IJAER/January-February-2019/Volume-8/Issue-2 ISSN: 2278-9677
International Journal of Arts & Education Research

ANALYSIS OF THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PUBLIC, PRIVATE, AND FOREIGN BANKS

Anil Kumar
Research Scholar Malwanchal University

Anil Ahluwalia
Professor Malwanchal University

Abstract

It is difficult to identify and quantify both inputs and outputs, making performance measurement in the banking industry a challenging endeavour. In addition, there is a possibility that banks are not homogeneous with regard to the kinds of output that they really create. In the current investigation, performance is evaluated based on a computation of 23 different financial ratios. The majority of international financial institutions have positive average composite ratings, indicating that their performance is above average. When it comes to banks operating in the private sector, some of these institutions have favourable composite ratings, while others have poor scores. This demonstrates that some have performance that is above average, while others do not meet the standard. The vast majority of banks in the public sector have composite scores that are negative, which results in poor performance.

Keywords: *Banks ,public, private, Foreign*

Introduction

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the operating results of Indian banks, both public and private, as well as those owned by foreign companies. After the adoption of reforms, a number of private and foreign sector banks have begun operations. This presents a significant threat to the banks that are part of the public sector. The duties of banks now days are not confined to the geographical limits of any country; rather, they extend their services to locations outside of the country as well. While attempting to evaluate the overall performance of the Indian Banking System, it will undoubtedly be beneficial to do a comparative analysis of public, private, and international banks. Evaluation of employee performance is at the centre of all management actions. If one can accurately assess their performance, they will be able to find ways to enhance it. Measurement of performance is the method by which a business may determine whether or not its operations have been successful in attaining the goals it has set for itself. There are a lot of various angles from which one may look at an organisation, and each angle provides a unique perspective on the characteristics that constitute successful performance. In an ideal world, a system for measuring performance would not only provide an accurate evaluation of how well an organisation is operating (depending on the parameters that have been established), but it would also provide insight into areas that require development. After the implementation of financial deregulation in India, have the commercial banks seen an improvement in their performance? A lot of factors contribute to the significance of the question. First and first, it is essential to determine whether or not one of the goals of deregulatory efforts, namely greater performance, has been attained. It was anticipated that by supporting the liberalised entry and expansion of private banks and foreign banks, Indian banks would become more competitive in their operations, which would result in an improvement in the banks' overall performance. Moreover, globalisation as well as advances in technology have brought about a

great deal of recent change and innovation in the banking industry. In the fields of money management and security development, it has brought forth more recent technological and methodological advancements. Understanding and constant skill improvement are required in order to navigate new territory within the banking industry. Because the performance of commercial banks is the primary factor that will determine the degree to which the stability of the financial system is impacted, it is essential to have an understanding of how the performance of commercial banks has been impacted as a result of recent reforms to the financial system. Yet, performance measurement in the banking industry is not easy since it is difficult to identify and quantify both inputs and outputs. This makes the assessment of performance more complicated. In addition, there is a possibility that banks are not homogeneous with regard to the kinds of output that they really create. If the dimensions along which performers are clearly separated from non-performers are properly defined, then appropriate policies may be established to increase performance. These policies can be designed to make performance better.

Review of Literature

Sathye (2005) using the Data Envelopment Analysis method to determine the productive efficiency (DIA). Two models were developed to illustrate how efficiency scores shift in response to changes in the amount of inputs and outputs. The effectiveness ratings of three distinct types of banks—public, private, and international—were all evaluated and compared. According to the findings of the study, the mean efficiency score as well as the efficiency of private sector banks as a group in India are, ironically, worse than those of both public sector banks and international banks.

Biswas (2006) utilising the CAMELS model, an analysis of the performance of new private sector banks was carried out. The information gathered over a period of five years, from the 2000-2001 school year to the 2004-2005 school year, was analysed. According to the results of the research conducted, the overall performance of IDBI bank was the highest among all of the banks, followed by the performance of UTI bank.

Ruchi Gupta (2014) In addition, the analysis found that there is a statistically significant gap between the CAMEL ratios of India's various public sector banks. Hence, indicating that the overall performance of public sector banks varies greatly within themselves. It is also possible to draw the conclusion that the banks that have the lowest ranking need to work on improving their performance in order to meet the criteria that are wanted.

Dhanesh Kumar Khatri (2019) His research led him to the conclusion that there was no significant difference in the ways in which public sector banks and private sector banks were performing, even though both types of banks were included in the study. Hence, based on the results of the test of hypothesis, it has been demonstrated that the performance of these private sector banks and public sector banks has been virtually identical on the many metrics that make up their CAMELS rating.

Research Methodology

The vast majority of the previous research assessed performance on different dimensions, each of which included capital, asset quality, management effectiveness, earnings, liquidity, and sensitivity. In other research, only a small number of carefully chosen institutions are compared against a much larger pool of banks. Yet, the vast majority of banks are chosen for comparison in this particular study using 23 different

financial parameters. In addition, composite scores are produced so that an overall performance assessment may be made rather than a piecemeal one. For the purpose of this study, a number of significant ratios have been chosen to assess the performance of banks. The research utilises both primary and secondary sources of information. The information was obtained from the official website of the Reserve Bank of India, which can be found at rbi.org.in. The most essential financial ratios may be found in the statistical tables relating to banks. The data has also been updated using the published annual reports of banks and the websites of such banks. Financial magazines and journals have also been used as sources of data. In the current research, the sample size for the analysis consisted of 26 public sector banks, 19 private sector banks, and 24 international banks. The selection of the banks is based on the availability of comprehensive data spanning the years 2005 to 2017. In the event that some data is absent, the relevant bank will be excluded from the sample.

Objectives

1. To examine the level of success achieved by India's public, private, and international banks.
2. Compiling a list that ranks the public, private, and international banks according to their overall performance.
3. The placement of governmental, commercial, and international banks within their respective groups.

Hypothesis

In light of the purpose stated above, the following assumptions have been developed to evaluate the performance of the Bank:

H0: There is no discernible difference in performance between publicly owned, privately held, and international banks.

H1 : At the very least, major differences may be seen between the two groups of banks.

The current research uses a total of 23 different ratios to evaluate the efficiency of public, private, and international banking institutions. The success of banks may be roughly broken down into seven different parameters, which are as follows. The following is a list of the financial ratios:

Deposit and Credit Ratios

R1: Cash to Deposit Ratio

R2: Credit to Deposit Ratio

R3: Investment to Deposit Ratio

R4: Term Deposit to Total Deposits

R5: Secured advances to total advances

R6: Investment in non-approved securities to total investment

R7: Priority Sector Advances to Total Advances

R8: Net NPA to Net Advances

Income Ratios

R9: Interest Income to Total Assets

R10: Non Interest Income to Total Assets

R11: Net Interest Margin to Total Assets

Expenses Ratios

R12: Wage Bill to Total Expenses

R13: Wage bill to total income

Cost of Funds

R14: Cost of Deposits

R15: Cost of Borrowing

R16: Cost of Funds

Return Ratios

R17: Return on Advances

R18: Return on Investment

R19: Operating profit to total assets

Efficiency Ratios

R20: Profit Per Employee

R21: Business Per Employee

Capital Adequacy Ratios

R22: Capital adequacy ratio

R23: Capital adequacy ratio- Tier-I

The Data is given in the Annexure-I.

Calculations are made to determine each bank's overall score. Although some of the ratios are expressed in rupees, such as the amount of business and profit generated by each branch. When it comes to certain ratios, such as the credit-to-deposit ratio, the investment-to-deposit ratio, the secured credit-to-total credit ratio, the return on deposits and the return on borrowing, etc., high numbers indicate successful performance. Several measures, such as the cost of deposit, the cost of borrowing, the cost of funds, the non-performing assets to total advances ratio, the wage bill to total costs ratio, and the wage bill to total assets ratio, all have low values, which indicates strong performance. As a result, the data are normalised with the assistance of Z scores. In order to make the data unidirectional, the six ratios described above that have a low score reflecting high

performance have a multiplier of -1 applied to them. The data are now unit-free and only flow in one way. After adding up all of the ratios' Z ratings, we order them by placing the ratio with the greatest Z value in position 1. (best performer).

Firstly, for a set of 'n' banks and 'j' indicators provide a n * j matrix in the following format:

X11 x12 .....X1j

X21 x22 .....X2j

X1j x2j .....Xij

Where Xij represent ith bank and its jth indicator. The subscript i = 1.....69 represent the banks and j=1.....23 represents the indication in question. As a consequence, the matrix contains a vector for each individual bank. Different measuring units are used for each of the indications in the matrix that was just shown. to achieve consistency in the data in order to construct a comprehensive index of the banking industry's performance. It is essential to convert the indicator matrix into a standard matrix, in which each indication is designed to be independent of any particular unit of measurement. This is accomplished with the use of a standard normal variate that has a mean value of zero and a standard deviation value of one. With the use of the equation in the next paragraph, the data are transformed into a conventional normal variate:

$$Z_{ij} = \frac{X_{ij} - \bar{X}_j}{\sigma_j}$$

j represents the average score and the standard deviation, while Zij represents the jth indication of the ith bank. j and the deviation of the jth indication each in their own right. Here is the new matrix:

$$\begin{matrix} Z_{11} & Z_{12} & \ldots\ldots Z_{1j} \\ Z_{21} & Z_{22} & \ldots\ldots Z_{2j} \\ Z_{zi} & Z_{z2} & \ldots\ldots Z_{ij} \end{matrix}$$

Each bank in the new matrix is represented by a vector in the space that has M dimensions. In this standardised matrix, the sums of each bank's Z scores are computed, and those sums are shown below. The composite scores are what determine the standings in this competition. The bank with the highest total score is ranked number one because the best bank is the one that has the most value.

Analysis and Interpretation

Table 1 displays the composite scores and calculated rankings for the chosen years. Barclays Bank had the highest composite score (rank 1) in 2005 with a 24.47, followed by Sonali Bank with a 13.85, Citi Bank with a 12.05, Shinhan Bank with an 11.50, and AB Bank with a 10.98. (rank 5). They are all foreign banks. Credit Agricole was the worst performer with a combined score of -14.99 (rank 69), followed by Punjab and Sind Bank with a score of -13.96. (rank 68). Other underperformers were Abu Dhabi Commercial Bank, DCB Bank, and Yes Bank. Abu Dhabi Commercial Bank had a composite score of -12.61 (rank67), 9.53 (rank66), and 9.13 (rank) respectively (Rank 65). Public, private, and international institutions all own the underperforming banks. As seen in table 1, both foreign and private banks performed better in subsequent years. The top-ranking banks contain deposits of cash, investments, term loans compared to total advances, interest and non-interest income, returns on investments that have been adjusted for cost of funds, and operational profits compared to total assets. Public sector banks often perform poorly since the majority of

their ratios are less than zero. In 2005, public sector banks' average composite scores were negative (-1.6904) with a standard deviation of 3.7478, while private banks' average scores were -1.1744 with a standard deviation of 4.7930. According to this, private sector banks outperformed public sector banks, and their variation was a little bit greater. In 2005, the average composite score for international banks was the highest (2.7610), with a standard deviation of 8.4862. This demonstrates that foreign banks outperformed banks in the private and public sectors. Foreign banks are inconsistent because the standard deviation is so big. Because of this, foreign banks' names might be found in both the top and bottom banks. Banks with low ratings performed better in subsequent years. In2009, the top five banks by composite score were all foreign institutions: J.P. Morgan Chase Bank N.A., Mashreq Bank PSC, Credit Agricole, CTBC Bank, and Bank of Ceylon, with scores of14.60,12.80,11.22, and14.60, respectively (Rank 5). These banks all fall under the designation of foreign banks, just like in 2005. In terms of deposit, credit, and income ratios, these banks did better. With a combined score of -29.82 in 2009 and -19.80 in2013, American Express Banking Corporation has the lowest ranking bank. Dhanlaxmi Bank was the next subpar performer, with a score of -12.17 (rank 68) in 2009 and ranking 67 in 2013. Sonali Bank drops from position two in 2005 to position 67 in 2009. Catholic Syrian maintained its low performance status in 2013 and 2017 despite having a composite score of -7.20 in 2009 (Rank 66). The Central Bank of India improved its performance in subsequent years, with a composite score of -6.55 (rank 65) in 2009. Although there was less fluctuation among public sector banks, the average composite score of public sector banks fell from -1.69 in 2005 to -3.40 in 2009. The average composite score for private banks decreased from -1.17 in 2005 to -1.29 in 2009. Hence, there was no improvement in the performance of private sector banks in 2009. Foreign banks' composite score increased from 2.75 in 2005 to 4.71 in 2016, although variance remained quite high (9.7641). This demonstrates that international banks' performance is inconsistent. 2013 saw international banks take the top 10 spots. Mashreq Bank PSC, Mizuho Bank, Credit Agricole, J.P. Morgan Chase, and Bank of Ceylon made up the top five banks, in that order. American Express Bank (Rank69), Catholic Syrian Bank (Rank68), Dhanlaxmi Bank (Rank67), and Laxmi Vilas Bank were among the worst performing banks (Rank 66). American Express Bank improved significantly in 2017 and rose to the sixth position. From -3.40 in 2009, the average composite score further decreased to -4.34 in 2013. The average composite score for private sector banks similarly shows a deterioration, going from -1.29 in 2009 to -2.57 in 2013 and -1.1744 in 2005. By increasing their composite score from 2.76 in 2005 and 4.71 in 2009 to 6.7340 in 2013, foreign banks achieved significant improvement. Foreign banks lack consistency because of their large standard deviation (9.10). The top five positions in 2017 are held by foreign banks Mashreq Bank (rank one), Bank of Ceylon (rank two), J.P. Morgan Chase (rank three), Citi Bank (rank four), and AB Bank (rank 5). In 2009 and 2013, American Express Bank was ranked 69th; in 2017, it was ranked sixth. From position 25 in 2013 to position 8 in 2017, HDFC Bank saw an improvement. Axis Bank also raised its standing and entered the top ten banks.

In 2017, the public sector banks' average composite score dropped even more, to -5.26. From -2.57 in 2013 to 0.79 in 2017, the composite score of private sector banks increased. Particularly, the performance of HDFC, Axis, ICICI, Kotak Mahindra, and Yes banks improved.

Table 1: Total Scores and Overall Ranks of Public Banks

S. No.	Banks	Scores					Overall Ranks				
		2005	2009	2013	2017	Avg	2005	2009	2013	2017	Avg. Rank

1	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	-.620	-2.965	-2.395	-5.294	-2.819	35	49	34	54	45
2	State Bank of Hyderabad	-2.833	-2.900	-4.062	-6.093	-3.972	52	48	46	61	50
3	State Bank of India	-4.826	-5.145	-3.856	-2.299	-4.031	59	62	42	35	54
4	State Bank of Mysore	-1.264	-3.896	-5.133	-10.363	-5.164	40	54	59	68	63
5	State Bank of Patiala	.570	-4.477	-5.701	-10.850	-5.115	28	57	61	69	62
6	State Bank of Travancore	-1.589	-3.075	-5.265	-5.993	-3.981	43	51	60	60	51
7	Allahabad Bank	-1.068	-2.489	-4.871	-5.000	-3.357	38	42	56	52	48
8	Andhra Bank	.958	-3.049	-3.885	-3.609	-2.396	26	50	44	46	41
9	Bank of Baroda	.455	-4.451	-4.109	-3.326	-2.858	30	56	47	43	46
10	Bank of India	-4.788	-3.593	-5.127	-5.854	-4.840	58	52	58	58	61
11	Bank of Maharashtra	-4.098	-4.276	-2.428	-5.936	-4.184	55	55	35	59	56
12	Canara Bank	-2.648	-4.510	-4.798	-5.496	-4.363	50	58	53	56	59
13	Central Bank of India	-2.549	-6.430	-6.552	.218	-3.828	48	65	63	29	49
14	Corporation Bank	3.368	-1.060	-3.107	-2.956	-.939	17	33	39	39	32
15	Dena Bank	-5.043	-2.476	-1.236	-7.859	-4.153	61	40	32	65	55
16	IDBI Bank Limited	5.020	-1.438	-2.266	-6.944	-1.407	11	36	33	64	36
17	Indian Bank	-2.236	-1.019	-4.237	-2.480	-2.493	46	32	49	38	42
18	Indian Overseas Bank	1.600	-3.615	-6.068	-8.005	-4.022	23	53	62	66	52
19	Oriental Bank of Commerce	4.385	-2.757	-2.859	-5.008	-1.560	14	46	38	53	37
20	Punjab And Sind Bank	-13.963	-4.961	-7.103	-4.372	-7.600	68	61	65	49	66

21	Punjab National Bank	-.749	-2.348	-3.174	-3.913	-2.546	36	38	40	47	43
22	Syndicate Bank	-4.285	-2.855	-4.211	-5.547	-4.224	56	47	48	57	57
23	Uco Bank	-4.684	-5.199	-4.858	-6.290	-5.258	57	63	55	62	64
24	Union Bank of India	-1.112	-2.379	-3.923	-3.094	-2.627	39	39	45	41	44
25	United Bank of India	-2.720	-4.580	-4.822	-6.359	-4.620	51	59	54	63	60
26	Vijaya Bank	.768	-2.482	-6.729	-4.067	-3.127	27	41	64	48	47
	Average	-1.6904	-3.4010	-4.3374	-5.2611						
	Standard Deviation	3.7478	1.3407	1.4613	2.4165						

Table 2: Total Scores and Overall Ranks of Private Banks

S. No.	Banks	Scores					Overall Ranks				
		2005	2009	2013	2017	Avg	2005	2009	2013	2017	Avg. Rank
27	Axis Bank	5.877	3.490	3.017	5.342	4.432	8	18	16	10	14
28	Catholic Syrian Bank Ltd	-3.513	-7.198	-11.008	-10.340	-8.015	54	66	68	67	67
29	City Union Bank Limited	-2.210	-1.189	-3.877	.923	-1.588	45	34	43	26	38
30	Dcb Bank Limited	-9.532	-4.687	-3.743	.608	-4.339	66	60	41	28	58
31	Dhanlaxmi Bank	-7.430	-12.172	-9.287	-3.372	-8.065	63	68	67	44	68
32	Federal Bank	-2.615	3.212	-2.756	-2.082	-1.060	49	19	37	34	33
33	HDFC Bank	7.066	2.311	1.081	7.004	4.366	6	21	25	8	15
34	ICICI Bank	1.327	2.241	2.514	4.386	2.617	24	22	18	15	19
35	Induslnd Bank	1.865	-2.707	1.632	4.627	1.354	22	45	21	14	24
36	Jammu & Kashmir Bank	.349	.247	2.061	-3.571	-.228	31	29	19	45	30

37	Karnataka Bank Ltd	-1.060	-2.186	-4.275	-.302	-1.956	37	37	50	31	40
38	Karur Vysya Bank	1.287	-1.426	-4.780	.097	-1.206	25	35	52	30	34
39	Kotak Mahindra Bank Ltd	3.566	.683	1.032	3.457	2.185	16	27	26	18	21
40	Lakshmi Vilas Bank	-5.007	-6.067	-8.698	-4.651	-6.105	60	64	66	51	65
41	Nainital Bank	2.914	.774	-.496	-3.184	.002	18	26	30	42	27
42	RBL	-3.103	2.738	-2.754	1.583	-.384	53	20	36	24	31
43	South Indian Bank	-5.565	-2.676	-4.903	-2.981	-4.031	62	43	57	40	53
44	Tamilnad Mercantile Bank Ltd	2.598	-.007	-4.295	.905	-.200	19	31	51	27	28
45	Yes Bank Ltd.	-9.129	.069	.689	3.058	-1.328	65	30	27	21	35
	Average	-1.1744	-1.2921	-2.5708	0.0793						
	Standard Deviation	4.7930	4.0223	4.1541	4.2169						

Table 3: Total Scores and Overall Ranks of Foreign Banks

S. No.	Banks	Scores					Overall Ranks				
		2005	2009	2013	2017	Avg.	2005	2009	2013	2017	Avg. Rank
46	AB Bank Limited	10.982	6.940	3.822	12.831	8.644	5	6	15	5	6
47	Abu Dhabi Commercial Bank	-12.613	6.539	1.517	-2.365	-1.730	67	8	23	36	39
48	American Express Banking Corp	-2.349	-29.823	-19.802	11.848	-10.031	47	69	69	6	69
49	Bank of America N.A.	2.199	6.125	2.535	2.611	3.368	21	11	17	23	17
50	Bank of Bahrain & Kuwait B.S.	-8.105	.394	7.358	-.462	-.204	64	28	10	33	29
51	Bank of Ceylon	-1.343	11.223	15.246	17.439	10.641	41	5	5	2	3
52	Bank of Nova Scotia	-.608	5.614	7.997	2.685	3.922	34	14	9	22	16
53	Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UFJ	.528	6.544	12.775	4.000	5.962	29	7	6	16	11

54	Barclays Bank PLC	24.471	.884	-.729	7.594	8.055	1	25	31	7	7
55	Bnp Paribas	-.490	5.796	.131	4.697	2.533	33	13	29	13	20
56	Citibank N.A.	12.050	5.172	5.294	14.153	9.167	3	15	13	4	4
57	Credit Agricole	-14.996	14.605	18.961	-.384	4.546	69	3	3	32	13
58	Ctbc Bank	6.903	12.799	1.087	5.044	6.458	7	4	24	11	9
59	Dbs Bank Ltd.	-1.838	5.053	1.579	-4.551	.061	44	16	22	50	26
60	Deutsche Bank AG	.044	6.354	10.056	4.897	6.419	32	9	8	12	10
61	Hongkong And Shanghai Banking	4.759	4.661	5.703	5.966	5.272	12	17	12	9	12
62	Jp Morgan Chase Bank N.A.	5.725	21.420	18.326	14.452	14.981	10	1	4	3	2
63	Mashreq Bank Psc	2.302	18.949	23.579	31.517	19.087	20	2	1	1	1
64	Mizuho Bank Ltd	4.326	6.178	21.399	3.255	8.790	15	10	2	19	5
65	Sbm Bank(Mauritius) Ltd	5.816	1.830	10.979	-5.489	3.284	9	23	7	55	18
66	Shinhan Bank	11.505	5.980	6.005	3.187	6.669	4	12	11	20	8
67	Societe Generale	-1.479	1.191	.611	.988	.328	42	24	28	25	25
68	Sonali Bank	13.847	-8.748	5.182	-2.395	1.971	2	67	14	37	22
69	Standard Chartered Bank	4.629	-2.705	2.006	3.764	1.924	13	44	20	17	23
	Average	2.7610	4.7073	6.7340	5.6368						
	Standard Deviation	8.4862	9.7641	9.0981	8.1886						

Performance within Public Sector Banks

In this part, we examine the overall performance of public, private, and international banks within their respective groups. The positions are determined according to the category for the years 2005, 2009, 2013, and 2017. Also, the average performance of the four years is computed, and rankings are given in order to access the performance from 2005 to 2017. Considering that ranks change throughout the years and that there is no consistency in ranks, this is necessary in order to access the performance. The performance of IDBI bank was ranked first in 2005, and it stayed in second or third position in 2009 and 2013, but it abruptly dropped to number 22 in 2017. In 2005, the bank's performance was ranked first (Table 4). In 2005, Oriental Bank of Commerce had the number two spot, however they were unable to keep this position in subsequent years. In 2005, Corporation Bank was ranked third, and it has consistently been among the top six banks since then.

The performance of this financial institution over the time period under consideration has been consistent. In 2005, Indian Overseas Bank had the fourth position, but by 2017, it had fallen to the twenty-fourth spot. Andhra Bank achieved position 5 in 2005 and continued to place among the top thirteen banks in subsequent years. 2017 was a year of significant progress for the State Bank of India. Its position rose from 24 in 2005 and 2009 to 2 in 2017, marking a significant advancement. The next bank on the list is the Central Bank of India, which has risen from position 26 in 2009 to position 1 in 2017. Moreover, Indian Bank shown signs of progress in 2017. In 2017, Union Bank of India had the fifth spot on this list, and it has remained there ever since. The State Bank of Patiala, State Bank of Mysore, Indian Overseas Bank, Dena Bank, and IDBI Bank all had the worst performance among the public sector banks. It might be due to non-performing assets, deposit mobilisation, credit deployment, or any number of other things. The twelve year average composite scores are displayed in tables 4 through 6, along with the ranks achieved within each category. Corporation Bank (rank 1), IDBI Bank (rank 2), Oriental Bank of Commerce (rank 3) and Andhra Bank (rank 4) are the top five performing banks in the public sector, respectively. Indian Bank comes in at number five (rank5). Bank of India comes in last place, followed by Punjab and Sind Bank (rank 26), UCO Bank (rank 25), The Bank of Mysore (rank 24), and State Bank of Patiala (rank 23). (Table4).

Table 4: Total Scores and Ranks within Public Banks

S. No.	Banks	Scores					Ranks within Public Banks				
		2005	2009	2013	2017	Avg	2005	2009	2013	2017	Avg. Rank
1	State Bank of Bikaner & Jaipur	-.620	-2.965	-2.395	-5.294	-2.819	9	12	3	13	8
2	State Bank of Hyderabad	-2.833	-2.900	-4.062	-6.093	-3.972	19	11	11	19	13
3	State Bank of India	-4.826	-5.145	-3.856	-2.299	-4.031	24	24	8	2	16
4	State Bank of Mysore	-1.264	-3.896	-5.133	-10.363	-5.164	13	17	20	25	24
5	State Bank of Patiala	.570	-4.477	-5.701	-10.850	-5.115	7	20	22	26	23
6	State Bank of Travancore	-1.589	-3.075	-5.265	-5.993	-3.981	14	14	21	18	14
7	Allahabad Bank	-1.068	-2.489	-4.871	-5.000	-3.357	11	8	18	11	11
8	Andhra Bank	.958	-3.049	-3.885	-3.609	-2.396	5	13	9	7	4
9	Bank of Baroda	.455	-4.451	-4.109	-3.326	-2.858	8	19	12	6	9
10	Bank of India	-4.788	-3.593	-5.127	-5.854	-4.840	23	15	19	16	22

11	Bank of Maharashtra	-4.098	-4.276	-2.428	-5.936	-4.184	20	18	4	17	18
12	Canara Bank	-2.648	-4.510	-4.798	-5.496	-4.363	17	21	15	14	20
13	Central Bank of India	-2.549	-6.430	-6.552	.218	-3.828	16	26	24	1	12
14	Corporation Bank	3.368	-1.060	-3.107	-2.956	-.939	3	2	6	4	1
15	Dena Bank	-5.043	-2.476	-1.236	-7.859	-4.153	25	6	1	23	17
16	IDBI Bank Limited	5.020	-1.438	-2.266	-6.944	-1.407	1	3	2	22	2
17	Indian Bank	-2.236	-1.019	-4.237	-2.480	-2.493	15	1	14	3	5
18	Indian Overseas Bank	1.600	-3.615	-6.068	-8.005	-4.022	4	16	23	24	15
19	Oriental Bank of Commerce	4.385	-2.757	-2.859	-5.008	-1.560	2	9	5	12	3
20	Punjab And Sind Bank	-13.963	-4.961	-7.103	-4.372	-7.600	26	23	26	10	26
21	Punjab National Bank	-.749	-2.348	-3.174	-3.913	-2.546	10	4	7	8	6
22	Syndicate Bank	-4.285	-2.855	-4.211	-5.547	-4.224	21	10	13	15	19
23	UCO Bank	-4.684	-5.199	-4.858	-6.290	-5.258	22	25	17	20	25
24	Union Bank of India	-1.112	-2.379	-3.923	-3.094	-2.627	12	5	10	5	7
25	United Bank of India	-2.720	-4.580	-4.822	-6.359	-4.620	18	22	16	21	21
26	Vijaya Bank	.768	-2.482	-6.729	-4.067	-3.127	6	7	25	9	10
	Average	-1.6904	-3.4010	-4.3374	-5.2611						
	Standard Deviation	3.7478	1.3407	1.4613	2.4165						

Performance within Private Sector Banks

During the time period that was the focus of this study, Axis Bank held either the number one or number two position. This demonstrates that the bank has maintained a consistent level of performance. In 2005 and 2017, HDFC Bank was ranked number one, while it maintained a spot in the top five for the other two selected time periods. Following that was ICICI Bank, which rose from position 7 in 2005 to position 2 in 2013 and position

4 in 2017, respectively. For the time period under consideration, Kotak Mahindra maintained a position in the top seven positions. The position of Indusland Bank, which had been ranked 15 in 2009, rose to number 3 in 2017. The performance of Yes Bank also improved, as seen by their rise from position 18 in 2005 to position 6 in 2017 in the overall rankings. These six private banks received composite ratings that were above average, whilst the majority of the other banks had scores that were below average, indicating that their performance was below average. The ranks of the various private sector banks are provided in Table 5. Table 5 displays the private sector banks' average composite scores for the past 12 years. On the basis of their twelve year average composite scores, the private sector banks that have performed the best over the past decade are as follows: Axis Bank (rank 1), HDFC Bank (rank 2), ICICI Bank (rank 3), Kotak Mahindra Bank (4), and Induslnd Bank (5). (rank5). The private banks that have the worst performance are as follows: Dhanlaxmi Bank (19th), Catholic Syrian Bank (18th), Lakshmi Vilas Bank (17th), DCB Bank (16th), and South Indian Bank (rank 19). (rank15).

Conclusion

In conclusion, it can be stated that despite the fact that there has been a wonderful development in Public, Private, and Foreign Banks in India following the Banking Sector Reforms, the Public Sector Banks are still falling behind the other types of banks. To be able to keep up with the challenging performance of the private sector banks in India and to be able to compete with global players who have established their branches in India, it may be recommended that the public sector banks in India should be more efficient in their overall asset management policy, employee performance, cost control, and should have more customer friendly banking operations. This would allow them to keep pace with the challenging performance of the private sector banks in India. According to the findings of the preceding investigation, there is a discernible gap between the levels of success achieved by public and private banks and those of their international counterparts. There is a significant gap in performance between public and private banks on each of these 23 financial parameters.

References

1. Aswini, M.K.(2012).Analyzing soundness in Indian Banking: A CAMEL Approach. Research, Journal of Commerce and Behavioural Science, 1(3), 9-14.
2. Dash, Mihir& Das, Annyesha.(2009). A CAMALS Analysis of the Indian Banking Industry. Retreived from http://ssrn.com/abstract=1666900
3. Gupta, Ruchi.(2014). An analysis of indian public sector banks using camel approach. IOSR Journal of Business and Managment, 16(1),94-102.
4. Kabir, A. Md. and Suman, D.(2012). Performance analysis through CAMEL Rating: A comparative study of selected private commercial banks in Bangladesh. Journal of Politics and Governance, 2(3), 16-25.
5. Khatik,S.K. & Nag,Amit.kr.(2014). Analyzing soundness of nationalised banks in India: A camel approach. Applied studies in agribusiness and commerce,8(1).Retrieved from http://ageconsearch.umn.edu/bitstream/187531/2/10S.K.Khatik.pdf.
6. Misra ,S.K & Aspal, P.K.(2013). A camel model analysis of State Bank Group, World journal of social sciences,3(4),36-55.
7. Mohiuddin, Golam (2014). Use of CAMEL model: A study of financial performance of selected commercial banks in Bangladesh. Universal journal of accounting and finance, 2(5),151-160.

8. Nazir,Tabassum.(2010).Analyzing financial performance of commercial banks in India: application of Camel model. Retrieved from etd.uum.edu.my/4587/7/s813769_abstract.pdf.