poisson mean, say  $\theta$  to capture the heterogeneity across the entities. If we assume that the conditional distribution of  $C$ , given a value of  $\theta$  follows a Poisson distribution, with mean and variance equal to  $\theta\lambda$ , we can then express the relation as;

$$C | \theta = \text{Pois}(\lambda_\theta)$$

The  $\theta$  parameter is assumed to capture the unobserved factors that affect the mean and variance of the response variable. Empirically, we could estimate the Poisson model, provided we obtain a measure of  $\theta$ . Instead, in absence of any knowledge of  $\theta$ , if we assume that  $\theta$  follows a Gamma distribution, with its two parameters  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ , we can re-characterize our original response variable as follows. First, the mean and variance of the Gamma distribution are  $\alpha/\beta$  and  $\alpha/\beta^2$ . Let  $\alpha = \beta = 1/\sigma^2$ . Then, the mean of the distribution becomes unity, and variance  $\sigma^2$ . Incorporating this change in the Poisson variable, we get the well known result of a Negative Binomial distribution. (See Casella & Berger (2002), Cameron and Trivedi (2010) for details)

3. The method provides a measure of over dispersion by estimating a scale parameter  $\hat{\phi} = (\frac{\chi^2_p}{n-k})$  where  $\chi^2_p$  is the Pearson goodness of fit statistics, and  $(n, k)$  are the number of observations and parameters. The corrected standard errors are obtained as  $\sqrt{\hat{\phi}}$ . The GLM in the Negative Binomial model uses the estimated shape parameter ( $\alpha = 0.020$ ) in the variance function to account for over dispersion.

4. Regression result for Linear Probability Model (LPM) and Logit. The LPM and Logit regressions model the instance of change for each firm in the sample, i.e.  $C_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln(\text{years}) + \beta_2 \ln(\text{size}) + \sum_k \beta_k D_k + v_i$ . The purpose of this model is limited to understanding the effect of basic firm variables such as size, years of data availability on the probability of a change in economic activity. The two variables of interest, years and size, after controlling for sectors and size variation show the broad expected result that the probability of change increases with increases in size of firms and years of data availability. However, for gaining predictability on count, the Poisson remains the most appropriate discrete choice model.

LPM: Dep. Var (Change)							
ln(years)	0.156*** (0.002)	ln(size)	0.004*** (0.001)	Size Dec (2)	0.005 (0.008)	Size Dec (3)	-0.0200** (0.008)
Size Dec (4)	-0.027*** (0.008)	Size Dec (5)	-0.052*** (0.008)	Size Dec (6)	-0.060*** (0.008)	Size Dec (7)	-0.101*** (0.009)
Size Dec (8)	-0.105*** (0.009)	Size Dec (9)	-0.116*** (0.009)	Size Dec (10)	-0.155*** (0.010)	Sector (2)	-0.095*** (0.015)
Sector (3)	-0.052*** (0.008)	Sector (4)	0.093 (0.145)	Sector (5)	-0.089*** (0.007)	Sector (6)	0.053** (0.024)
Sector (7)	-0.063*** (0.0075)	Constant	0.066*** (0.009)	N= 46665	R <sup>2</sup> = 0.11		
Logit: Dep. Var (Change)							
ln(years)	0.974*** (0.017)	ln(size)	0.012** (0.005)	Size Dec (2)	0.013 (0.048)	Size Dec (3)	-0.130*** (0.049)
Size Dec (4)	-0.178*** (0.049)	Size Dec (5)	-0.316*** (0.050)	Size Dec (6)	-0.362*** (0.051)	Size Dec (7)	-0.607*** (0.053)
Size Dec (8)	-0.620*** (0.054)	Size Dec (9)	-0.680*** (0.057)	Size Dec (10)	-0.961*** (0.063)	Sector (2)	-0.606*** (0.097)
Sector (3)	-0.347*** (0.046)	Sector (4)	0.427 (0.786)	Sector (5)	-0.573*** (0.043)	Sector (6)	0.178 (0.132)
Sector (7)	-0.390*** (0.044)	Constant	-2.358*** (0.055)	N= 46665			

Notes: Standard errors in parentheses, \*\*\* p<0.01, \*\* p<0.05, \* p<0.1. Change (0,1) denotes the event of a change in primary economic activity, years denote the number of years of data availability of the firm, size is three year average of total income and assets, size decile denotes dummies (D) for decile of size (1-10), sector denotes dummies respectively for; construction, electricity, financial services, irrigation, manufacturing, mining and non-financial services



5. Number of active companies in the MCA21 database. Active companies are shown as the number of companies that remain after removing; number of liquidate/dissolved, defunct/struck-off, amalgamated, dormant or are under liquidation, from the total registered companies. See MCA (2019) for details

Table 7: Number of active companies by industry as of May, 2019

	Economic Activity	Private	Public	Sum	% Share in Total
1	Agriculture and Allied Activities	32170	2355	34525	2.96
2	Industry	329652	24879	354531	30.38
2.1	Manufacturing	210939	18155	229094	19.63
2.2	Metals & Chemicals, and products thereof	72644	7843	80487	6.90
2.3	Machinery & Equipments	49849	3421	53270	4.56
2.4	Textiles	28858	2719	31577	2.71
2.5	Food stuffs	29674	2454	32128	2.75
2.6	Paper & Paper products, Publishing, printing	13502	849	14351	1.23
2.7	Others	11237	500	11737	1.01
2.8	Leather & products thereof	2737	191	2928	0.25
2.9	Wood Products	2438	178	2616	0.22
3	Construction	96363	4316	100679	8.63
4	Electricity, Gas & Water companies	11861	1686	13547	1.16
5	Mining & Quarrying	10489	722	11211	0.96
6	Services	727163	36618	763781	65.44
6.1	Business Services	371507	10282	381789	32.71
6.2	Trading	143522	6013	149535	12.81
6.3	Real Estate and Renting	66814	2940	69754	5.98
6.4	Community, personal & Social Services	73782	3936	77718	6.66
6.5	Finance	36921	11838	48759	4.18
6.6	Transport, storage and Communications	33845	1460	35305	3.03
6.7	Insurance	772	149	921	0.08
7	Others	11833	2394	14227	1.22
	Total	1100818	66246	1167064	100.00

Source: MCA Monthly Information Bulletin, May, 2019

## References

- Cameron, Colin A. and Trivedi, Pravin K.** (2010) *Microeconometrics using Stata*, Stata Press, StataCorp, Texas: US
- Casella, George and Berger, Roger** (2002) *Statistical Inference*, Second Ed: Cengage Learning: US
- CSO** (2015a) "No room for doubts on new GDP numbers", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. L, No. 16, April 18th, pp. 86-89
- CSO** (2015b) *Final Report of the Sub-Committee on Private Corporate Sector including PPPs*, National Accounts Division, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India, New Delhi
- Hyland, David and Diltz, J David**, (2002) "Why Firms Diversify: An Empirical Examination", *Financial Management, Financial Management Association*, vol. 31(1), Spring.
- Manna, GC** (2017) "An investigation into some contentious issues of GDP estimation", *Journal of Indian School of Political Economy*, Vol. XXIX, No. 1 & 2, January-June, 2017
- MCA** (2019) *Monthly Information Bulletin on Corporate Sector*, Ministry of Corporate Affairs, Govt. of India, May, 2019
- McCullagh, P and Nelder, J** (1983) *Generalized Linear Models*, Springer Science, Springer: Verlag
- Mishra, Anurag and Akbar, M** (2007) "Empirical examination of diversification strategies in business groups: Evidence from emerging markets", *International Journal of Emerging Markets*, Vol. 2 Issue: 1, pp.22-38, <https://doi.org/10.1108/17468800710718877>
- Nagaraj, R** (2015a) "Seeds of doubt on new GDP numbers Private corporate sector overestimated?", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. L, No. 13, March 28th, pp. 14-17
- Nagaraj, R** (2015b) "Seeds of doubt remain: A reply to CSO's rejoinder", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol-L, No. 18, May 8th, pp. 64-66

**National Statistical Commission (NSC)** (2018) Report of the Committee on Real Sector Statistics, National Statistical Commission, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation (MosPI), New Delhi

**Sapre, Amey and Sinha, Pramod** (2016) "Some areas of concern about Indian manufacturing sector GDP estimation", National Institute of Public Finance and Policy (NIPFP) *Working Paper*, No. 172/2016

**Seddon, Peter B. and Lewis, G.P. and Freeman, Phil and Shanks, G** (2004), "The Case for Viewing Business Models as Abstractions of Strategy", *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, Volume 13(1)

## MORE IN THE SERIES

- Patnaik Ila., Mittal, S., and Pandey, R. (2019). [Examining the trade-off between price and financial stability in India](#) WP No. 248 (January).  
Radhika Pandey, is Consultant, NIPFP  
Email: [radhika.pandey@nipfp.org.in](mailto:radhika.pandey@nipfp.org.in)
- Datta, P. (2018). [Value destruction and wealth transfer under the Insolvency and Bankruptcy Code, 2016](#) WP No. 247 (December).  
Amey Sapre, is Assistant Professor, NIPFP  
Email: [amey.sapre@nipfp.org.in](mailto:amey.sapre@nipfp.org.in)
- Bailey, R., Parsheera, S., Rahman, F., and Sane, R. (2018). [Disclosures in privacy policies: Does “notice and consent” work?](#) WP No. 246 (December).  
Pramod Sinha, is Consultant, NIPFP  
Email: [pramod.sinha@nipfp.org.in](mailto:pramod.sinha@nipfp.org.in)

National Institute of Public Finance and Policy,  
18/2, Satsang Vihar Marg,  
Special Institutional Area (Near JNU),  
New Delhi 110067  
Tel. No. 26569303, 26569780, 26569784  
Fax: 91-11-26852548  
[www.nipfp.org.in](http://www.nipfp.org.in)