

# PERFORMANCE ANALYSIS USING CAMEL MODEL- A STUDY OF SELECT PRIVATE BANKS

1. B. Lavanya 2. T. Srinivas

1.Assistant. Professor 2.Research Student

1.SMS department , CBIT-Gandipet: Hyderabad-Telangana

2. SMS department , CBIT-Gandipet: Hyderabad-Telangana

## **Abstract:**

*As a country's financial system depends upon the financial soundness of banking industry, it is very much essential to measure it. The main objective of this study is to analyze the financial performance of select private sector banks and compare them using CAMEL Model.*

*The study is related to a period of five years from financial year 2012-2013 to 2016 – 2017. The CAMEL model helped to measure the performance of banks from each of the important parameter like Capital Adequacy, Assets Quality, Management Efficiency, Earning Quality and Liquidity. From the analysis of select private banks, ICICI Bank, HDFC Bank, KOTAK MAHINDRA Bank, AXIS Bank and YES Bank , the study is concluded giving the relative positions of the banks.*

**Index Terms:** Financial Soundness, performance, CAMEL Model

## **1. INTRODUCTION:**

Though, Significance of performance evaluation in a Banking sector, for sustainable growth and development has been recognized since long it still requires a system that first measures all aspects of banks and then brings out the strengths and weaknesses of the banks to ensure further improvement. With the advances in computational tools, performance evaluation systems have evolved over a period of time from single aspect systems to more comprehensive systems covering all aspects of banks. CAMEL Model is one such rating system that proved to be better for performance measurement, evaluation and strategic planning for future growth and development of the Indian banks in the light of changing requirements of this sector.

## **2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE:**

CAMEL model as a tool is very effective, efficient and accurate to be used for evaluating the performance in banking industries and to anticipate the future and relative risk. CAMEL, as a rating system for judging the soundness of Banks is a quite useful tool that can help in mitigating the conditions and risks that lead to Bank failures. The CAMEL stands for

C - Capital adequacy      A - Asset quality      M – Management      E - Earning

L – Liquidity

Majumdar (2016), measured the financial performance of 15 banks in Bangladesh with CAMEL Model. Using Composite Ranking, average and ANOVA he concluded that there had been significant difference in the

performance of selected banks. The study suggested that banks should take required steps to recover their shortcomings. Erol (2014), compared the performance of Islamic banks against conventional banks in Turkey by using CAMEL model. The results showed that Islamic banks performed better in profitability and asset management ratios compared to conventional banks but slow in sensitivity to market risk criterion.

Anita Makkar (2013), analyzed comparative analysis of the financial performance of Indian commercial banks. The study concluded that on an average, there is no statistically significant difference in the financial performance of the public and private sector banks in India, but still, there is a need for overall improvement in the public sector banks to make their position strong in the competitive market. Sushendra Kumar Misra (2013), assessed the performance and financial soundness of State Bank Group using CAMEL approach, and concluded that there is a requirement to improve its position in respect to asset quality and capital adequacy.

Aswini Kumar Mishra and et.al (2013), analyzed the soundness and the efficiency of 12 public and private sector banks based on market cap. CAMEL approach has been used over a period of twelve years (2000-2011), and it is established that private sector banks are at the top of the list, with their performances in terms of soundness being the best. Priya Ponraj and Gurusamy Rajendran (2012), measured the bank competitiveness among the select Indian commercial banks in terms of financial strength. Financial strength of the bank is measured in terms of financial ratios viz. efficiency ratio, profitability ratio, capital adequacy ratio, income-expenditure ratio, deposits and return ratios. It is found that foreign banks are the most competitive compared to the private and public sector banks in terms of the profitability ratio, returns ratio and capital adequacy ratio.

Sufian Fadzlan (2012) examined the internal and external factors that influenced the performance of banks operating in the Indian banking sector during the period 2000-2008. The empirical findings from this study suggest that credit risk, network embeddedness, operating expenses, liquidity and size have statistically significant impact on the profitability of Indian banks. Ashok Khurana and Kanika Goyal (2011), analysed the financial performance of public-sector banks and commercial banks in India, using the trend of operating cost / total cost, cost to income, labor/non labor cost, net interest income, NPA and capital to risk weighted asset ratio, the study observed that there is a need for increased absorption of enhanced technological capability by several banks to further argument yield of the banking sector and this would call for changes in processes and improvement in human resource skills.

Doonger Singh Kheechee (2011), attempted to compare the profitability of different categories of banks. The results shows that return on funds and return on advances are high in private and foreign banks whereas interest income is highly seen in public sector banks compared to their counter parts. Ashish Kumar (2011), attempted to investigate the efficiency of Indian commercial banks with data envelopment analysis (DEA), a deterministic non-parametric approach. The results of the study show that only 22 banks are efficient on the criteria of technical efficiency and pure technical efficiency respectively. Further using ANOVA it was found that there is no significant difference in the mean technical efficiency scores of various banks belonging to various groups defined for the purpose of the study. Bhagirathi Nayak and Nahak (2011), analyzed the performance of public sector banks in India during the post-liberalization period. It is found that reform measures have impacted positively in enhancing the stability and soundness of the public sector banks in India. Vikas Choudhary and Suman Tandon (2010), analysed the financial performance of

Public sector banks in India. It is concluded the CAGR of various variables have shown variations from bank to bank.

Sreeramulu and et.al (2010), compares the efficiency of Indian banking industry over two time periods, 1999 - 2003 and 2004-2008. A Cobb Douglas stochastic frontier model is adopted in order to estimate the bank efficiency. The analysis suggests that there is a substantial efficiency improvement in the Indian banking sector during 2004-2008 as compared with 1999-2003. The improvements in the Indian banking sector are mainly attributed due to globalization, deregulation and advances in information technology. Nevertheless, still there is a wide scope for Indian banking industry to improve efficiency further. Mabwe Kumbirai and Robert Webb (2010) investigate the performance of South Africa's commercial banking sector for the period 2005-2009. Financial ratios are employed to measure the profitability, liquidity and credit quality. The study found that overall bank performance increased considerably in the first two years of the analysis. A significant change in trend is

noticed at the onset of the global financial crisis in 2007, reaching its peak during 2008-2009. This resulted in falling profitability, low liquidity and deteriorating credit quality in the south African banking sector.

Ramachandran and Kavitha (2009), analyzed the importance of improving the profitability performance of the banking sector in recent years, a census study has been adopted by covering all the Indian scheduled commercial banks. The nationalized banks group showed a position of provisions and contingencies to total expenses in the first half of the study period and Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) during the second half of the study period. In relation to the private banks group, it has changed from other interest expenses ratio to capital adequacy ratio.

## **PURPOSE OF THE STUDY**

Although many studies based on the CAMEL model revealed performance of the Private sector banks, it is always necessary to evaluate them continuously, so as to monitor the effectiveness and ensure the true financial position

## **3.RESEARCH METHODOLOGY:**

### **3.1-OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

1. To study the performance analysis of select private banks by using CAMEL model.
2. To assess the financial growth of the select banks.
3. To rank the banks under the study based on performance and efficiency.
- 4.

**3.2 -SCOPE OF THE STUDY :** The study covers only five private banks in India and CAMEL ratios are used to evaluate their performance and efficiency to come to a conclusion that which bank is leading position in performance and efficiency.

**3.3 -SOURCES OF DATA:** Data is collected from the secondary sources, which include Annual Reports, Data published on bank websites, Journals .

**3.4-SAMPLE SIZE:** Sample is selected Randomly. Data of top five private banks under BSE is collected for period of 5 years , from 2013 to 2017 .

### **3.5-TOOLS FOR ANALYSIS:CAMEL MODEL**

- ❖ C-capital adequacy
- ❖ A-asset quality
- ❖ M-management
- ❖ E-earning and profitability
- ❖ L-liquidity (also called asset liability management)

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:**

### **1. C - CAPITAL ADEQUACY RATIOS FOR SELECT BANKS**

**Table-1: DEBT EQUITY RATIOS (DER) & CAPITAL ADEQUACY RATIOS (CAR) FOR SELECT BANKS**

YEAR/BANK	ICICI		HDFC		AXIS		KOTAK		YES	
	DER	CAR	DER	CAR	DER	CAR	DER	CAR	DER	CAR
<b>2012-13</b>	6.57	18.74	9.09	16.8	8.96	17	7.56	16.05	15.13	16.05
<b>2013-14</b>	6.65	17.7	9.36	16.07	8.67	16.67	5.86	18.83	13.41	18.83
<b>2014-15</b>	6.64	17.02	8	16.79	9	15.09	6.15	17.17	10.05	17.17
<b>2015-16</b>	6.86	16.64	8.25	15.53	8.6	15.29	6.66	16.34	10.4	16.34
<b>2016-17</b>	6.58	17.39	8.02	14.6	9.31	14.95	6.64	16.77	8.23	16.77
<b>AVG</b>	6.66	17.498	8.55	15.958	8.908	15.8	6.574	17.032	11.444	17.032
<b>RANK</b>	1	1	3	4	4	5	2	2	5	2

The debt to equity ratio shows the percentage of company financing that comes from creditors and investors. A higher debt to equity ratio indicates that more creditor financing (bank loans) is used than investor financing (shareholders). A debt equity ratio of 1 would mean that investors and creditors have an equal stake in the business assets. From the table-1, it is observed that the average debt equity ratio of ICICI BANK is lowest among all 5 banks. Hence the financial stability of ICICI is better. Debt equity ratio of YES bank is decreasing continuously since the financial year 2012-13. There is growth in the financial stability of YES bank. And there are fluctuations in the debt equity ratio of other banks. Hence there is no continuous growth regarding debt to equity of other banks. Higher value of CAR ratio indicates better solvency and financial strength of the banks and lower value indicates poor solvency and financial strength of the banks. CAR ratio is fluctuating yearly for all the selected banks. Here the average CAR of ICICI is higher than all the other banks with 17.498 hence the ICICI Bank is strong to absorb its losses than other 4 banks.

So it can be inferred that when considered C-CAR. As per two ratios ICICI performance is better than all other select banks.

## 2. A- ASSET QUALITY RATIOS FOR SELECT BANKS

**Table-2 : NET NPA TO TOTAL ASSETS( NNTA) & NET NPA TO TOTAL ADVANCES (NNTAD) RATIO FOR SELECT BANKS**

YEAR/BANK	ICICI		HDFC		AXIS		KOTAK		YES	
	NNTA	NNTAD	NNTA	NNTAD	NNTA	NNTAD	NNTA	NNTAD	NNTA	NNTAD
2012-13	0.41	0.76	0.12	0.19	0.21	0.36	0.37	0.64	0	0.01
2013-14	0.55	0.97	0.17	0.27	0.27	0.44	0.65	1.08	0.02	0.05
2014-15	0.97	1.61	0.15	0.24	0.28	0.47	0.57	0.92	0	0
2015-16	1.79	2.97	0.18	0.28	0.48	0.74	0.65	1.06	0.17	0.29
2016-17	3.26	5.43	0.21	0.33	1.43	2.31	0.37	1.26	0.49	0.81
AVG	1.396	2.34	0.166	0.26	0.534	0.86	0.8	0.99	0.13	0.22
RANK	5	5	2	2	3	3	4	4	1	1

The average NET NPA TO TOTAL ASSET RATIO indicates the efficiency of the bank in assessing credit risk and, to an extent, recovering the debts. Lower the ratio better is the performance of the bank. It is observed from table-2, that the average NET NPA TO TOTAL ASSET RATIO of YES BANK is lower than other selected banks. Hence the efficiency of YES BANK in assessing credit is better than the other banks. YES BANK AND KOTAK BANK has growth in assessing credit compared to the financial year 2012-2013 and there is downfall in remaining banks.

The Net NPA levels help us to know the efficiency of Credit Risk Management system of the bank. The ratio of Net NPAs to Net Advances is a measure of quality of assets and advances of the banks. The lower the Net NPA level, the better is the quality of the assets of the bank. The average NET NPA TO TOTAL ADVANCES ratio of YES bank is lower than all other selected banks. Hence YES BANK is better performing than other banks. There is no growth in the NET NPA TO TOTOL ADVANCES RATIO of all the selected banks when compared to the financial year 2012-2013.

Therefore based on the ratios considered for ASSET QUALITY of the banks, HDFC and YES banks are performing better than other banks under the study.



**3. M- MANAGEMENT QUALITY RATIOS FOR SELECT BANKS****Table-3: CREDIT DEPOSIT (CDR) & RETURN ON NETWORTH (RNR) RATIOS FOR SELECT BANKS**

YEAR/BANK	ICICI		HDFC		AXIS		KOTAK		YES	
	CDR	RNR	CDR	RNR	CDR	RNR	CDR	RNR	CDR	RNR
<b>2012-13</b>	99.2	12.48	80.91	18.57	77.97	15.64	94.98	14.4	70.19	22.39
<b>2013-14</b>	102.04	13.4	82.48	19.5	81.89	16.26	89.76	12.24	74.98	22.71
<b>2014-15</b>	107.17	13.89	81.07	16.47	87.17	16.64	88.37	13.19	82.86	17.16
<b>2015-16</b>	103.28	11.19	85.02	16.91	94.63	15.46	85.59	8.72	87.90	18.41
<b>2016-17</b>	94.73	10.11	86.16	16.26	90.03	16.59	86.44	12.35	92.57	15.09
<b>AVG</b>	101.28	12.21	83.13	17.54	86.34	16.12	89.03	12.18	81.7	19.15
<b>RANK</b>	1	4	4	2	3	3	2	5	5	1

Credit deposit ratio indicates the total advances as a proportion of total deposits. It shows the management's aggressiveness to improve income by higher lending operations. The ratio of 60 percent is considered as a norm for banks. If CD ratio is higher a larger percentage of deposits mobilized are lent to different sectors and it will lead to an improvement in profitability of banks. It is noted from table-3, that the average credit deposit ratio of ICICI BANK is higher than all other selected banks. Hence, the performance of ICICI BANK in terms of deposits is efficient than the other banks. There is a continuous growth in all the selected banks except KOTAK regarding credit deposit ratio. The RETURN ON NET WORTH ratio is a profitability ratio that measures the ability of a firm to generate profits from its shareholders investments in the company. The average RETURN ON NET WORTH ratio of YES bank is higher in all the selected banks with 19.152. Hence, the YES BANK is performing more effectively in management of funds than other selected banks. There is no growth in all selected banks except AXIS BANK regarding RETURN ON NET WORTH RATIO when compared to the 2012-13.

So it can be inferred that when considered MANAGEMENT QUALITY ratios. As per two ratios ICICI bank is performing well among all 5 select banks.

#### 4. E - EARNINGS CAPACITY RATIOS FOR SELECT BANKS

**Table-4: INTEREST INCOME TO TOTAL ASSETS( IITA)& RETURN ON ASSETS (ROA) RATIOS FOR SELECT BANKS**

YEAR/BANK	ICICI		HDFC		AXIS		KOTAK		YES	
	IITA	ROA	IITA	ROA	IITA	ROA	IITA	ROA	IITA	ROA
<b>2012-13</b>	7.46	1.55	8.75	1.68	7.98	1.52	9.6	1.62	8.36	1.31
<b>2013-14</b>	7.42	1.64	8.36	1.72	7.99	1.62	10	1.71	9.15	1.48
<b>2014-15</b>	7.59	1.72	8.2	1.73	7.68	1.59	9.16	1.76	8.49	1.47
<b>2015-16</b>	7.31	1.34	8.49	1.73	7.8	1.56	8.52	1.08	8.16	1.53
<b>2016-17</b>	7.01	1.26	8.02	1.68	7.4	0.61	8.24	1.58	7.63	1.54
<b>AVG</b>	7.35	1.50	8.36	1.70	7.77	1.38	9.10	1.55	8.36	1.46
<b>RANK</b>	5	2	2	1	4	5	1	3	3	4

Net interest margin is the ratio of net interest income to total asset. A positive net interest margin means the investment strategy pays more interest than it costs. Conversely, if net interest margin is negative, it means the investment strategy costs more than it makes interest. As analyzed from the table, the average INTEREST INCOME TO TOTAL ASSETS ratio of KOTAK is higher in selected banks with 9.104 and the performance of KOTAK BANK is better than other banks. There is no growth in all the selected banks regarding to the INTEREST INCOME TO TOTAL ASSETS compared to the financial year 2012-13.

Return on Assets measures the bank profits per currency units of assets. It is an indicator of assets management's efficiency of an organization. It is one among the guidelines of RBI for balance sheet analysis of bank. Higher value of this ratio indicates better financial productivity and profitability of banks and lower value indicates lower productivity of banks. Table- 4 reveals that the average RETURN ON ASSETS ratio of HDFC bank is higher in all selected banks. Hence, the HDFC BANK shows a better financial productivity and profitability than the other selected banks.

So it is understood that when considered two EFFICIENCY ratios, HDFC and AXIS banks are performing well among all 5 select banks.

## 5. L - LIQUIDITY RATIOS FOR SELECT BANKS

**Table-5: LIQUID ASSETS TO TOTAL ASSETS (LATA) & LIQUID ASSETS TO TOTAL DEPOSITS (LATD) RATIOS FOR SELECT BANKS**

YEAR/BANK	ICICI		HDFC		AXIS		KOTAK		YES	
	LATA	LATD	LATA	LATD	LATA	LATD	LATA	LATD	LATA	LATD
<b>2012-13</b>	7.72	14.15	6.18	9.2	6	8.08	4.4	7.22	4.1	6.07
<b>2013-14</b>	6.98	12.51	8.05	10.77	7.37	10.05	6.82	10.12	5.4	7.94
<b>2014-15</b>	6.55	11.7	6.15	8.05	7.8	11.19	5.9	8.36	5.54	8.28
<b>2015-16</b>	8.31	14.2	5.49	7.12	6.34	9.3	5.65	7.84	4.9	7.35
<b>2016-17</b>	9.18	15.45	5.67	7.61	8.4	12.12	10.51	14.33	9.09	13.68
<b>AVG</b>	7.75	13.60	6.31	8.55	7.18	10.15	6.65	9.57	5.81	8.66
<b>RANK</b>	1	1	4	5	2	2	3	3	5	4

Ratio of Liquid Assets to Total Assets indicates that what percent of total assets are held as liquid assets. This liquidity can be considered to be adequate enough to meet the immediate liabilities of the banks. This ratio shows the degree of liquidity preference adopted by the Bank. Higher value of this ratio indicates higher liquidity of banks and lower value indicates lower liquidity of banks. From table-5, it can be analyzed that there is a growth in the liquidity efficiency of all the selected banks in the financial year 2016-2017 compared to the financial year 2012-13. The average LIQUID ASSETS TO TOTAL ASSETS ratio of ICICI is higher in all selected banks with 7.75

The liquid assets to total deposits ratio indicates that percent of total deposits are held as liquid Assets. Higher value of this ratio indicates higher liquidity of bank and lower value of the ratio indicates lower liquidity of bank. The average LIQUID ASSETS TO TOTAL DEPOSITS ratio of ICICI is higher in all selected banks with 13.60. Hence, the liquidity position of ICICI BANK is better than the other banks. There is a growth in the liquidity position of the KOTAK, AXIS and YES BANKS compared to the financial year 2012-13.

Therefore from two ratios of LIQUIDITY, it can be inferred that ICICI and AXIS banks are performing well in the aspects of liquidity among all 5 select banks



**Table-6: Overall ranking for select banks based on CAMEL Rating**

<b>RATIO/BANK</b>	<b>ICICI</b>	<b>HDFC</b>	<b>AXIS</b>	<b>KOTAK</b>	<b>YES</b>
DEBT EQUITY RATIO	1	3	4	2	5
CAPITAL ADEQUACY RATIO	1	4	5	2	3
NET NPA TO TOTAL ASSETS	5	2	3	4	1
NET NPA TO TOTAL ADVANCES	5	2	3	4	1
CREDIT DEPOSIT RATIO	1	4	3	2	5
RETURN ON NETWORTH	4	2	3	5	1
INTEREST INCOME TO TOTAL ASSETS	5	2	4	1	3
RETURN ON ASSETS	2	1	5	3	4
LIQUID ASSETS TO TOTAL ASSETS	1	4	2	3	5
LIQUID ASSETS TO TOTAL DEPOSITS	1	5	2	3	4
<b>FINAL RANKS OF BANKS</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>

From the table-6, it can be inferred that ICICI bank has best performance in Debt equity ratio, Capital adequacy ratio, Credit deposit ratio, Liquid assets to total assets ratio and Liquid assets to total deposits ratio. HDFC bank has best performance in Return on assets ratio and Net NPA to total advances ratio. KOTAK bank has best performance in Interest income to total assets ratio. YES bank has performance Net NPA to total assets ratio and Return on net worth ratio. By considering ranks scored on the selected ratios in the CAMEL MODEL the ICICI is ranked first and Axis as last in their performance.

## **CONCLUSION:**

Due to radical changes, the central banks all around the world have improved their supervision quality and techniques. In evaluating the function of the banks, many of the developed countries are now following uniform financial rating system (CAMEL RATING) along with other existing procedures and techniques. In the present study with reference to Capital adequacy ratios ICICI bank is performing well than other banks. As per Asset quality ratios HDFC and YES banks are performing well. When considered Management quality ratios, ICICI bank performance is better than other banks. As per earning capacity ratios HDFC and KOTAK are performing better than other banks. When Liquidity is considered ICICI is in top among 5 banks and HDFC and YES banks are in last place. There is no continuous growth with respect to any parameters in all selected Banks. The positions of selected banks by averaging all the ranks related to all the calculated ratios are i) ICICI BANK ii) HDFC BANK iii) KOTAK MAHINDRA BANK iv) YES BANK v) AXIS BANK

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT:**

We wish to convey our heartfelt gratitude to the principal CBIT, Prof. P. Ravinder Reddy, former HOD-SMS Dr. S. Saraswathi and present HOD Dr. V. Harileela for encouraging us to conduct quality research work. We thank our family members and friends for their support, without whom this research would have been impossible to complete.

**REFERENCES:**

1. Anita Makkar.2013. A CAMEL approach towards overall financial performance of new private sector banks during pre and post financial crisis.Vol-3 issue-2
2. Ashish Kumar .2011. Analysis of Efficiency of Banks in a Developing Economy: A case of India. International Journal of Computer Science and Management Studies. Vol.II, Issue 03,
3. Ashok Khurana and KanikaGoyal. 2011.Camel Approach , Interfirm comparison on select Private banking companies in India. International journal of management . Volume 4, Issue 2. pp. 138-146
4. Aswini Kumar Mishra, Jigar N. Gadhia, BidhuPrasadkar, Bismabasptra andShiviAnand., April.2011.Are Private sector Banks More sound and efficient than public sector Banks? Assessments Based on Camel and Data Envelopment Analysis. Research Journal of Recent Sciences. Vol.2(4) .pp.28-35;
5. Bhagirathi Nayak and Nahak . 2011. Benchmarking Performance of Public Sector Banks in India; IUP Journal of Bank Management.
6. Doonger Singh KheeChee .2011. A Comparative study of profitability of different groups of scheduled commercial banks in India. Vol.19, No (1).
7. Erol.2017. International Journal of Economic and Business Review.Volume – 5.Issue- 7,
8. MabweUmbirai and Robert Webb .Dec-2010. A financial Ratio Analysis of Commercial bank Performance in SourthAfrica .African Review of Economics and Finance. Vol.2, No.1.
9. Majumder, Md&MizanurRahman, Mohammed. .2016. A CAMEL Model Analysis of Selected Banks in Bangladesh. International Journal of Business and Technopreneurship. 6. 233-266. 10.2139/ssrn.3068004.
10. PriyaPonraj and GurusamyRajendran .2012.Financial Strength as an indicator for Measuring Bankcompetitiveness. An Empirical evidence from Indian Banking Industry; Journal of Applied Economic Sciences. Vol.7 issue 2(20) pp.179-188, 2012
11. Ramachandran and Kavitha .2009. Profitability of the Indian Scheduled Commercial Banks: A case analysis. IUP Journal of Bank Management, Vol.VIII, issue – 3 &4.pp 129-139
12. Sreeramulu, Nancy Vaz and Sharad Kumar- Efficiency of Indian Banks during 1999-2008: 2010.A stochastic frontier approach; International Journal of Financial Services Management. Vol.4, No.4.pp 298- 310.
13. Sufian Fazhan .2012.Determinants of Bank performance in a Developing Economy; Global business review. Vol.13, pp.1-23.
14. Sushendra Kumar Misra.2013.A Camel Model Analysis of State Bank Group, World Journal of Social Sciences Vol. 3. No. 4. July 2013 Issue. Pp. 36 – 55
15. Vikas Choudhary and SumanTandon.2010. , Impact of Board size on Firm Performance : a study of selected BSE500 companies, Apeejay Journal of Management and Technology . Vol. 10, No. 1, 34-40
16. Management of Banking & Financial Services, Padmalatha Suresh & Justin Paul, Pearson, 2 nd Edition
17. Banks & Institutional Management, Vasant Desai, Himalaya Publishing House 2010, 2ndEdition.
18. [www.moneycontrol.com](http://www.moneycontrol.com)
19. [www.rbi.com](http://www.rbi.com)
20. [www.shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in](http://www.shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in)