Sustainable Humanosphere
ISSN: 1880 - 6503, | March 2020
Volume: 16 Issue: 1

Comparative Analysis of Corporate Governance Elements of Indian and Foreign Banks

[1]Satish Kumar, [2]Dr. Mandeep Kaur
[1]Research Scholar, I.K. Gujral Punjab Technical University, Kapurthala
[2]Assistant Professor, I.K. Gujral Punjab Technical University, Kapurthala

Abstract—Corporate governance is a significant part of dealing with the corporate type of associations. Recently it has expected more noteworthy centrality and researchers, experts and strategy producers have been investigating manners by which present day partnership ought to be figured out how to meet the monetary, social and legitimate needs of various socio-political frameworks. The article thinks about Indian and remote banks working in India on various components of corporate administration. It is, by and large accepted that India and Overseas banks contrast essentially on various corporate governance components and this influences their presentation in a huge way. With the end goal of present research, researchers have taken diverse corporate governance components and distinctive control factors to comprehend the effect of corporate management on firm functioning. The researcher with the end goal of present examination has accepted % of independent directors, % of free executives on review board, and CEO duality as corporate governance components. It was discovered that the Indian and remote banks altogether contrast on the corporate governance components under examination.

Keywords: *Corporate governance, Banks, Indian banks, Corporate Governance of Indian banks.*

I. INTRODUCTION

Corporate governance consists to a broad scope of exercises that identify with the path business of firm is coordinated and represented. It supervises the approaches and exercises that straightforwardly sway on the company's presentation and its capability to be liable to its diverse partners. Corporate governance is the arrangement of relations between the investors, the governing body and the board of a firm as characterized by the corporate sanction, by-laws, formal strategy and rule of law.

According to G20/OEC, Principles of Corporate Governance-2015-"Good corporate governance is not an end in itself. It is a means to support economic efficiency, sustainable growth and financial stability. It facilitates companies' access to capital for long-term investment and helps ensure that shareholders and other stakeholders who contribute to the success of the corporation are treated fairly." The primary target of the corporate governance is to ensure long haul investor appreciate alongside different partners. It prompts hierarchical supportability by implementing mindful conduct from the gatherings required into corporate governance framework.

The following segment examines the exploration procedure for present research.

II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research strategy is the outline that portrays the methodology about how we direct research technique. It helps in discovering goals of the exploration issue. To start with, the examination issue will be built up and based on this exploration issue destinations will be distinguished. An exploration model will be created and based on this model the examination destinations will discover.

Research Design: The exploration plan for this investigation is enlightening just as diagnostic.

The Population: The populace for the present investigation includes the Indian Banking area and Overseas Banking part working in India.

Sample Size: The researcher has chosen top 30 Indian banks and the best 18 outside banks according to the rating of Business Today-KPMG study on India's best banks. The report distributed in Business Today as on February 14, 2016.

The time span of study: For the investigation of information, a time of 5 years has been taken into study. 5 years time frame will be from the financial year 2012 to 2016.

III. CORPORATE GOVERNANCE ELEMENTS

Different researchers have recognized various components of corporate governance in the Indian setting. The great administration has many significant qualities. It is participatory, accord positioned, accountable, simple, responsive, successful and fruitful, impartial and widespread, and adheres to the standard of rule. The great administration is friendly to the current and future needs of the organization, practices prudence in the arrangement situation and dynamic, and that the ultimate benefits of all colleagues are considered. Analysts have taken diverse corporate governance components and distinctive control factors to understand the effect of company management on firm performance. The researcher with the end goal of present investigation has accepted % of free executives, % of independent directors on the review advisory group, and CEO duality to comprehend the contrast among the Indian and remote banks working in India.

IV. DATA COLLECTION

To gather information identifying with the corporate governance exposure of the Indian Banks, the researcher utilized Center for Monitoring Indian Economy (CMIE) database PROWESS and Bloomberg Database for remote banks. The researcher likewise got to the yearly reports, site and other pertinent productions to gather information identifying with parameters for which the information was not accessible with the previously mentioned databases. The goal of the examination is to explore varieties in the corporate governance rehearses and their exposure adopted by the Indian and overseas banks working in India. With this thinking following Hypotheses were proposed to comprehend the distinction for corporate governance among Indian and outside banks working in India.

Hypothesis 1: Indian and Foreign Banks operating in India do not essentially vary in terms % of Independent executives on their board.

Hypothesis 2: Indian and Foreign Banks operating in India fundamentally vary in terms % of Independent executives on their Audit Committees.

Hypothesis 3: Indian and Foreign Banks operating in India fundamentally contrast as far as their CEO duality.

As the hypothesis testing includes looking at corporate governance components for Indian and overseas banks working in India, it analyzes two samples which are free of one another. The Independent Samples t-Test was the suitable test as it thinks about the means for two independent samples so as to choose if there is realistic proof that the associated population means are considerably different. The autonomous Samples t Test is a parametric Test. The factors utilized right now known as dependent variable, or test variable and Independent variable, or gathering variable.

Testing Hypothesis 1: Indian and Overseas Banks operating in India do not significantly differ in terms % of Independent directors on their board.

The prerequisite for the Independent Directors stimulated because of the requirement of a hard structure of corporate management in the operational of the association. There is a "developing significance" of their profession and responsibility. The Act, 2013 formulates the work of Independent Directors in total different from that of authorized persons. The sovereign director is vested with a variety of jobs, responsibilities and accountabilities for good business administration. He sources a company to protect the eagerness of minority shareholders and assurance that the board doesn't maintain a specific arrangement of investors or partners.

As indicated by NASDAQ "Independent Directors" signifies an individual other than an official or worker of the organization or some other individual having a relationship which, in the assessment of the guarantor's governing body would meddle with the activity of autonomous judgment in doing the duties of an executive. The hypothesis is tested by using independent sample t-Test.

The information for mean % of independent directors on the board exposed to the above test came about into Table- 1.

Since $p < .001$ is not exactly our picked importance level $\alpha = 0.05$, we can acknowledge the invalid theory, and reason that the mean % of free executives on the leading group of Indian and Overseas Banks working in India is diverse fundamentally.

In view of the outcomes, it tends to be expressed that:

There was a huge distinction in mean % of independent directors on the board for Indian and Overseas Banks working in India ($p > .001$). The normal % of autonomous executives on the leading group of Indian Banks and remote banks working in India varies essentially.

Testing Hypothesis 2: Indian and Overseas Banks operating in India do not significantly differ in terms % of Independent directors on their Audit Committees.

A re-evaluate advisory team is one of the most important working committee of a company's administrating body that is accountable for governing budgetary detailing and exposure. All traded on open market organizations must keep up a certified review advisory group so as to be recorded on a stock market.

The Audit board is one of the principle mainstays of the company management framework out in the open organizations. Accused of the important oversight of money related detailing and exposure, the Audit agency expects to improve the trust in the honesty of the organization's monetary reports and declarations, the inward direct procedures and methods and the hazard the board frameworks. The authorization of the Companies Act, 2013, each open organization in India comprises settled up capital of rupees five crores was mandatory to embrace an Audit Committee according to Section 292A of the Companies Law, 1956. The Listing Agreement, appropriate just to the listed organizations, required each listed companies to appropriately contain an Audit Committee with an endorsed set of obligations. The hypothesis is tested by utilizing free sample t-Test.

The information for mean % of independent directors on review board exposed to the above test came about into Table 2.

Since $p < .001$ is not exactly our picked criticalness level $\alpha = 0.05$, we can acknowledge the invalid theory, and infer that the mean % of autonomous executives on the Audit Committee of Indian and Overseas Banks working in India is diverse essentially.

In light of the outcomes, it tends to be expressed that:

There was a huge distinction in % of independent directors on the Audit Committee for Indian and Overseas Banks working in India ($p > .001$). The normal % of autonomous executives on the Audit Committee of Indian Banks and remote banks working in India contrasts altogether.

Testing Hypothesis 3: Indian and Overseas Banks operating in India do not significantly differ in terms of their CEO duality.

A company having its CEO additionally fill up in as the manager of its top managerial staff has been distinguished as a key incompatible circumstance by Boyd (1996) and Strier (2005). In spite of the apparently manifest irreconcilable situation of having the CEO lead the gathering that is observing their exhibition, there is no command from the SEC or the trades concerning whether this is permitted, and no law forbids firms from having one individual perform the two obligations. Truth be told, CEO duality has been very normal in the United States. Despite the fact that CEO duality is still very normal in the US, there is proof that more firms are parting the jobs (Grinstein and Valles Arellano 2008). One potential explanation behind the decrease could be that organizations are progressively delicate to the potential irreconcilable circumstance this structure presents. With this thinking the theory is tried by utilizing free example t-Test.

The information for mean CEO duality exposed to the above test came about into Table 3.

Since $p < .001$ is not exactly our picked importance level $\alpha = 0.05$, we can acknowledge the invalid hypothesis, and infer that the Indian and Overseas Banks working in India is distinctive fundamentally on CEO duality.

In light of the outcomes, it tends to be expressed that:

There was a critical distinction on CEO duality for Indian and Overseas Banks working in India ($p > .001$).The normal on CEO duality of the Indian Banks and overseas banks working in India varies basically.

V. CONCLUSION

In aggregate, it very well may be reasoned that the Indian banks and overseas banks functioning in India contrast altogether to the extent corporate governance components under investigation are concerned. The normal % of independent directors on the leading body of Indian Banks and overseas banks running in India varies fundamentally. The normal % of independent directors on the Audit Committee of Indian Banks and overseas banks functioning in India contrasts fundamentally. The normal on CEO duality of Indian Banks and overseas banks operational in India contrasts essentially. Researchers feel this might be reason clarifying the changeability in execution of Indian and overseas banks.

REFERENCES

[1] Adams, R. and H. Mehran, 2003, Is Corporate Governance Different for Bank Holding Companies?", Federal Reserve Bank of New York Economic Policy Review April 2003, 123-142.

[2] Basel Committee (1999), Enhancing Corporate Governance for Banking Organisations, Switzerland, Basel Committee on Banking Supervision.

[3] Coy, D., Fischer, M. and Gordon, T. (2001), "Public accountability: a new paradigm for college and university annual reports", Critical Perspectives on Accounting, Vol. 12 No. 1, pp. 1-31.

[4] Department of Banking Supervision, About Us, Reserve Bank of India, https://www.rbi.org.in/scripts/AboutUsDisplay.aspx?pg=DeptOfBS.htm

[5] Gallagther, T. (2002), "Development and disclosure of corporate governance guidelines", The Corporate Governance Advisor, Vol. 10 No. 2, pp. 23-4.

[6] Haat, M.H., Abdul Rahman, R. and Mahenthiran, S. (2008), “Corporate governance, transparency and performance of Malaysian companies”, Managerial Auditing Journal, Vol. 23 No. 8, pp. 744-78.

[7] Monks, R. and Minow, N. (2004). Corporate governance. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell Pub.

OECD (2004), Principles of Corporate Governance, Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development, OECD, Paris.

[8] OECD (2010), ‘Corporate Governance and the Financial Crisis: Conclusions and Emerging Good Practices to Enhance Implementation of the Principles’, available at: http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/53/62/ 44679170.pdf

[9] Parker, L.D. (2007), “Financial and external reporting research: the broadening corporate governance challenge”, Accounting & Business Research, Vol. 37 No. 1, pp. 39-54.

[10] Reserve Bank of India Act 1934, https://rbidocs.rbi.org.in/rdocs/Publications/PDFs/RBIAM_230609.pdf

Sapienza, P. (2004), ‘The Effects of Government Ownership on Bank Lending’, Journal of Financial Economics, 72(2), 357–84.

[11] Sinclair, A. (1995), “The chameleon of accountability: forms and discourses”, Accounting, Organization and Society, Vol. 20 Nos 2/3, pp. 219-37.

[12] Sir Adrian Cadbury, UK, Commission Report: Corporate Governance 1992

Solomon, J. and Solomon, A. (2004), Corporate Governance and Accountability, Wiley, London.

[13] Taylor, D.W. (2000), “Facts, myths, monsters: understanding the principles of good governance”, The International Journal of Public Sector Management, Vol. 13, pp. 108-24.

[14] Wei, T.L., Davey, H. and Coy, D. (2008), “A disclosure index to measure the quality of annual reporting by museums in New Zealand and the UK”, Journal of Applied Accounting Research, Vol. 9 No. 1, pp. 29-51.

Annexure:

Table 1: Independent Sample Statistics for Hypothesis 1

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
% Independent Directors	Equal variances assumed	165.482	.000	27.758	238	.000	51.78507	1.86558	48.10991	55.46022
	Equal variances not assumed			34.054	197.077	.000	51.78507	1.52067	48.78620	54.78393

Table 2: Independent Sample Statistics for Hypothesis 2

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
% Independent Directors in	Equal variances assumed	166.701	.000	20.002	238	.000	40.36193	2.01789	36.38672	44.33714

Audit Committee	Equal variances not assumed			24.476	199.285	.000	40.36193	1.64906	37.11009	43.61378

Table 3: Independent Sample Statistics for Hypothesis3

Independent Samples Test										
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
CEO Duality	Equal variances assumed	108.081	.000	6.238	238	.000	.38000	.06091	.26000	.50000
	Equal variances not assumed			6.693	226.278	.000	.38000	.05678	.26812	.49188