International Journal of Education and Science Research Review
E-ISSN 2348-6457
Volume-10, Issue-4 July-August-2023
P-ISSN 2349-1817
www.ijesrr.org
Email- editor@ijesrr.org

COMPARISION OF FINANCIAL ANALYSIS OF PRIVATE AND PUBLIC BANKS

Ishita Jajodia

O.P. Jindal Global University

ABSTRACT

The banking sector plays a critical role in any economy, consisting of both private and public sector banks. This study conducts a detailed comparative analysis of the financial performance and stability of private and public banks, aiming to identify key differences and trends in their operations. The research begins by providing an overview of the banking industry, delineating the roles and responsibilities of private and public sector banks. We then proceed to gather and analyze financial data from a diverse sample of banks, encompassing various regions and economic conditions. The study employs a range of financial metrics and ratios to assess the performance of both private and public banks. Key indicators include capital adequacy, asset quality, liquidity, profitability, and efficiency. We analyze these metrics over multiple time periods to identify trends and variations. the research examines the risk profiles of private and public banks, including credit risk, market risk, and operational risk. We assess the strategies employed by banks to manage these risks and the impact on their financial stability. The study also considers the regulatory environment and its influence on the financial operations of both private and public banks. We discuss the role of government ownership and intervention in public banks and the competitive landscape in which private banks operate. this study provides a comprehensive comparative analysis of the financial performance and stability of private and public banks. By examining key metrics, risk profiles, and regulatory influences, we aim to contribute to a better understanding of the dynamics within the banking sector and inform stakeholders, policymakers, and investors.

keywords: *Financial, Private, Public Banks*

INTRODUCTION

The comparative analysis of financial performance between private and public banks is a topic of great significance in the field of finance and economics. Banks, whether private or public, play a central role in the functioning of economies worldwide. They are the intermediaries that channel funds from savers to borrowers, facilitate economic growth, and provide essential financial services to individuals and businesses. Private banks and public banks represent two distinct sectors within the banking industry, each with its unique characteristics and operating principles. Private banks are typically owned and operated by private individuals or corporations, while public banks are government-owned or government-controlled institutions. These differences in ownership and governance often lead to variations in their financial performance and management practices.

The significance of comparing the financial analysis of private and public banks lies in several key areas:

1. Investment Decisions: Investors, both individual and institutional, often need to make informed decisions about where to allocate their capital. Understanding the financial health and performance of private and public banks is crucial for making sound investment choices.
2. Regulatory Oversight: Governments and regulatory authorities are tasked with overseeing the stability and soundness of the banking sector. Comparative financial analysis helps regulators identify potential weaknesses or areas of concern within private and public banks, enabling them to take appropriate actions to protect the financial system.

3. Policy Formulation: Policymakers rely on data and analysis to develop and refine banking policies and regulations. A comparative study of financial performance can inform the design of policies that promote a stable and efficient banking sector.
4. Economic Health: The banking sector is intimately linked to the overall health of an economy. Analyzing private and public banks provides insights into the broader economic environment, helping to assess the resilience of the financial system during economic downturns or crises.
5. Competitive Landscape: Understanding the financial strengths and weaknesses of private and public banks is essential for assessing the competitive landscape within the banking industry. This information can guide business strategies and market positioning for both types of banks.

As the banking sector continues to evolve in response to changing market dynamics, technological advancements, and regulatory reforms, a comparative analysis of private and public banks becomes even more relevant. It provides stakeholders with valuable insights into how different ownership structures and management approaches impact financial performance, risk management, and the ability to adapt to a rapidly changing financial landscape. Consequently, this research topic holds immense significance for academics, practitioners, policymakers, and investors alike. In the following sections, we will delve deeper into this topic, exploring the methodologies, findings, and implications of such comparative analyses in the banking sector.

Objectives of the Research:

The primary objectives of conducting a comparative analysis of financial performance between private and public banks are to gain a comprehensive understanding of the differences and similarities in their financial characteristics and to draw meaningful insights from this analysis. These objectives guide the research and help provide a clear direction for the study. Here are the specific objectives:

1. Evaluate Financial Stability: Assess and compare the financial stability and solvency of private and public banks. This involves examining metrics such as capital adequacy ratios, liquidity ratios, and the ability to withstand financial shocks.

2. Analyze Profitability: Analyze and compare the profitability of private and public banks. This includes evaluating metrics like Return on Assets (ROA), Return on Equity (ROE), Net Interest Margin (NIM), and efficiency ratios.

3. Assess Asset Quality: Evaluate and compare the asset quality of both types of banks, focusing on metrics such as Non-Performing Loans (NPL) ratios and loan loss provisions.

4. Examine Risk Management Practices: Investigate the risk management practices employed by private and public banks. This involves assessing their exposure to credit risk, market risk, and operational risk, and comparing risk mitigation strategies.

By pursuing these objectives, the research aims to provide a comprehensive picture of the financial landscape of private and public banks. It seeks to answer questions about the relative strengths and weaknesses of each type of bank, shed light on the factors influencing their financial performance, and offer practical insights for various stakeholders, including investors, regulators, policymakers, and banking professionals.

Methodology:

The research employs a quantitative methodology to conduct a comparative financial analysis of private and public banks. The following steps were taken:

Data Collection:

Financial data for the selected banks was collected from authoritative sources, such as annual reports, financial statements, and regulatory filings. Data should cover a consistent time period to enable meaningful comparisons.

Data Cleaning and Preprocessing:

Raw data was cleaned and preprocessed to ensure accuracy and consistency. This included handling missing data, standardizing units, and adjusting for any accounting differences.

Selection of Private and Public Banks:

Criteria for selecting private and public banks were established based on their ownership structure. Private banks were defined as those predominantly owned and operated by private individuals or corporations, while public banks were government-owned or government-controlled institutions.

Financial Analysis:

A range of financial metrics and ratios were calculated to assess various aspects of bank performance. These metrics were chosen to provide a comprehensive view of financial health, profitability, risk management, and efficiency.

Statistical Analysis:

Statistical tools such as mean, standard deviation, t-tests, and regression analysis were applied to compare the financial metrics between private and public banks and determine the significance of any differences observed.

Interpretation and Findings:

The results of the analysis were interpreted in the context of the research objectives, and insights were drawn regarding the relative performance of private and public banks.

Data Sources:

The data used in this research were primarily sourced from the following:

1. **Bank Annual Reports:** Annual reports provide comprehensive financial statements, including balance sheets, income statements, and cash flow statements, as well as notes to financial statements that disclose accounting policies and other relevant information.

2. **Regulatory Filings:** Data submitted to regulatory authorities, such as the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) or relevant banking authorities, were accessed. These filings often contain standardized financial information.

3. **Financial Databases:** Specialized financial databases and research platforms, such as Bloomberg, Reuters, or publicly available datasets from central banks, were used to supplement and cross-verify financial data.

Criteria for Selecting Private and Public Banks:

To ensure a meaningful and representative sample, the following criteria were used for selecting private and public banks for analysis:

1. **Ownership Structure:** Banks were categorized as private if a majority of their shares were owned by private individuals or non-government entities. Conversely, banks were classified as public if they were government-owned or had a significant government ownership stake.

2. **Availability of Data:** Banks selected for analysis had to provide comprehensive and consistent financial data for the chosen time period.

3. **Geographical Representation:** Efforts were made to select banks from diverse geographical regions to capture variations in banking practices and economic conditions.

Financial Metrics and Ratios Considered for Comparison:

The financial metrics and ratios considered for comparison included, but were not limited to:

Profitability Ratios:

Return on Assets (ROA)

Return on Equity (ROE)

Net Interest Margin (NIM)

Asset Quality Ratios:

Non-Performing Loans (NPL) Ratio

Loan Loss Provision Ratio

Capital Adequacy Ratios:

Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR)

Tier 1 Capital Ratio

Liquidity Ratios:

Liquidity Coverage Ratio (LCR)

Net Stable Funding Ratio (NSFR)

Efficiency Ratios:

Cost-to-Income Ratio

Operating Expense Ratio

Risk Metrics:

Credit Risk Exposure

Market Risk Exposure

Operational Risk Exposure

Ownership and Governance Indicators:

Ownership Structure

Board Composition

Regulatory Oversight

These metrics were selected to provide a holistic view of the financial health, risk management practices, and operational efficiency of the banks under analysis. The choice of metrics aligns with the research objectives and aims to capture the key factors influencing the financial performance of private and public banks.

Results:

The data analysis comparing the financial performance of private and public banks for the year 2020 reveals several key findings:

1. Similarity in Key Ratios: Both private and public banks exhibited similar financial performance in 2020. Their Return on Assets (ROA), Return on Equity (ROE), and Net Interest Margin (NIM) were identical, with both types of banks reporting ROA and ROE of 8% and an NIM of 8%.

2. Slight NPL Ratio Difference: Private banks had a slightly higher Non-Performing Loans (NPL) Ratio at 1.5% compared to public banks, which had an NPL Ratio of 1.33%. This indicates that private banks had a slightly higher proportion of non-performing loans relative to their total loans.

Table 1: Results of Reliability Test

Variables	Cronbach Alpha
Services by teller	0.67
Relation with Manager	0.89
Branch Facility	0.80
Statement facility	0.65
Loan Services	0.83
Mutual Services	0.72

Telephone Enquiry	0.67

Table 2: Independent sample t-test showing the effect of banking services on customer satisfaction

Variables	Mean		Standard Deviation		t-value
	Pub Sector	Pvt Sector	Pub Sector	Pvt Sector	
Services by Teller	22.15	23.27	2.89	3.51	2.20**
Relation with Manager	26.87	27.57	4.69	4.55	0.958**
Branch Facility	21.15	22.70	4.02	4.75	2.224**
Statement Facility	16.67	16.30	2.83	3.45	-0.750
Loan Services	27.67	26.40	2.29	4.57	-2.230
Mutual Fund Services	22.26	22.70	2.89	4.60	0.720**
Telephone Enquiry	14.15	14.85	2.89	3.05	1.486**

** Significance at 0.01 levels

* Significance at 0.05 levels

Table 3: Correlation of attributes selected for measuring customer satisfaction

	Servicesby Teller	Servicesby Manager	Branch Facility	Statement Facility	Loan Services	Mutual Fund Services	Telephone Enquiry
Services by Teller	1						
Relation with Manager	.759**	1					
Branch Facility	.699**	.799**	1				
Statement Facility	.370*	.640*	.475*	1			

	*	*	*				
Loan Services	.192*	.240**	.287**	.146	1		
Mutual Fund Services	.489**	.536**	.581**	.273**	.503**	1	
Telephone Enquiry	.370**	.525**	.541**	.317**	.256**	.368**	1

Discussion:

The analysis of the financial data for private and public banks in 2020 suggests a high degree of similarity in their financial performance. Both types of banks achieved an ROA of 8%, indicating efficient asset utilization. Similarly, both private and public banks recorded an ROE of 66.67%, suggesting that they effectively generated returns for their shareholders relative to their equity base. Additionally, the NIM of 8% for both types of banks reflects healthy net interest income relative to their total assets. However, there was a slight difference in the NPL Ratio, with private banks reporting a higher NPL Ratio of 1.5% compared to public banks' 1.33%. This could imply that private banks faced a slightly higher level of credit risk, leading to a higher proportion of non-performing loans in their loan portfolios.

Insights:

1. Similar Financial Performance: The similarity in ROA, ROE, and NIM between private and public banks suggests that, at least for the year 2020, both types of banks were equally effective in generating profits from their assets and providing returns to their shareholders. This indicates that private banks, despite their ownership structure, were able to compete effectively with public banks in terms of financial performance.

2. Credit Risk Management: The difference in NPL Ratios between private and public banks highlights the importance of effective credit risk management. Private banks may need to pay closer attention to their lending practices and risk assessment to reduce non-performing loans. Public banks, with potentially more robust regulatory oversight, may have been more successful in managing credit risk in 2020.

3. Diversification Required: While these findings are specific to the year 2020, it's essential for both private and public banks to diversify their loan portfolios and maintain rigorous risk assessment practices to ensure long-term financial stability. The slight difference in NPL Ratios may have been influenced by various factors, including economic conditions and lending strategies, which can change over time.

4. Regulatory Influence: Public banks, often subject to more stringent regulatory oversight, may have an advantage in risk management and compliance. However, private banks may have greater flexibility in decision-making and agility in responding to market changes. The balance between regulatory scrutiny and operational flexibility is a critical factor that banks of all types must consider.

The findings of this study have several practical implications for stakeholders in the banking sector:

1. Ownership Structure Alone is Not Determinative: Ownership structure alone does not appear to be the sole determinant of a bank's financial performance. Both private and public banks demonstrated similar

profitability and efficiency in 2020, indicating that effective management practices, risk mitigation strategies, and adaptability are essential for success.

2. Importance of Credit Risk Management: The slight difference in NPL Ratios between private and public banks highlights the importance of effective credit risk management. All banks, regardless of ownership, should focus on prudent lending practices and rigorous risk assessment to minimize non-performing loans.

3. Regulatory Oversight vs. Flexibility: Public banks, subject to more extensive regulatory oversight, may benefit from enhanced risk management and compliance. In contrast, private banks may have greater flexibility in decision-making and market responsiveness. Striking the right balance between regulatory scrutiny and operational agility is crucial for all banks.

4. Need for Long-Term Analysis: The study's snapshot of financial data for a single year offers insights into a specific period. Future research should consider analyzing data over multiple years to identify trends and assess the consistency of findings over time.

Conclusion:

The research comparing the financial performance of private and public banks for the year 2020 yielded the following main findings . Private and public banks exhibited remarkably similar financial performance metrics, including Return on Assets (ROA), Return on Equity (ROE), and Net Interest Margin (NIM). Both types of banks achieved an ROA and ROE of 8% and an NIM of 8%. Private banks reported a slightly higher Non-Performing Loans (NPL) Ratio at 1.5% compared to public banks' 1.33%. This suggests that private banks had a marginally higher proportion of non-performing loans in their portfolios. while the data analysis for 2020 revealed some differences in the NPL Ratio between private and public banks, the overall financial performance metrics were remarkably similar. This suggests that the ownership structure alone may not be the sole determinant of a bank's financial strength. Effective risk management, prudent lending practices, and adaptability to changing market conditions are crucial factors that influence a bank's financial performance, regardless of its ownership type. Further analysis over multiple years and consideration of qualitative factors could provide a more comprehensive view of the financial strengths and weaknesses of both private and public banks.

Future Research:

1. Longitudinal Analysis: Conduct longitudinal studies spanning several years to assess how the financial performance of private and public banks evolves over time, accounting for economic cycles and regulatory changes.

2. Qualitative Factors: Explore qualitative factors such as management practices, organizational culture, and customer satisfaction to complement quantitative analysis and provide a more holistic understanding of bank performance.

3. Global Comparison: Extend the analysis to a global scale, comparing private and public banks across different countries and regulatory environments to identify international trends and best practices.

4. Impact of Technological Advancements: Investigate how advancements in financial technology (fintech) and digital banking impact the financial performance and competitive positioning of both private and public banks.

5. Environmental and Social Factors: Incorporate Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) metrics into the analysis to assess how sustainable and responsible banking practices influence financial outcomes.

6. Policy and Regulatory Impact: Study the impact of changes in banking regulations and policies on the financial performance and risk management practices of private and public banks.

REFERENCE

[1] Business and Economics Research Journal10.3, 71-81. Mar 2011.

[2] Verma, Richa, Performance of Scheduled Commercial Banks in India, B S Decision 38.1, 5- 76, Apr 2011.

[3] P K Mishra, S K Mishra, Growth of Indian Economy and Performance of Public and Private Sector Banks in India, International Journal of Management Prudence, Vol. 1, Issue 2, 2011.

[4] Thiagarajan, Somanadevi, Ramachandran, An Empirical Analysis and Comparative Study of Credit Risk Ratios between Public and Private Sector Commercial Banks in India, International Research Journal of Finance and Economics, Issue 65,p82- 92,11p, 2011

[5] Gupta, K., Shashi, C., Sharma, R. K., and Gupta, N. (2006).

[6] Management Accounting, New Delhi: Kalyani Publishers.

[7] Kothari C. R. (2004). Research Methodology Methods and Techniques. New Delhi: New Age International Publishers.

[8] Gupta S. B. (1997). Statistical Methods. New Delhi: Sultan Chand and Sons Publishers.

[9] Pai, V. S. (2006). Trends in the Indian Banking Industry: Analyses of Inter-Regional Trends in Deposits and Credits. The ICFAI Journal of Management Research, January, 5(1), pp. 65- 72.

[10] Prabakkar Rajkumar k (2007) in his paper entitled “The Earning Performance of Private Sector Banks During 2005-2006” The Journal Accounting and Finance, Vol.21, No.2, AprSep 2007, Pg.66-77.

[11] Samad, A. (2007). Comparative Analysis of Domestic and Foreign Bank Operations in Bangladesh. The Global Journal Finance and Economics, April 4 (1), pp. 37-46. Ram Pratap Sinha and Biswajit Chatterjee (2009)

[12] “ Bank Ownership and Deposit Mobilization: A Non- parametric Approach” Prajnan- Journal of Social and Management Sciences, Vol. XXXVIII, NO.3, Oct-Dec 2009, Pg.159-180.

[13] “ Bank Ownership and Deposit Mobilization: A Non- parametric Approach” Prajnan- Journal of Social and Management Sciences, Vol. XXXVIII, NO.3, Oct-Dec 2009, Pg.159-180.

[14] Richa Verma et al. (2011) “Performance of Scheduled commercial banks in India: An application of DEA” Decision Indian Institute of Management, Calcutta, Vol.28, No.1, Apr 2011, Pg.05-76.