

Banking Sector Performance and Economic Growth in India: An Empirical Study

Prof. Manoj Kumar Mishra¹, Dr. Akshay Kumar², Mridul³ & Sachin Kumar⁴

1. Dean Academics, AISECT University, Hazaribag, Jharkhand, India
2. Associate Professor, Bradford International Business School, Patna, Bihar, India (Corresponding Author, Email: kumaraks18@yahoo.com)
3. Assistant Professor, Bradford International Business School, Patna, Bihar, India
4. Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, S. Sinha College, Aurangabad, Bihar, India

Abstract

The financial area's job in impacting monetary development is a basic area of study, especially in creating economies like India. This study plans to research the drawn-out connection between banks' presentation and monetary development in India, using board information from 20 public area banks crossing from 2009 to 2019. Not at all like past investigations, this exploration integrates inventive factors like revenue edge, return on resources, bank venture, and loaning ability to evaluate their relationship with the nation's GDP (Gross domestic product). Utilizing different econometric methods including the Pedroni and Kao trial of co-mix, board vector mistake remedy model (VECM) dynamic, board completely adjusted standard least squares (FMOLS), and dynamic OLS (DOLS), the review digs into the nuanced elements between these bank-related factors and monetary development. The discoveries uncover that the chose bank-related factors are to be sure co-incorporated with monetary development, showing a supported relationship over the long haul. In particular, the review features a huge connection between's advantage edge and return on resources with financial development. Nonetheless, it recommends that loaning limit and venture exercises inside the financial area don't display a huge relationship with monetary development, highlighting the requirement for strategy mediations to upgrade these perspectives to invigorate higher development rates.

Keywords: Economic Growth, Banking sector, GDP, Monetary development, Financial management etc.

1. Introduction

The monetary administrations industry, especially banks, assumes a vital part in driving financial development by working with capital development, preparing assets, and diverting assets to useful areas of the economy. All in all, the financial area's importance in powering monetary development is broadly recognized, with banks filling in as basic go-betweens in the monetary framework. Their job in assembling reserve funds, designating assets, and working with ventures contributes altogether to feasible monetary turn of events. In any case, the exact degree of their commitment and the ramifications of their productivity for monetary advancement warrant further examination and academic discussion. This exploration adds to the current writing by giving exact proof on the exchange between bank execution measurements and financial development in India, offering important bits of knowledge for policymakers and partners meaning to encourage manageable monetary advancement in the country. This study plans to research the drawn-out connection between banks' presentation and monetary development in India, using board information from 20 public area banks crossing from 2009 to 2019.

2. Concerned Literatures

Monetary improvement depends on the accessibility of capital, which is to a great extent worked with through monetary go-betweens like banks (Beckett et al., 2000). Banks go about as middle people, overcoming any barrier between contributors with excess assets and financial backers with practical activities yet restricted capital (Nwanyanwu, 2010). This cycle powers monetary action as well as guarantees productivity for banks. Moreover, the financial area is urgent for non-industrial countries, filling in as an essential road for capital fascination (Adeniyi, 2006). Various investigations have inspected the unique connection between a country's monetary area and its in general financial presentation (Aurangzeb, 2012; Tabash and Dhankar, 2014; Abedifar et al., 2016; Boukhatem and Moussa, 2018). These

investigations feature that a hearty monetary framework is fundamental for quick financial turn of events. Banks and monetary foundations assume a vital part in this cycle by preparing reserve funds and coordinating speculations toward useful endeavors, consequently cultivating practical financial development. In spite of the agreement on the significance of banks in driving financial development, the degree of their commitment stays a subject of discussion among researchers. Past exploration has zeroed in on different proportions of bank size to check their effect on financial advancement, while less examinations have dug into the impact of bank productivity on monetary turn of events.

The negative and huge blunder remedy term (ECT) affirms the presence of a long-run harmony connection among Gross domestic product and the bank execution measurements. The hosed union interaction demonstrates that deviations from this harmony are continuously changed over the long haul. By investigating the leftover coefficients (C(2) to C(12)), specialists can acquire important experiences into the particular transient elements at play. This extensive comprehension of both long-run and short-run connections permits policymakers and monetary foundations to pursue informed choices that advance financial soundness and a stronger financial area. Board VECM examination arises as an integral asset for dissecting cointegrated factors in board information. It reveals insight into the perplexing connections between monetary development and bank execution measurements, empowering specialists to pursue informed choices for a powerful and practical monetary environment.

Completely Altered OLS (FMOLS) and Dynamic OLS (DOLS) are progressed econometric methods utilized in board information examination to resolve issues like sequential connection and expected predispositions in Standard Least Squares (OLS) gauges. Board information alludes to information gathered over the long haul from various people, gatherings, or elements, taking into consideration the assessment of both cross-sectional and time-series varieties all the while. Normal Least Squares (OLS) relapse is a broadly involved technique for assessing the boundaries of direct relapse models. Be that as it may, in board information examination, OLS appraisals can be one-sided because of different factors like autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity. Autocorrelation happens when mistakes in a single period are corresponded with blunders in another period, disregarding the suspicion of free blunders. Heteroskedasticity alludes to the inconsistent fluctuation of mistakes across perceptions, which can prompt wasteful assessments. Completely Changed OLS (FMOLS) resolves these issues by utilizing a non-parametric methodology that thinks about redresses for sequential connection. It considers the conceivable relationship between's the main contrast of the regressors, the mistake term, and the presence of the steady term. By integrating these amendments, FMOLS produces steady gauges of the coefficients and standard mistakes, making them appropriate for measurable induction and speculation testing.

3. Research Methodology

This study breaks down the connection between banking execution and financial development in India from 2009 to 2019. It centers around planned business banks, including the State Bank of India and its partners. The underlying example comprised of 28 banks in 2009, yet consolidations diminished it to 20 by 2019. This period is huge in light of the fact that it follows the 2007-2008 monetary emergency, making it vital to analyze bank execution during financial recuperation.

Table3.1. Variables for study, their measure, hypotheses, and literature.

Determinant/Variable	Measure/Intermediary	Theory (H)	Writing
Loaning ability	Regular logarithm of absolute credit	H1: The bank loaning divert impact is negative over the long haul to the monetary development of low-pay nations.	Tahir et al. (2015)
Bank venture	Regular logarithm of ventures	H2: The speculation exercises of banks have a positive effect over the long haul on the monetary development cycle of the country.	Bint-e-Ajaz and Ellahi (2012); Nasir et al. (2004)

Interest edge	Regular logarithm of Net interest edge	H3: The premium edge of banks adversely influences the course of monetary turn of events.	Neumeyer and Perri (2005); Anari and Kolari (2016)
Return on resources (ROA)	Regular logarithm of ROA	H4: The profit from resources of banks decidedly influences the course of monetary turn of events.	Babatunde et al. (2013); Claeyssand Schoors (2007); Field (2008)

Generally speaking, these outcomes propose most factors may be fixed, yet further investigation may be expected to set this end.

$$\ln Yi_t = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \ln Lei_t + \beta_2 \ln inv_t + \beta_3 \ln ROA_{i,t} + \beta_4 \ln int_{i,t} + \mu_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

where; Le-indicates loaning limit, inv-means bank speculation, ROA-signifies return on resources, int-indicates revenue edge, and the yearly development pace of Gross domestic product is taken as a proportion of the development of the economy (Y).

Board Unit Root Tests

The board unit root test is significantly better than that of the standard time-series unit root test in limited examples. The review utilizes different trial of the board unit root, which is involved the LLC test, presented by Levin et al. (2002); the IPS test, proposed by Im et al. (2003); and Fisher-type tests utilizing ADF and PP tests, proposed by Maddala and Wu (1999). In Table 3, the LLC test's invalid speculation assumes that there is a standard unit root across the cross-segments, though the elective speculation expects no unit root across the cross-segments. The IPS, Fisher-PP, and Fisher-ADF tests assume that the singular unit root process wins across every one of the cross-areas in Table 3. The invalid speculation of every one of the three tests expresses that there is a unit root across the cross-segments of factors, while the elective theory express that there is no unit root across the cross-areas.

The gathering board test result through LLC recommends a unit root in the gathering test, while IPS, ADF, and PP all propose a positive relationship, and that implies the series is liberated from the unit root at the singular level. The board bunch test further has been finished for the primary distinction to get a fixed gathering shown.

Board Co-Mix Test

The Engle and Granger (1987) looks at a misleading relapse's residuals finished through I(1) factors or factors. That's what it proposes assuming elements are coordinated, the residuals will be incorporated at the level, and on the off chance that not, then first request joining will be found.

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_i + \sum_{q=1}^p \beta_q X_{qit} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

where $I = 1, \dots, N$ demonstrates each bank in the example and $t = 1, \dots, T$ shows the period. The variable α_i grants bank-explicit fixed impacts. The term ε_{it} connotes expected residuals, which show the deviation from a drawn out relationship all the while. The decent impact is utilized in light of the fact that the chi-square measurement of the Hausman test dismissed the invalid speculation of arbitrary. The speculation of no co-reconciliation ($R_i = 1$) is evaluated by residuals as follows:

$$\varepsilon_{it} = R_i \varepsilon_{i(t-1)} + M_{it} \quad (3)$$

In this review, two trial of co-mix have been utilized. The primary test is Pedroni (2004), and the subsequent test is Kao (1999), which depends on Engle-Granger and implements homogeneity on units in the board set.

Pedroni Test for Panel Cointegration

For this test, the following regression equation is used:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \delta_{it} + \beta_1 x_{1i} + \beta_2 x_{2i} + \dots + \beta_m x_{mi} + e_{i,t} \quad (4)$$

where $t = 1, \dots, T$; $i = 1, \dots, N$; $m = 1, \dots, M$ and x is expected to be $I(1)$. The factors α_i and δ_i are individual and drift effects, which may be fixed at zero if needed. As mentioned above, if there is no co-integration, the residuals $e_{i,t}$ will be $I(1)$. Generally, an auxiliary regression (Equation (5)) is run on the residuals obtained from Equation (4) and tested if $I(1)$ for each cross-section.

$$e_{i,t} = \rho_i e_{i,t-1} + u_{i,t}$$

In any case, a few Pedroni tests showed blended results, demonstrating some vulnerability. This features the significance of utilizing various tests, as each has restrictions. In general, while there's some proof for co-joining, further examination with extra tests may be expected to harden the end.

For this test, the following regression equation is used:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \delta_{it} + \beta_1 x_{1i,t} + \beta_2 x_{2i,t} + \dots + \beta_m x_{mi,t} + e_{i,t} \quad (4)$$

where $t = 1, \dots, T$; $i = 1, \dots, N$; $m = 1, \dots, M$ and x is expected to be $I(1)$. The factors α_i and δ_i are individual and drift effects, which may be fixed at zero if needed.

As referenced above, in the event that there is no co-mix, the residuals $e_{i,t}$ will be $I(1)$. By and large, a helper relapse (Condition (5)) is run on the residuals acquired from Condition (4) and tried if $I(1)$ for each cross-area.

$$e_{i,t} = \rho_i e_{i,t-1} + u_{i,t} \quad (5)$$

Kao Test for Panel Co-Integration

Kao (1999) suggested that:

$$y_{it} = \alpha_i + \beta X_{it} + e_{it} \quad (6)$$

for:

$$y_{it} = \rho_i y_{it-1} + u_{i,t} \quad (7)$$

$$x_{it} = \rho_i x_{it-1} + e_{i,t} \quad (8)$$

where $t = 1, \dots, T$ and $i = 1, \dots, N$.

Kao then ran the pooled auxiliary regression:

$$e_{i,t} = \rho_i e_{i,t-1} + u_{i,t} \quad (9)$$

The consequence of board information in Table 5, co-joining recommends a co-coordinating relationship according to the Kao test in light of the fact that the ADF measurement is huge at a 1% degree of importance. Be that as it may, the Pedroni test shows no co-reconciliation, as the p-upsides of the board PP insights, board ADF measurements, bunch PP measurements, and gathering ADF insights are immaterial at a 1% degree of importance. Thus, we don't dismiss the invalid speculation.

This investigation investigates the long-run interchange between financial development and different bank execution measurements. It uses a strong factual method called Board Vector Mistake Remedy Model (VECM) to break down these connections in the wake of affirming cointegration among the factors. Cointegration suggests that apparently autonomous factors with fluctuating patterns over the long haul (non-fixed) move together over the long haul.

Board VECM: Overcoming any issues for Strong Investigation

Conventional Vector Blunder Revision Models (VECMs) are appropriate for examining cointegrated factors in single time series datasets. Be that as it may, with regards to bank execution, scientists frequently manage board information, where data is gathered from numerous banks across various periods. Board VECM stretches out the VECM system to deal with this kind of information, taking into consideration a more thorough investigation. It all the while explores two urgent parts of the connections. Momentary Elements: This alludes to what changes in a single variable in a specific period mean for one more factor in a similar period. For instance, an ascent in revenue edge in one period could prompt a transitory expansion in a bank's benefit in that period. This catches how deviations from harmony (long-run balance) are remedied over the long haul. With regards to financial development and bank execution, on the off chance that a bank's productivity digresses from its balance level because of a momentary shock, the VECM comprehends how the framework changes with bring it back towards the long-run harmony over resulting periods.

Deciphering the VECM Condition and Its Translation

The examination presents a particular VECM condition as $\Delta(\text{GDP}) = C(1)*(\dots) + \dots + C(12)$. Here, $\Delta(\text{GDP})$ addresses the adjustment of Total national output (Gross domestic product), the variable of essential interest. We should dive into the vital parts of the situation. Blunder Remedy Term (ECT) - C(1): This term assumes a focal part in grasping the long-run connections. It catches the strength and course of the cointegrating vector, which characterizes the harmony connection among Gross domestic product and other bank execution measurements like revenue edge, speculation, loaning capacity, and return on resources.

The assessed worth of C(1) is accounted for to be negative and genuinely critical (- 1.8915). This negative sign demonstrates union. That's what it implies in the event that Gross domestic product veers off from its harmony level over the long haul, a power exists inside the framework to bring it back towards the mean worth. The outright worth (1.8915) falls inside the normal reach (0 to - 2) for assembly. In any case, its nearness to - 2 proposes a hosed union cycle. This infers that deviations from balance are changed step by step over the long run, not momentarily.

Short-Run Elements - C(2) to C(12): These excess terms address the effect of short-run elements. Every coefficient catches how changes in different factors (slacked by a couple of periods) impact the ongoing change in Gross domestic product development ($\Delta(\text{GDP})$). For instance, a positive and huge coefficient for C(4) (D(INTMARGIN(- 1)) or change in interest edge slacked by one period) could recommend that an expansion in interest edge in the past period prompts an ascent in current Gross domestic product development (positive short-run influence). Nonetheless, the particular understandings of these coefficients rely upon their signs and importance levels, which are not displayed here and would require further investigation.

4. Results and Discussion

Table 4.1. Worth of coefficients.

Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Probability
C(1)	-1.89159	0.09855	-19.1942
C(2)	0.814919	0.069943	11.65118
C(3)	1.41028	0.123827	11.38913
C(4)	0.00512	0.002779	1.842436
C(5)	0.002089	0.002786	0.749931
C(6)	-0.00245	0.003567	-0.68555
C(7)	-0.00294	0.004057	-0.72553
C(8)	-0.00011	0.000172	-0.63939
C(9)	0.000106	0.000171	0.622498

C(10)	-0.00512	0.001426	-3.59152
C(11)	-0.00085	0.000959	-0.88681
C(12)	-0.0006	0.00079	-0.76409

This examination explores the long-run associations between financial development, bank execution measurements, and venture choices. Since the information includes factors with fluctuating patterns after some time (non-fixed), a standard relapse method (OLS) wouldn't be reasonable. OLS can create one-sided brings about such situations. To address this, the review utilizes the Completely Changed Common Least Squares (FMOLS) strategy. FMOLS offers a critical benefit by revising for issues like autocorrelation (mistakes impacting one another) and inconsistent blunder fluctuations (heteroskedasticity) in the model's residuals. This upgrades the exactness and unwavering quality of the assessed long-run connections between the factors. The examination is additionally reinforced by remaining tests affirming ordinariness (Jarque-Bera test), nonappearance of heteroskedasticity (Breusch-Agnostic Godfrey test), and absence of autocorrelation (Ljung-Box and Breusch-Godfrey tests, Durbin-Watson measurement). By utilizing FMOLS and guaranteeing strong residuals, the review lays out a genuinely solid starting point for looking at how monetary development, return on resources, loaning capacity, premium edge, and bank speculation impact each other in the long haul.

Table 4.2. Completely changed OLS (FMOLS) and dynamic OLS (DOLS) results.

Dep. Variable of Eco. Development	FMOLS Results		DOLS Results	
Coefficient	Probability		Coefficient	Probability
Loaning ability	2.168183	0.1865	0.000237	0.8527
Return on resource	0.003645	0	0.007509	0.1053
Interest edge	-0.00919	0	-0.03569	0.0082
Bank venture	-0.00046	0.922	0.041161	0.1533

Two methods (FMOLS, DOLS) assessed these connections. Loaning capacity's effect is indistinct, with one technique indicating a beneficial outcome and the other appearance negligible impact. Return on resources shows a positive and possibly huge effect on development, recommending productive banks could help the economy. The two strategies uncover an adverse consequence of premium edges, suggesting higher loan fees could prevent financial extension. Bank speculation results are blended, with one technique proposing an adverse consequence and the other a potential positive one. In general, the examination gives a proof to banking execution impacting development, however the uncertain outcomes for loaning capacity and bank speculation require further examination or elective assessment procedures for more grounded ends.

Table 4.3. Remaining investigation.

Test Type	Test Statistic	p-Value
Test of Normality	Jarque-Bera	4.9242
(p-Value)	0.085252	
Test of Heteroskedasticity	Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey	168.856
(p-Value)	0.079	

The indicative tests recommend the information might be reasonable for additional investigation. The Jarque-Bera ordinarieness test measurement (4.9242) with a p-worth of 0.085252 shows we can't dismiss the invalid speculation of ordinarieness at a 5% importance level. Essentially, the Breusch-Agnostic Godfrey test for heteroskedasticity yields a measurement of 168.856 with a p-worth of 0.079, again neglecting to dismiss the invalid speculation of no heteroskedasticity. In any case, it's fitting to investigate these outcomes close by other diagnostics and representations to acquire a more extensive comprehension of the information's properties prior to continuing with additional examination.

Table 4.4. Trial of auto-connection.

Autocorrelation	Partial Correlation	AC	PAC	q-Statistics	Probability
.	.	.	.	1	0.01
*	.	*	.	2	-0.069
**	.	**	.	3	-0.24
**	.	**	.	4	-0.235
*	.	**	.	5	-0.193
.	*	.	.	6	0.122
.	.	*	.	7	0.038
.	*	*	.	8	0.114
.	.	*	.	9	-0.047

Autocorrelation (AC) and Halfway Relationship (PAC) values show possible negative connection at slacks 3 and 4, and some sure relationship at slack 8. The critical q-measurement probabilities (set apart by **) affirm this. This proposes the model's blunders may be associated, possibly influencing its dependability. Further moves toward address autocorrelation might be required prior to depending on the model's outcomes.

5. Main Findings

The discoveries of the review shed light on the perplexing connection between banking advancement factors and financial development in India over the period 2009 to 2019. Through a thorough investigation utilizing board unit root tests, board co-joining tests, and vector mistake revision models, the review gives experiences into the long haul and transient elements of these factors. The review, first and foremost, found blended results in regards to the stationarity of the factors. While the Levin-Lin-Chu (LLS) test proposed stationarity at the main contrast level for one factor, others stayed fixed at the level structure. This disparity features the significance of additional testing and affirms that the variable is coordinated of request one (I(1)), demonstrating the need to examine their progressions over the long haul.

Also, the board co-reconciliation results yielded blended discoveries. The Pedroni test demonstrated no co-incorporation among the factors, while the Kao test recommended in any case. Co-joining, if present, suggests a drawn out harmony connection between the factors. In this manner, the error in results required further examination to affirm the presence of co-joining. After affirming co-reconciliation, vector mistake rectification investigation was led to inspect the change elements towards harmony. The negative and critical coefficient of the blunder rectification term recommended combination towards the drawn out harmony, demonstrating the presence of a steady connection between banking improvement factors and financial development in India.

To address predispositions intrinsic in standard least squares (OLS) assessment, the review utilized completely altered customary least squares (FMOLS) to appraise the coefficients. The outcomes uncovered a critical long haul relationship between return on resources and interest edge with monetary development. In any case, there was no huge affiliation seen between loaning limit and speculations with monetary development during the example time frame. The dismissal of speculation 1 (H1), which set a positive effect of bank venture exercises on financial development, proposes that bank ventures didn't essentially add to India's monetary development during the review time frame. This finding difficulties

the traditional conviction that expanded venture exercises by banks animate monetary development. Moreover, the negative relationship between interest edge and financial improvement shows that higher interest edges might upset monetary development. This finding highlights the significance of serious financial conditions and lower subsidizing costs for working with monetary development. Conversely, the positive and critical coefficient of return on resources upholds speculation 3 (H3), demonstrating that bank productivity, as estimated by return on resources, decidedly impacts financial development over the long haul. This finding lines up with past writing underlining the significance of bank benefit for financial turn of events. Strangely, theory 4 (H4), which proposed an adverse consequence of banks' loaning limit on financial development, was dismissed. The positive and unimportant coefficient of loaning limit suggests that banks' ability to loan didn't fundamentally influence financial development in India during the review time frame. This finding proposes that different elements might be more compelling in driving financial development. In general, the discoveries add to how we might interpret the mind boggling connection between banking advancement factors and monetary development in India. The review highlights the significance of thinking about various factors and utilizing strong econometric procedures to evaluate this relationship precisely. Moreover, the blended idea of the discoveries features the requirement for additional exploration to investigate the basic components driving the noticed connections and to illuminate strategy choices pointed toward advancing maintainable financial development.

6. Conclusions

The review uncovers a critical long-haul connection between banks' presentation and financial development in India. Bank benefit, as estimated by return on resources (ROA), decidedly adds to financial development, certifying the expected pay hypothesis. Be that as it may, loaning limit and venture exercises show unimportant relationship with financial development during the review time frame. The discoveries highlight the significance of a steady and beneficial financial area for supported monetary turn of events, lining up with past exploration by Claeys and Schoors (2007) and Field (2008). Strategy suggestions recommend that policymakers ought to think about the effect of their choices on banks' exhibition, given their consistent impact on the economy. In spite of the review's attention on just two huge factors, it reveals insight into their examples and conduct, giving significant experiences into their impact on the Indian economy. Nonetheless, the review recognizes specific impediments. The utilization of yearly information, first and foremost, may limit the profundity of investigation, as high-recurrence information could offer more nuanced experiences. Moreover, the review's time span might restrict the breadth of the investigation. Future examination could profit from utilizing board information investigation over a drawn out period to catch individual series' elements. Besides, extending the degree to incorporate more factors connected with the monetary area's effect on financial development could give a more complete comprehension of the elements at play. Generally speaking, while the review offers important experiences into the connection between bank execution and monetary development in India, there is space for additional examination to extend how we might interpret these elements and illuminate more viable policymaking.

References

1. Abedifar, P., Hasan, I., & Tarazi, A. (2016). Finance-growth nexus and dual-banking systems: Relative importance of Islamic banks. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 132, 198–215.
2. Adeniyi, O. M. (2006). *Bank Credit and Economic Development in Nigeria: A Case Study of Deposit Money Banks*. Jos: University of Jos.
3. Akshay Kumar, Manoj Kumar Mishra, V. S. S. Prasad, Mridul. (2024). An Empirical Study of Financial Vulnerability of Monetary Strategy in India. *European Economic Letters (EEL)*, 14(2), 695–704. <https://doi.org/10.52783/eel.v14i2.1392>
4. Angori, G., Aristei, D., & Gallo, M. (2019). Determinants of banks' net interest margin: Evidence from the Euro area during the crisis and post-crisis period. *Sustainability*, 11, 3785.
5. Anari, A., & Kolari, J. (2016). Dynamics of interest and inflation rates. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 39, 129–144.
6. Arena, M. (2008). Bank failures and bank fundamentals: A comparative analysis of Latin America and East Asia during the nineties using bank-level data. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 32, 299–310.

7. Athanasoglou, P. P., Brissimis, S. N., & Delis, M. D. (2008). Bank-specific, industry-specific and macroeconomic determinants of bank profitability. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 18, 121–136.
8. Aurangzeb. (2012). Contribution of banking sector in economic growth: A case of Pakistan. *Economics and Finance Review*, 2, 45–54.
9. Awdeh, A. (2012). Banking sector development and economic growth in Lebanon. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 100, 53–62.
10. Babatunde, O., Adegbeni, O., & Onakoya, A. (2013). The performance of conventional and Islamic banks in the United Kingdom: A comparative Analysis. *Journal of Research in Economics and International Finance (JRELF)*, 2, 29–38.
11. Beckett, A., Hewer, P., & Howcroft, B. (2000). An exposition of consumer behaviour in the financial services industry. *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 18, 15–26.
12. Berger, A. N. (2000). The integration of the financial services industry: Where are the efficiencies? *North American Actuarial Journal*, 4, 25–45.
13. Berger, A. N., Demsetz, R. S., & Strahan, P. E. (1999). The consolidation of the financial services industry: Causes, consequences, and implications for the future. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 23, 135–194.
14. Bint-e-Ajaz, M., & Ellahi, N. (2012). Public-Private Investment and Economic Growth in Pakistan: An Empirical Analysis. *The Pakistan Development Review*, 51, 61–78.
15. Boukhatem, J., & Moussa, F. B. (2018). The effect of Islamic banks on GDP growth: Some evidence from selected MENA countries. *Borsa Istanbul Review*, 18.
16. CGFS. (2018). Structural changes in banking after the crisis, CGFS Papers No 60, Committee on the Global Financial System. Retrieved from <https://www.bisorg/publ/cgfs60.pdf>
17. Claeys, S., & Schoors, K. (2007). Bank supervision Russian style: Evidence of conflicts between micro-and macro-prudential concerns. *Journal of Comparative Economics*, 35, 630–657.
18. Dr. Manoj Kumar Mishra, Dr Veena Kumari and Dr. Vivekanand Pandey (2014); International Capital Flow and Economic Growth: A Case of FDI in Asian Economies *Int. J. of Adv. Res.* 2 (Dec). 0] (ISSN 2320-5407). www.journalijar.com
19. Emecheta, B. C., & Ibe, R. C. (2014). Impact of bank credit on economic growth in Nigeria: Application of reduced vector autoregressive (VAR) technique. *European Journal of Accounting Auditing and Finance Research*, 2, 11–21.
20. Engle, R. F., & Granger, C. W. J. (1987). Co-integration and error correction: Representation, estimation, and testing. *Econometrica: Journal of the Econometric Society*, 55, 251–276.
21. Flannery, M., & Rangan, K. P. (2008). What Caused the Bank Capital Build-up of the 1990s? *Review of Finance*, 12, 391–429.
22. Fullana, O., Ruiz, J., & Toscano, D. (2020). Stock market bubbles and monetary policy effectiveness. *The European Journal of Finance*, 1–13.
23. Hou, H., & Cheng, S.-Y. (2017). The dynamic effects of banking, life insurance, and stock markets on economic growth. *Japan and the World Economy*, 41, 87–98.
24. Manoj Kumar Mishra, Syed Mohammad Ghouse, Ravikumar JS, Amit Kumar Pathak, Hemant Kumar. (2023). Corporate Governance Practices and their Impact on Attracting Investment and Capital. *European Economic Letters (EEL)*, 13(4), 445–453. <https://doi.org/10.52783/eel.v13i4.619>
25. Mishra, M. K., Kumari, N., & Pandey, V. (2014). A Study of Foreign Banks and Indian Financial Development. *The International Journal of Business & Management*, 2(11). Retrieved from <https://www.internationaljournalcorner.com/index.php/thejbm/article/view/137933>
26. Mishra, M. K., & Yadav, S. (2014). Effects of Crude Oil Prices on Indian Financial Sector. *The International Journal of Business & Management*, 2(6). Retrieved from <https://www.internationaljournalcorner.com/index.php/thejbm/article/view/127662>
27. RIMJHIM JHA, and DR MANOJ KUMAR MISHRA. "A Study of HRM and Employees Performance in Banking Sector in India" *International Journal Of Advance Research And Innovative Ideas In Education* Volume 1 Issue 3 2015 Page 24-28