

Financial Performance of Commercial Banks: A Comparative Study

Dr. Parameshwara

Assistant professor, Department of Commerce, Mangalore University, Mangalagangotri-574199

ABSTRACT

Bankers are the custodians and purveyors of public money. They have the policy framework for accepting and lending. They have the responsibility and target of lending to the different sectors of the economy and overall development of the economy. This requires the sound financial health of the banks by ensuring liquidity, safety, profitability, solvency and other principles of sound bank management. The effective and efficient management of financial sources can be measured through financial performance of the banks. The financial performance can be evaluated through various ratio analyses. Banks collect deposits from public and channelize funds for different sectors of the economy as per the guidelines of RBI. It has to win the confidence of the customers, shareholders and the government through its financial activities. After the liberalization banks face more competitions from private and foreign banks. The success of the banks can be measured through performance analysis by considering various determining factors. Ratio analysis is one such tool to measure the performance of commercial banks. It is helpful to take decisions on weak areas based on ratios.

Key words: Banks, Funds, Financial performance, Ratios, and RBI

INTRODUCTION

Banking industry in India developed to a large extent between nationalization and liberalization of economy. After the liberalization since 1991 banking system in India had the challenge of achieving efficiency and productivity because of the entry of foreign and private banks. To ensure sound banking system, Government of India also initiated control mechanisms through capital adequacy requirements and safety norms. The ultimate objective of private and foreign licensing is to bring Indian banking system to the global standard. Bankers are the custodians and purveyors of public money. They have the policy framework for accepting and lending. They have the responsibility and target of lending to the different sectors of the economy and overall development of the economy. This requires the sound financial health of the banks by ensuring liquidity, safety, profitability, solvency and other principles of sound bank management. The effective and efficient management of financial sources can be measured through financial performance of the banks. The financial performance can be evaluated through various ratio analyses.

Objective of the study:

- a. To understand the concept of measurement of various ratios for performance evaluation
- b. To study various ratios to measure financial performance of banks

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Bourke, (1989) Liquidity risk, arising from the possible inability of a bank to accommodate the increase of withdrawal demands or to fund increases on the loan demands, is considered an important determinant of bank profitability. Normally speaking, higher liquidity should be positively associated with better financial performance of the banks. **Bhayani et al.** (2007) had attempted to investigate how the proportion of transformation cost is higher than that of transaction cost in the banks under study. Transaction cost plays an important role in the profit ability of banks. Therefore, if the management of co-operative banks tries to reduce the transaction cost, it will improve their banks' profitability. Samad (2007) examined the operation of foreign and domestic banks in the process of industrialization and economic development of Bangladesh.



The comparison of the financial ratios of foreign and domestic banks indicates that there are significant differences in operation between them. Kumbirai, M. and Webb, R. (2010) their study revealed 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. Din Sangm (2010) Sound financial health of a bank is the guarantee not only to its depositors but is equally significant for the shareholders, employees and whole economy as well. As a sequel to this maxim, efforts have been made from time to time, to measure the financial position of each bank and manage it efficiently and effectively

Theoretical background: The following are the formulas of various ratios.

Cash to Deposits ratio measures the cash in hand at the bank in a particulars year in relation to the deposits of the • customers. The greater value of this ratio makes the bank less stressful on the liquidity front. This ratio can be computed with the help of the following formula

Cash in Hand + Balances with RBI

Cash-Deposit Ratio = ------ x 100

Deposit

Credit-Deposit ratio measures the efficiency of the management in converting the available deposit into advances. The efficiency is positively related to the value of the ratio.

Total Advances

Credit-Deposit Ratio = ----- x 100

Total Deposit

• Investment - Deposit Ratio measures the efficiency of the management in converting the available deposit into investments. The efficiency is positively related to the value of the ratio.

Total Investment

Investment-Deposit Ratio = ----- x 100

Total Deposit

(Credit + Investment) - Deposit Ratio is calculated by dividing the amount of total earning assets (Advance +Investments) by the amount of total deposit. It measures the management efficiency and quality of assets.

Total Advances + Total Investment

(Credit + Investment) -Deposit Ratio = ------x 100

Total Deposit

• The total **deposit to total liability ratio** measures the total deposit as a percentage of total liabilities. The higher this ratio indicates that a bank received high deposit and its liquidity is high.

Total Deposit

Deposit to Total Liabilities Ratio = ------ x 100

Total Liabilities

The term deposits to total deposit ratio measures the term deposit as a percentage of total deposits. If the ratio is higher, it indicates that a bank received more term deposits and its liquidity is high.

Term Deposit

Term Deposit to Total Deposit Ratio = ----- x 100

Total Deposit

• Ratio of Priority Sector Advances to Total Advances measures priority sector advances as a percentage of total advance. The higher value of this ratio means that there is more advance for priority sector as a portion of total advance.

Priority Sector Advances

Priority Sector Advances to = ------ x 100

Total Advances Ratio Total Advances

Ratio of Term Loan to Total Advances measures the term loan outstanding as a percentage of total advances. If • this ratio is higher, it indicates that a bank is loaned up and its liquidity is low. The higher the ratio, the more risky a bank may be to higher defaults.

Term Loan

Term Loan to Total Advances Ratio = ------ x 100

Total Advances

The secured advances to total advances ratio measures the secured advance as a percentage of total advances. The higher this ratio means it indicates a bank loaned up and its liquidity is low.

Secured Advances

Secured Advances to Total Advances = ------ x 100



Total Advances

• **Investments in non-approved securities to the total investments ratio** measures investments in non-approved securities as a percentage of total investments. It measures the risk-taking ability of the bank.

Advances Secured by Tangible Assets + Advances covered by

Bank or Govt. Guarantees

Investments in Non-Approved = ------ x 100

Securities to Total Investment Ratio

Total Investments

• **Ratio of Interest Income to Total Assets** This ratio is an indicator of the rate at which a commercial bank earns income by lending the funds to the public. The higher ratio is an indicator of efficient management of banks' total assets.

Total Income

Interest Income to Total Assets Ratio = ------ x 100

Total Assets

• Ratio of Net Interest Income to Total Assets (Net interest margin) ratio is the difference between interest earned from lending the funds by the bank and the interest paid on deposit and borrowings. The banks should keep their interest low on deposits and high on advances for greater net interest margin. The net interest margin would determine the earning capacity of the bank.

| | Interest Income – |
|---|-------------------|
| | Interest Expenses |
| Net Interest Margin to Total Assets Ratio = | x 100 |
| - | Total Assets |

• **Ratio of Non-Interest Income to Total Assets** represents income earned by way of commission, brokerage, service charges and other miscellaneous receipts. Efforts should be made to closely monitor this ratio so that the burden can be reduced and bank profitability can be increased.

Non-Interest Income

Non Interest Income to Total Assets Ratio = ------ x 100

Total Assets

• **Ratio of Intermediation Cost to Total Assets** ratio measures the intermediation cost as a percentage of total assets. This ratio indicates the amount of intermediation costs expended per unit of assets.

Operating Expenses

Intermediation Cost to Total Assets Ratio = ------ x 100

Total Assets

• Wage Bill to intermediation cost ratio measures payment to the provision for employee as a percentage of intermediation cost. The higher ratio indicates that it adversely affects the net profit.

Payment to and Provisions

for Employees

Wage Bills to Intermediation Cost Ratio = ------ x 100

Operating Expenses

• **Ratio of Wage Bills to Total Expenses** measures payment to and provisions for employees as a percentage of total Expenses. The higher value of ratio indicates that it adversely affects the net profit.

Payment to and Provisions

for Employees

Wage Bills to Total Expenses Ratio = ----- x 100

Total expenses

• **Ratio of wage bills to total income** measures payment to and provisions for employees as a percentage of total income.

Payment to and Provisions

for Employees

Wage Bills to Total Income Ratio = ----- x 100

Total Income

• **Burden to Total Assets ratio,** the difference between non-interest expenses and non-interest income of bank is called burden. It measures the burden as a percentage of total assets. Profit of the bank is the difference between spread and burden. If the burden is more, it adversely affects profit.

Operating Expenses – Other Income

Burden to Total Assets Ratio = ----- x 100

Total Assets



• **Ratio of burden to Interest Income** measures the burden as a percentage of interest Income. Higher value of ratio adversely affects profit.

Operating Expenses – Other Income

Burden to Interest Income Ratio = ----- x 100

Interest Income

• **Ratio of Operating Profits to Total Assets** is arrived at by dividing the operating profit by the total assets. The earning quality of the bank is directly proportional to this ratio.

Operating Profit

Operating Profit to Total Assets Ratio = ------ x 100 Total Assets

• **Return on assets (ROA)** gives an indication as to how much profit a business unit is able to generate per unit of its assets. Higher value of this ratio is indicative of higher profitability.

Net Profit

Return on Assets Ratio = ----- x 100

Average Assets

• **Return on equity** indicates among of profits that a business unit is generating for its equity investor. The ratio is widely used by equity investors in their decision-making. Higher value of the ratio is indicative of higher profitability and productivity.

Net Profit

Return on Equity Ratio = ----- x 100

Capital + Reserves and Surplus

• **Cost of deposits** measures the interest paid on deposits. The banks should keep their interest low on deposit. It determines the earning capacity of the bank.

Interest Paid on Deposits

Cost of Deposits Ratio = ----- x 100

Deposits

• **Cost of borrowings** measures the interest paid on borrowings from the RBI and the other agencies. The lower value of this ratio indicates better performance.

Interest Paid on Borrowings from RBI and Other Agencies

Cost of Borrowings Ratio = ----- x 100

Borrowings

• **Cost of funds** measures the interest paid on deposits and borrowings as a percentage of deposits plus borrowings. The lower value of this ratio indicates better performance.

Interest Paid on Deposits + Interest Paid on Borrowings from RBI

and Other Agencies

Cost of Funds Ratio = ----- x 100

Deposits + Borrowings

• **Return on advances** measures the interest earned on advance and bills. The higher value of this ratio indicates more earning of the bank from lending.

Interest Earned on Advances

and Bills

Return on Advances Ratio = ----- x 100

Advances

• **Return on investments** measures the interest earned on investments. The higher value of this ratio indicates more earning of the bank from investments.

Interest Earned on Investments

Return on Investments Ratio = ----- x 100

Investments

- **Return on advances** adjusted to cost of funds measures the net return on advances.
- Return on Advances Adjusted = Return on Advances Cost of Funds to Cost of Funds Ratio
- Return on investments adjusted to cost of funds measures the net return on investments.
- Return on Investments Adjusted = Return on Investments Cost of Funds to Cost of Funds Ratio



Ratio analysis of commercial banks: The following table depicts various ratios of SBI, public sector, private sector, foreign banks and other small financial banks in India.

| Cash - Deposit Ratio 2016-17 6.22 5.99 6.18 8.04 9.30 Credit - Deposit Ratio 2016-16 4.93 5.59 5.67 5.18 - Credit - Deposit Ratio 2016-17 72.29 63.78 86.54 7.1.39 164.37 2016-17 71.38 74.72 90.30 79.24 - - 2014-15 82.07 76.12 86.36 80.85 - - 1nvestment - Deposit Ratio 2016-17 136.44 31.62 33.34 51.50 62.08 2014-15 2014-15 2014-16 10.49 104.75 127.48 140.54 - Deposit Ratio 2016-17 77.78 82.99 71.22 57.51 35.93 liabilities 2016-17 77.78 82.99 71.22 57.51 35.93 liabilities 2016-17 75.65 81.65 68.25 56.33 - Ratio of deposits to total 2016-17 75.21 32.15 22 | Ratios | YEARS | SBI & ASC | PUBLIC SECTOR BANKS | PRIVATE SECTOR BANKS | FOREIGN BANKS | SMALL FINANCE BANKS |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------|----------------|---------------------------|----------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|
| 2015-16 4.93 5.90 5.67 5.18 Credit - Deposit Ratio 2016-17 72.29 68.78 86.54 71.39 164.37 2015-16 71.38 74.72 90.30 79.24 - 2015-16 71.38 164.37 Investment - Deposit Ratio 2016-17 36.44 31.62 33.34 51.50 66.08 C(redit + Investment) 2016-17 108.37 100.40 119.88 122.89 22.64.17 Deposit Ratio 2016-17 108.73 100.40 119.88 122.89 22.64.17 Deposit Ratio 2016-17 177.78 82.99 71.22 75.13 35.93 liabilities 2015-16 75.65 81.65 68.25 56.33 - Poposit Ratio 2016-17 77.78 82.99 70.47 75.367 - Ratio of demand & saving 2015-16 75.21 32.15 28.48 28.93 84.75 advances to total 2016-17 25.21 32.15 | Cash - Deposit Ratio | 2016-17 | 6.22 | 5.99 | 6.18 | 8.04 | 9.30 |
| 2014-15 7.06 5.46 6.08 5.97 - Credit - Deposit Ratio 2016-17 72.29 68.78 86.54 71.30 164.37 Investment - Deposit Ratio 2016-16 71.38 74.72 90.30 79.24 - 2014-15 62.07 76.12 86.36 80.85 - - 2014-15 2016-17 36.44 31.62 33.34 \$51.50 62.08 2014-15 2016-17 108.73 100.40 119.88 102.77.48 140.54 - Credit + Investment) 2016-17 177.78 82.99 70.47 13.99 23.57 13.59 Ratio of deposits total 2015-16 77.65 81.65 68.25 56.33 29.59 36.42 62.31 - 20.59 36.43 34.65 - 20.59 20.51 56.53 35.93 20.51 20.59 20.59 20.51 20.59 20.51 20.51 20.51 20.51 20.51 20.51 20. | 1 I | 2015-16 | 4.93 | 5.59 | 5.67 | 5.18 | _ |
| Credit - Deposit Ratio 2016-17 72.29 68.78 86.54 71.39 164.37 2015-16 71.38 74.72 90.30 79.24 - 2014-15 62.07 76.12 86.36 80.85 - 2014-15 62.07 76.12 86.36 80.85 - 2015-16 32.40 30.03 37.18 61.30 - 2014-15 29.79 28.59 36.42 62.31 - 2014-15 111.86 104.77 122.78 143.16 - 2014-15 111.86 104.71 122.79 143.16 - 2015-16 77.65 81.65 68.25 56.33 - 2014-15 78.23 82.89 70.47 53.67 - adaior deposits to total 2015-16 40.60 32.68 39.33 34.45 - adaio of priority sector 2016-17 25.21 32.15 28.85 27.34 - 2014-15 51.21 < | | 2014-15 | 7.06 | 5.46 | 6.08 | 5.97 | _ |
| Investment 1015 1.6 71.38 74.72 90.30 79.24 2014-15 82.07 76.12 86.36 80.85 | Credit - Deposit Ratio | 2016-17 | 72.29 | 68.78 | 86.54 | 71.39 | 164.37 |
| Investment - Deposit Ratio 2016-17 36.44 31.62 33.34 51.50 62.08 Investment - Deposit Ratio 2016-16 32.40 30.03 37.18 61.30 - 2014-15 29.79 28.59 36.42 62.31 - - 2014-15 2017 108.73 100.40 119.88 122.89 2226.45 2014-15 111.86 104.71 122.79 143.16 - - 2014-15 111.86 104.71 122.79 143.16 - - 2014-15 171.85 82.89 70.47 53.67 - - 2014-15 78.25 82.89 70.47 53.67 - - Ratio of demand & savings 2016-17 25.21 32.15 28.85 28.93 84.75 advances to total advances 2016-17 25.21 32.15 28.85 28.93 84.75 advances to total advances 2016-17 56.12 52.64 68.06 37.51 | | 2015-16 | 71.38 | 74.72 | 90.30 | 79.24 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 82.07 | 76.12 | 86.36 | 80.85 | - |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | Investment - Deposit Ratio | 2016-17 | 36.44 | 31.62 | 33.34 | 51.50 | 62.08 |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 2015-16 | 32.40 | 30.03 | 37.18 | 61.30 | - |
| (Credit + Investment) 2016-17 108,73 100.40 119.88 122.89 226.45 Deposit Ratio 2015-16 114.94 104.75 127.48 140.54 - Ratio of deposits to total 2016-17 77.78 82.99 71.22 57.51 33.93 Ilabilities 2015-16 77.55 81.65 68.25 56.33 - 2015-16 77.85 82.99 71.22 57.51 33.93 Batio of demand & saving 2016-17 43.68 37.38 43.06 37.63 29.59 bank deposits to total 2015-16 25.21 32.15 28.85 28.93 84.75 advances to total advances 2015-16 25.60 31.05 28.83 27.34 - - 2014-15 25.12 32.12 27.77 27.30 - - - - - - 2014-15 51.21 52.58 68.58 38.18 - - - - - - | | 2014-15 | 29.79 | 28.59 | 36.42 | 62.31 | - |
| Deposit Ratio 2015-16 114.94 104.75 127.48 140.54 Ratio of deposits to total 2016-17 77.78 82.99 71.22 57.51 35.93 iabilities 2015-16 75.65 81.65 68.25 56.33 - 2014-15 78.25 82.89 70.47 53.67 - advances 2016-17 43.68 37.38 43.06 37.63 29.59 bank deposits to total 2014-15 39.46 30.99 38.34 34.87 - deposits 2014-15 39.46 30.99 38.34 34.65 - advances to total advances 2016-17 25.21 32.15 28.83 27.34 - 2014-15 51.21 52.64 68.06 37.51 85.98 advances 2016-17 83.26 86.51 79.0 - - advances 2016-17 53.20 52.58 68.58 38.18 - - - - <td< td=""><td>(Credit + Investment) -</td><td>2016-17</td><td>108.73</td><td>100.40</td><td>119.88</td><td>122.89</td><td>226.45</td></td<> | (Credit + Investment) - | 2016-17 | 108.73 | 100.40 | 119.88 | 122.89 | 226.45 |
| 2014-15 111.86 104.71 122.79 143.16 Ratio of deposits to total liabilities 2015-16 77.78 82.99 71.22 57.51 35.93 Ratio of demand & savings 2016-17 78.85 82.89 70.47 53.67 - Ratio of demand & savings 2016-17 43.68 37.38 43.06 37.63 29.59 bank deposits to total 2015-16 40.60 32.68 39.31 34.87 - advances to total advances 2016-17 25.21 32.15 28.83 28.93 84.75 advances to total advances 2015-16 25.69 31.05 28.83 28.93 84.75 advances 2016-17 25.11 25.64 68.06 37.51 85.98 advances 2016-16 53.20 52.58 68.58 38.18 - 2014-15 51.21 52.64 87.18 83.00 43.66 - advances 2015-16 81.24 86.59 80.54 42. | Deposit Ratio | 2015-16 | 114.94 | 104.75 | 127.48 | 140.54 | - |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | L | 2014-15 | 111.86 | 104.71 | 122.79 | 143.16 | - |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | Ratio of deposits to total | 2016-17 | 77.78 | 82.99 | 71.22 | 57.51 | 35.93 |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | liabilities | 2015-16 | 75.65 | 81.65 | 68.25 | 56.33 | - |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | 2014-15 | 78.25 | 82.89 | 70.47 | 53.67 | - |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | Ratio of demand & savings | 2016-17 | 43.68 | 37.38 | 43.06 | 37.63 | 29.59 |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | bank deposits to total | 2015-16 | 40.60 | 32.68 | 39.31 | 34.87 | - |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | deposits | 2014-15 | 39.46 | 30.99 | 38.34 | 34.65 | - |
| advances to total advances 2015-16 25.69 31.05 28.83 27.34 Ratio of term loans to total advances 2016-17 56.12 52.64 68.06 37.51 85.98 advances 2015-16 53.20 52.58 68.58 38.18 2014-15 51.21 52.53 67.07 39.82 Ratio of secured advances 2016-17 83.56 86.51 79.65 45.15 61.13 non-approved securities to total advances 2016-17 21.75 18.00 26.66 16.46 2.74 non-approved securities to total investments 2016-17 7.13 7.20 8.27 6.33 10.07 Ratio of interest income to total assets 2016-17 7.13 7.20 8.27 6.33 10.07 Ratio of non-interest income to total assets 2016-17 2.93 2.12 3.38 3.41 5.08 2014-15 2.81 8.21 8.12 8.61 6.71 2014-15 2.8 | Ratio of priority sector | 2016-17 | 25.21 | 32,15 | 28.85 | 28.93 | 84.75 |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | advances to total advances | 2015-16 | 25.69 | 31.05 | 28.83 | 27.34 | - |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | 2014-15 | 25.43 | 29.31 | 27.77 | 27.30 | _ |
| advances 2015-16 53.20 52.58 68.58 38.18 - 2014-15 51.21 52.53 67.07 39.82 - Ratio of secured advances 2015-16 81.24 86.59 80.54 42.36 - 2014-15 82.54 87.18 83.00 43.66 - - 2014-15 82.54 87.18 83.00 43.66 - - 2014-15 82.54 87.18 83.00 43.66 - - 2014-15 82.54 87.18 83.00 43.66 - - attio of investments in non-approved securities to total investments 2016-17 7.13 7.20 8.27 6.33 10.07 attio of net interest income to 2016-17 7.13 7.20 8.27 6.33 10.07 attio of non-interest income to cotal assets 2015-16 2.60 2.23 3.41 5.08 2014-15 2.821 8.12 8.12 8.81 6.71 - < | Ratio of term loans to total | 2016-17 | 56.12 | 52.64 | 68.06 | 37.51 | 85.98 |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | advances | 2015-16 | 53.20 | 52.58 | 68.58 | 38.18 | - |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | 2014-15 | 51.21 | 52.53 | 67.07 | 39.82 | - |
| to total advances 2015-16 81.24 86.59 80.54 42.36 - Ratio of investments in non-approved securities to total investments 2016-17 21.75 18.00 26.66 16.46 2.74 Ratio of investments 2015-16 18.30 17.23 23.83 14.61 - Ratio of interest income to total assets 2016-17 7.13 7.20 8.27 6.33 10.07 Ratio of net interest income to total assets (Net Interest income to total assets (Net Interest income to total assets (Net Interest income to total assets 2016-17 2.93 2.12 3.38 3.41 5.08 Ratio of non-interest income to total assets 2016-17 1.36 1.20 1.88 1.95 2.12 Ratio of non-interest income to total assets 2016-17 1.36 1.20 1.88 1.95 2.12 Income to total assets 2016-17 1.36 1.20 1.88 1.95 2.12 Income to total assets 2016-17 1.36 1.20 1.88 1.95 2.12 Income to total assets | Ratio of secured advances | 2016-17 | 83.56 | 86 51 | 79.65 | 45.15 | 61.13 |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | to total advances | 2015-16 | 81.24 | 86.59 | 80.54 | 42.36 | - |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | | 2014-15 | 82.54 | 87.18 | 83.00 | 43.66 | _ |
| $\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Ratio of investments in | 2016-17 | 21.75 | 18.00 | 26.66 | 16.46 | 2 74 |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | non-approved securities to | 2015-16 | 18.30 | 17.23 | 23.83 | 14.61 | 2.71 |
| Ratio of interest income to total assets 2016-17 7.13 7.20 8.27 6.33 10.07 Ratio of interest income to total assets 2015-16 7.72 7.74 8.63 6.67 - Ratio of net interest income to total assets (Net Interest Margin) 2016-17 2.93 2.12 3.38 3.41 5.08 2014-15 2.81 2.35 3.37 3.54 - - Ratio of non-interest income to total assets 2016-17 1.36 1.20 1.88 1.95 2.12 Ratio of intermediation cost to total assets 2016-17 1.36 1.20 1.88 1.95 2.12 Ratio of wage bills to intermediation cost 2016-17 1.36 1.20 1.88 1.95 2.12 Ratio of wage bills to total assets 2016-17 1.85 1.64 2.25 2.08 5.13 2014-15 2.00 1.60 2.23 2.17 - Ratio of wage bills to total assets 2016-17 58.22 58.34 39.35 40.34 57.98 <td>total investments</td> <td>2014-15</td> <td>19.52</td> <td>17.23</td> <td>25.05</td> <td>11.52</td> <td></td> | total investments | 2014-15 | 19.52 | 17.23 | 25.05 | 11.52 | |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | Ratio of interest income to | 2016-17 | 7.13 | 7 20 | 8 27 | 6.33 | 10.07 |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | total assets | 2015-16 | 7.13 | 7.20 | 8.63 | 6.67 | 10.07 |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | 2013-10 | 8.21 | 8.12 | 8.81 | 6.07 | _ |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Ratio of net interest income | 2016-17 | 2.93 | 2.12 | 3 38 | 3.41 | 5.08 |
| Margin) 2014-15 2.81 2.23 3.41 3.39 1 Ratio of non-interest 2016-17 1.36 1.20 1.88 1.95 2.12 Ratio of non-interest 2016-17 1.36 1.20 1.88 1.95 2.12 2014-15 2015-16 1.20 0.92 1.73 1.60 - 2014-15 1.12 0.91 1.72 1.99 - Ratio of intermediation 2016-17 1.85 1.64 2.22 2.07 - Ratio of wage bills to 2016-17 58.22 58.34 39.35 40.34 57.98 Intermediation cost 2015-16 59.71 59.61 40.59 42.48 - 2014-15 61.70 61.20 41.27 42.68 - 2014-15 61.70 61.20 41.27 42.68 - 2014-15 16.40 13.19 11.99 17.32 - < | to total assets (Net Interest | 2015-16 | 2.60 | 2.12 | 2.41 | 2 50 | 5.00 |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | Margin) | 2014-15 | 2.81 | 2.23 | 2.27 | 2.54 | _ |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Ratio of non-interest | 2016-17 | 1.36 | 2.33 | 1.89 | 1.05 | 2 12 |
| $\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | income to total assets | 2015 16 | 1.20 | 0.92 | 1.00 | 1.95 | 2.12 |
| Ratio of intermediation cost to total assets 2016-17 1.12 0.91 1.12 1.92 1.99 <th1< td=""><td></td><td>2013-10</td><td>1.20</td><td>0.92</td><td>1.73</td><td>1.00</td><td>-</td></th1<> | | 2013-10 | 1.20 | 0.92 | 1.73 | 1.00 | - |
| $ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$ | Ratio of intermediation | 2014-13 | 1.12 | 1.64 | 2.25 | 2.09 | 5 12 |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | cost to total assets | 2010-17 | 1.05 | 1.04 | 2.23 | 2.08 | 5.15 |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | | 2013-10 | 2.00 | 1.03 | 2.22 | 2.07 | - |
| $ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $ | Datio of ware hills to | 2014-15 | 50 2.00 | 1.00 | 2.23 | <u> </u> | 57 00 |
| Intermediation cost $2015-10$ 37.11 37.01 40.39 42.46 $ 2014-15$ 61.70 61.20 41.27 42.68 $-$ Ratio of wage bills to total $2016-17$ 58.22 14.26 12.39 16.79 29.40 $2015-16$ 15.97 13.60 12.11 17.07 Page 193 $ 2014-15$ 16.40 13.19 11.99 17.32 $-$ Ratio of wage bills to total $2016-17$ 12.72 11.40 8.71 10.16 24.41 | intermediation cost | 2010-17 | 50.22 | 50.54 | 37.33 40.50 | 40.34 | 51.90 |
| Ratio of wage bills to total expense $2014-15$ 01.70 01.20 41.27 42.06 $-$ Ratio of wage bills to total 2016-17 $2016-17$ 58.22 14.26 12.39 16.79 29.40 $2015-16$ 15.97 13.60 12.11 17.07 Page 193 - $2014-15$ 16.40 13.19 11.99 17.32 - Ratio of wage bills to total 2016-17 12.72 11.40 8.71 10.16 24.41 | intermediation cost | 2013-10 | 57.71 61.70 | 57.01 61.20 | 40.39 | 42.40 | - |
| expense $2016-17$ 36.22 14.20 12.37 10.75 229.40 expense $2015-16$ 15.97 13.60 12.11 17.07 Page 193 $ 2014-15$ 16.40 13.19 11.99 17.32 $-$ Ratio of wage bills to total $2016-17$ 12.72 11.40 8.71 10.16 24.41 | Ratio of wage bills to total | 2014-13 | 58.77 | 14.26 | 12 30 | 16 70 | 20.40 |
| Dependence Defendence Defendence <thdefendence< th=""> Defendence Defenden</thdefendence<> | expense | 2010-17 | 15.07 | 14.20 | 12.39 | 10.79 | Page 193 |
| Z014-13 10.40 13.19 11.79 17.32 - Ratio of wave hills to total 2016-17 12.72 11.40 8.71 10.16 24.41 | <u>r</u> r | 2014 15 | 15.77 | 13.00 | 12.11 | 17.07 | |
| | Ratio of wage bills to total | 2014-13 | 10.40 | 15.19 | § 71 | 17.32 | 24.41 |



International Journal of Enhanced Research in Management & Computer Applications ISSN: 2319-7471, Volume 7 Issue 4, April-2018, Impact Factor: 3.578

| | income | 2015-16 | 12.52 | 11.23 | 8.69 | 10.61 | - |
|----------|-----------------------------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | | 2014-15 | 12.91 | 10.77 | 8.73 | 10.62 | - |
| | Ratio of burden to total | 2016-17 | 0.49 | 0.44 | 0.37 | 0.13 | 3.01 |
| | assets | 2015-16 | 0.67 | 0.71 | 0.49 | 0.47 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 0.80 | 0.70 | 0.51 | 0.17 | - |
| | Ratio of burden to interest | 2016-17 | 6.94 | 6.09 | 4.42 | 2.13 | 29.93 |
| | income | 2015-16 | 8.68 | 9.21 | 5.67 | 7.01 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 10.10 | 8.40 | 5.75 | 2.61 | - |
| | Ratio of operating profits | 2016-17 | 1.90 | 1.68 | 3.02 | 3.27 | 2.07 |
| | to total assets | 2015-16 | 1.93 | 1.51 | 2.92 | 3.13 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 2.00 | 1.70 | 2.86 | 3.36 | - |
| | Return on assets | 2016-17 | -0.02 | -0.10 | 1.30 | 1.62 | 1.13 |
| | | 2015-16 | 0.42 | -0.07 | 1.50 | 1.45 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 0.66 | 0.46 | 1.68 | 1.84 | - |
| | Return on equity | 2016-17 | -0.69 | -2.05 | 11.87 | 9.12 | 5.41 |
| | | 2015-16 | 6.78 | -3.47 | 13.81 | 8.00 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 10.56 | 7.76 | 15.74 | 10.24 | - |
| | Cost of deposits | 2016-17 | 5.76 | 5.70 | 5.59 | 4.24 | 4.04 |
| | | 2015-16 | 6.18 | 6.19 | 6.08 | 4.46 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 6.28 | 6.43 | 6.39 | 4.61 | - |
| | Cost of borrowings | 2016-17 | 2.89 | 4.80 | 6.56 | 4.26 | 8.64 |
| | | 2015-16 | 3.47 | 5.27 | 6.27 | 4.00 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 4.90 | 5.90 | 6.41 | 4.87 | - |
| | Cost of funds | 2016-17 | 5.40 | 5.62 | 5.76 | 4.24 | 6.49 |
| | | 2015-16 | 5.85 | 6.11 | 6.11 | 4.36 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 6.13 | 6.39 | 6.39 | 4.68 | - |
| | Return on advances | 2016-17 | 8.29 | 8.44 | 9.99 | 8.77 | 14.92 |
| | | 2015-16 | 8.79 | 9.02 | 10.46 | 8.95 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 9.35 | 9.50 | 10.90 | 9.27 | - |
| | Return on investments | 2016-17 | 7.61 | 7.49 | 7.49 | 6.89 | 4.26 |
| | | 2015-16 | 7.97 | 7.80 | 7.49 | 7.28 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 8.00 | 7 64 | 7.16 | 7 73 | |
| | Return on advances | 2016-17 | 2.79 | 2.82 | 4.23 | 4.53 | 8.43 |
| | adjusted to cost of funds | 2015-16 | 2.94 | 2.92 | 4.35 | 4.60 | - |
| | | 2014-15 | 3.22 | 3.12 | 4.51 | 4.59 | |
| <u> </u> | Return on investments | 2016-17 | 1.89 | 1.87 | 1.73 | 2.65 | -2.23 |
| | adjusted to cost of funds | 2015-16 | 2.12 | 1.70 | 1.37 | 2.92 | - |
| | . | 2014-15 | 1.87 | 1.25 | 0.77 | 3.05 | _ |
| L | | | 1.07 | 1.20 | 5 | 2.00 | |

Source: RBI 2018.

The above table reveals the ratios pertaining to different aspects relating the last three years from 2014-15, 2015-16 and 2016-17. Some of the highlights are as follows

- The cash deposit ratio of SBI and its associates was 7.06 in the year 2014-15 which was reduced to 6.22 in the year 2016-17, in public sector banks the ratio was increased from 5.46 to 5.99, in private sector banks it is increased from 6.08 to 6.18, in foreign banks it increased from 5.97 to 8.04 and in small finance banks it is 9.30. It clearly signifies that the liquidity positions of banks are increased in all banks compared to SBI and its associates.
- Cash deposit ratio of SBI and its associates decreased from 82.07 to 72.29 from 2014-15 to 2016-17, in public sector banks it is decreased from 76.12 to 68.78, in private sector banks it is increased from 86.36 to 86.54, in foreign banks it is decreased from 80.85 to 71.39 and in small financial banks it is 164.37. This clearly shows private sector banks and small financial banks were more effective in creating advances out of deposits compared to all other banks.



- Investment deposit ratio which signifies the efficiency of banks in using the deposits collected for investment to generate revenue. From the table it clearly reveals that efficiency is increased in SBI and its associates and in public sector banks compared to private sector banks and foreign banks which shows decreasing trend.
- The management efficiency and quality of assets are measured through its total earning assets and total deposits. Table clearly specifies the decreasing trend in all the banks except small finance banks.
- The total deposits and liability ratio is less in private and foreign banks compared to SBI and its associates and public sector banks. The ratio is decreased in SBI and its associates and public sector banks and increased in foreign and private banks
- Ratio of demand and savings bank deposits to total deposits specifies the deposits and liquidity position in banks. In the above table it clearly state that the percentage of total deposits and liquidity position is increased from 2014-15 to 2016-17 in all the banks.
- Priority sector lending is varying from 25 percent to 84.75 percent in all the banks. The ratio is increasing in public, private and foreign banks compared to SBI and its associates.
- In the above table the Ratio of term loans to total advances shows more than 50 in SBI and its associates, public sector and private sector. In foreign banks, the ratio is less than 40. Which indicates the proportion of risky advances were more in banks except in foreign banks. Hence majority of the banks in the banking system experiencing defaults in loads and advances.
- Investments in non-approved securities to the total investments ratio shows low ratio in public sector banks and in foreign banks. The ratio is more in SBI and its associates and in private sector banks. The ratios clearly indicate risk-taking ability of the bank. SBI and its associates and the private sector banks have more risk taking ability compared to other banks.
- Ratio of Interest Income to Total Assets indicates high ratios in private sector banks compared to all other banks. The table clearly indicates that private banks are more efficient in management of banks total assets.
- In he above table Net interest margin ratio is high in private sector banks and in foreign banks compared to SBI and other public sector banks. This indicates the earning capacity of all the banks. Private and foreign banks are more efficient in earning capacity.
- Return on assets in the above table less or negative in SBI and public sector banks. it is positive in private sector banks and in foreign banks. Profitability is more in private and foreign banks. Similarly the return on equity ratio clearly indicates higher profitability and productivity in private and foreign banks

CONCLUSION

Banking sector plays crucial role in the economic development of the country. Banks collect deposits from public and channelize funds for different sectors of the economy as per the guidelines of RBI. It has to win the confidence of the customers, shareholders and the government through its financial activities. After the liberalization banks face more competitions from private and foreign banks. the success of the banks can be measured through performance analysis by considering various determining factors. Ratio analysis is one such tool to measure the performance of commercial banks. It is helpful to take decisions on weak areas based on ratios.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aravind, M.,&Nagamani, P. (2013).Financial analysis of state bank of India during 2000- 2012., Asian
- [2] Bhayani, S. J., and Gohil, D. C. (2007). Role of Transaction Cost in the Financial Performance of Co-operative Banks. The Journal Accounting and Finance, 21(2), pp. 89-100.
- [3] Bourke, P. (1989). "Concentration and other determinants of bank profitability in Europe, North America and Australia." Journal of Banking and Finance 13, 65-79.
- [4] Chakraborty, Rajesh. (2006). The financial sector in India: Emerging issues.Oxford University Press, 156.
- [5] Din,Sangmi, M. U., & Tabassum. (2010). Analyzing financial performance of commercial banks in India: Application of CAMEL Model.Pak. J. Comm. Social Science, Vol. 4 (1), 40-55.
- [6] Haque, Imamul (2011), "Comparative Study between Public Sector Banks & Private Sector Banks", International Journal of Management & Innovation.
- [7] M. Kumbirai, R. Webb, "A Financial Ratio Analysis of Commercial Bank Performance in South Africa", African Review of Economics and Finance, Vol.2, Issue.1, pp.30-53, 2010.
- [8] Makkar, Anita and Singh, Shveta (2013), "Analysis of the Financial Performance of Indian Commercial Banks: A Comparative Study", Indian Journal of Finance, India.



- [9] Mishra, Akshay Kumar (2013), "Trends of Non-performing Asset (NPA) in Public Sector Banks in India during 1993 to 2012", International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management, India.
- [10] RBI annual report 2018.
- [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.
- [12] Tatuskar, Svetlana (2010), "A Study of Financial Performance of Select Indian Scheduled Commercial Banks Using CAMELS Methodology for 2006-2010", International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management, India.
- [13] Verma, P., & Sonali. (2011). Comparative performance of different bank groups from the era of global recession. www.tapmi.edu.in/index.php/download_file/view/3450/618.