International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research (IJFMR)
E-ISSN: 2582-2160 ● Website: www.ijfmr.com ● Email: editor@ijfmr.com

Non-Performing Assets (NPA) Dynamics in Emerging Markets: A Comparison Between India and China

Mithilesh Gupta[1], Urvi Naresh Shah[2]

[1]Assistant Professor at St. Peter Degree College
[2]Assistant Professor at Mount Carmel Junior College

Abstract
Non-performing assets (NPAs) are a serious concern for banks, and they serve as a key measure of profit. Elevated levels of NPAs suggest a higher chance of credit bankruptcy, which harms banks' profitability and net worth while also reducing the value of their assets. This review provides a thorough investigation of NPAs in emerging countries, with a particular emphasis on a comparative analysis of regulatory methods in India and China. It seeks to clarify the significance of NPAs in emerging market economies by examining their role as indices of financial health, drivers of systemic concerns, and impediments to effective monetary policy. The study elucidates the performance of NPAs in banks in India and China. Additionally, the study identifies the economic, political, institutional, and social factors governing NPAs in these countries. Lastly, the study supports controlling NPAs rather than simply eliminating them, especially considering the higher inflation rates and bank margins found in these countries. This adaptive method enables more appropriate risk-return compromises, which is consistent with India and China's distinct socioeconomic environments.

Keywords: Non-performing assets, comparative analysis, performance, regulatory framework, influencing factors.

1. Introduction

1.1. Background of Non-Performing Assets (NPAs)

Non-performing assets (NPAs) are a serious concern for banks, and they serve as a key measure of profit. Elevated levels of NPAs suggest a higher chance of credit bankruptcy, which harms banks' profitability and net worth while also reducing the value of their assets [1]. The proportion of NPAs in banks indicates the general well-being of the industrial and trade sectors. Public sector banks, in particular, confront significant challenges in controlling NPAs. Solving this issue is critical for increasing efficiency and profitability in the banking industry [1]. While obtaining a zero percent NPA ratio may be impossible, banks can strive to satisfy international standards and compete effectively with their overseas competitors. The governments have made efforts to minimize NPAs, recognizing the need to reduce these risks to ensure the financial system's stability [1]. However, controlling NPAs requires dealing with a variety of underlying reasons and hazards inherent in banking operations. This study investigates the nature of nonperforming assets (NPAs), the factors that contribute to their accumulation, the scope of the problem, and the reasons behind high NPA levels in India and China. It also studies the effects of NPAs on banking

operations and recommends ways to lessen their impact [1].

1.2. Significance of studying NPAs in emerging nations

Non-performing assets (NPAs) constitute a substantial danger to bank loaning activities, hurting credit dispensation operations and reducing profitability. When repayments of loans and interest payments are not recovered, banks incur financial losses and must set aside additional capital and reserves to cover possible loan losses [2]. The decrease in NPAs is consequently critical for increasing bank profitability and safeguarding the soundness of the financial system. The implementation of NPA guidelines has also been inconsistent throughout time. The banking system has seen a tremendous transition in recent years, owing to financial sector reforms and the implementation of foreign best practices [2]. Managing non-performing assets necessitates the creation of provisions, which can have an impact on overall profitability and serve as a measure of a country's banking health. Given the varying nature and magnitude of the NPA problem among different types of banks, uniform measures may not produce the desired results. As a result, case-specific remedies tailored to each bank's unique circumstances may be required [2].

1.3. Purpose and Scope of the Essay

This review provides a thorough investigation of NPAs in emerging countries, with a particular emphasis on a comparative analysis of regulatory methods in India and China. It seeks to clarify the significance of NPAs in emerging market economies by examining their role as indices of financial health, drivers of systemic concerns, and impediments to effective monetary policy [3]. A comparative review of regulatory frameworks in countries such as India and China have revealed shared difficulties, effective practices, and lessons gained. It also delves into the problems of handling NPAs, including legal and institutional limits, macroeconomic considerations, and governance issues [3]. Finally, it suggests potential future studies to address understanding and knowledge gaps in NPA management [3].

2. Literature Review

2.1. Definition and types of NPAs

Gross NPA is an advance that is regarded as irrecoverable after the bank has made provisions and is still recorded in the bank's books of account. Gross NPAs are the total of all loan assets designated as NPAs. Gross NPA measures the quality of loans made by banks. It includes all non-standard assets, such as substandard, questionable, and lost assets [4].

Net NPAs are those from which the financial institution has subtracted its reserves for NPAs. Net NPA reflects the true cost of banks. Because financial institution balance sheets contain a large number of NPAs and the procedure of recovering and writing off loans takes a long time, banks must make particular arrangements for the NPAs following the government's requirements [4].

2.2. Factors contributing to the rise of NPAs in developing nations

The pattern of growth of non-performing assets (NPAs) in emerging countries is greatly impacted by macroeconomic factors. Studies have found a strong correlation between NPAs and economic performance, including recessions, downturns, savings rates that are low, poor markets, variations in income per person, and rising prices [5]. Several empirical studies have investigated the connection between NPAs and macroeconomic indicators, focusing on variables such as GDP expansion, the size of banks, adequate capitalization, increased loan a security interest, and regulatory regime [6], [7], [8]. Internal causes within banks, such as inefficient management, technological issues, and product depreciation, all lead to NPAs. Furthermore, the positive link between GDP growth and credit to banks points to the favorable connection between GDP development and NPA proportions [5].

Endogenous factors within banks, such as capital sufficiency, lending growth, operational efficiency, and regional concentration, all have an impact on nonperforming assets. Certain studies investigate the effect of operational effectiveness and the solvency on NPAs whereas Kwan and Eisenbis (1997) and Ranjan and Dhal (2003) investigate the connection between problematic loans and efficiency in banks, emphasizing the importance of meticulous loan portfolio management and responsiveness to economic fluctuations [9], [10], [11], [12]. Overall, comprehending the interactions of macroeconomic and endogenous determinants is critical for successful NPA handling and stability in finances.

3. Previous studies on NPAs in India and China

3.1. India

Various theoretical frameworks are employed to understand and address the complexities of NPAs and their impact on bank performance [3]. Theoretical constructs help delineate research problems and provide a foundation for analysis [13]. Before 1991, the issue of NPAs and their impact on banking performance was not extensively studied in the Indian banking sector. Bamoriya (2013) utilized multiple regression analysis to assess the impact of key financial variables on NPAs, revealing significant associations between total assets and deposits with NPAs [14]. Similarly, studies by Chaudhary (2012), PodPiera and PodPiera (2005), and Patidar (2012) examined the profitability and performance of banks, highlighting factors such as performance metrics, credit growth, capitalization, and cost efficiency as influencing NPAs [15], [16], [17]. Conversely, Haron (2004) identified significant relationships between capital and return on assets, as well as bank size. Additionally, they also reported the negative impacts of higher loan ratios on bank profitability [18]. These studies collectively underscore the multifaceted nature of NPAs and their implications for bank performance [3]. By employing diverse methodologies and theoretical frameworks, researchers have elucidated the intricate relationships between NPAs, financial variables, and bank profitability [3].

3.2. China

In China, banks play a pivotal role as the major financial intermediaries, with bank assets accounting for over 310% of GDP or nearly 68% of the country's total financial system assets as of the end of 2016 [19]. The dominance of large commercial banks, particularly the big four banks - Industrial and Commercial Bank of China, Bank of China, China Construction Bank, and Agricultural Bank of China - remains pronounced, comprising a significant proportion of total banking sector assets [20]. However, China's financial landscape has given rise to several challenges, including inefficient resource allocation, a high level of non-performing assets (NPAs), moral hazard issues, and systemic risks within the financial system [19].

As highlighted by Song & Xiong (2018), the state-centric model has also endangered additional complexities such as soft budget constraints, characterized by extensive lending to state-owned enterprises at subsidized interest rates, a repressed financial system, and political interference that restricts access to bank credit for private firms [21]. China's regulatory framework for NPAs is primarily governed by the China Banking Regulatory Commission (CBRC), which oversees the management and supervision of banking activities, including NPA resolution strategies [20]. The CBRC imposes stringent asset quality assessments and provisioning requirements on banks to ensure adequate coverage for potential loan losses stemming from NPAs. Moreover, China has introduced measures to enhance transparency and accountability in NPA classification and reporting, enabling regulators to monitor and address emerging risks effectively. The Chinese government has also implemented policy initiatives aimed at strengthening

risk management practices and promoting greater financial discipline among banks to prevent the accumulation of NPAs [20].

4. Regulatory Frameworks in India and China

4.1. Overview of banking regulations related to NPAs

4.1.1. India

The Recovery of Debts Due to Banks and Financial Institutions Act, 1993 (RDDBFI) was adopted to improve creditor privileges, based on the suggestions of the Narasimhan Committee I. It established debt repayment tribunals (DRTs) and appealing bodies. The tribunals were established to facilitate the repayment of debts for banks and other financial institutions. This measure granted creditors an advantage over other applicants, including operational creditors and laborers, to retrieve payments [22].

Restoration under RDDBFI has had limited efficacy due to issues such as low recovery ratios. In 2001, the Reserve Bank of India (RBI) established the Corporate Debt Restructuring (CDR) Scheme to facilitate out-of-court settlements for debts above INR 100 million [22]. The initiative allows lenders to reduce loan amounts and prolong repayment periods. The RBI allowed banks to make fewer provisions for loans under CDR. The process was delayed and ineffective in addressing non-performing assets (NPAs) [22]. In 1998, the Narasimhan Committee II and Andhyarujina Committee were established to address the rising NPA situation. The SARFAESI, 2002 was enacted based on the committee's proposals [22]. The Act empowered banks and financial organizations to take possession of debtors' assets. When creditors took ownership of resources, there had been no plan for the organization to continue as an ongoing entity. This resulted in a decrease in the firm value throughout recovery [22]. The RBI emphasized the need for early recognition of the financial crisis in the Indian banking sector, rapid resolution, and fair recovery for lenders and investors. They took this action in response to mounting non-performing assets (NPAs) in the Indian banking system because of the downturn in the economy [22].

4.1.2. China

In China, the banking scene has changed dramatically, as seen by the emergence of major financial institutions and modernization-focused regulatory policies [23]. The reform of Chinese banks began in full effect in August 1998, with the issuing of Special Government Bonds worth RMB270 billion. The infusion of capital, along with a drop in the legal reserve demand, practically doubled the capital base of the four largest banks [23]. Despite the enormous investment, experts are perplexed by the lack of payments for interest on these instruments. In 1999, four Asset Management Companies (AMCs) were founded to manage NPAs, which totaled, in Chinese currency, 1.4 trillion, or 20% of the entire loan sum at that time. These NPAs were assigned to the Asset Management Companies at par value, with the condition that they had been acquired before the end of 1995. The AMCs offered securities to the four financial institutions at stated rates of interest, but no payments for interest have been received [23]. The reorganization initiatives underscore the Chinese government's dedication to modernizing the banking sector, but some details remain unclear. The absence of payments of interest on Special Government Bonds and AMC-issued bonds calls into doubt the monetary maneuvers' long-term viability and accountability. Despite these obstacles, Chinese banks have seen large increases in deposits and loans over the last five years, showing a strong financial industry [23].

4.2. Comparative Analysis

When comparing the procedures of Non-Performing Loan (NPL) production and resolution in China and

India, clear discrepancies appear. In China, NPAs are generally caused by State Owned Enterprises (SOEs), whereas in India, they are caused by private company operations and, on rare occasions, priority sectors that are unable to provide appropriate returns on investment. Indian banks have low exposure to SOEs, which distinguishes their NPL dynamics from China's [20].

In India, the resolution procedure differs significantly, making it difficult for market economies to replicate China's financial reforms [20]. Indian banks, particularly state-owned enterprises such as the State Bank of India, have always had a high rate of loan advancement. Private banks in India, led by ICICI, have seen impressive gains in efficiency in recent years. The effectiveness of reformed and recapitalized Chinese banks, such as ICBC, CCBC, and BOC, is currently under examination [20]. Despite receiving substantial funding from the Hong Kong and Shanghai stocks, the aforementioned banks are incurring efficiency losses. Investors' greater control and supervision have limited loan growth, indicating a trend toward market discipline [20]. On the contrary, Chinese banks that have yet to be recapitalized and restructured keep on following aggressive credit distribution policies [20]. The variance in banking procedures highlights the impact of economic circumstances and regulatory frameworks on operational strategy. While Chinese banks face efficiency issues following the reorganization, Indian banks show different tendencies, with state-owned firms focused on loan growth and private banks prioritizing efficiency enhancement [20]. The different sources of NPAs and resolution procedures in China and India represent their respective financial systems and administrative contexts. While Chinese banks manage the challenges of economic-driven improvements, Indian banks display adaptability and resilience in the face of shifting market circumstances, highlighting the varied character of financial dynamics in developing nations [20].

5. Performance Analysis of Banks in India and China

5.1. Case Study 1: India

The study by Sethi et al. (2020) used a comprehensive market theory method to evaluate how financial stocks respond to laws and regulations and evaluate modifications to systemic danger as a consequence of these rules [22]. The study, which spans the time frame from the end of 2013 to the end of May 2017, looks into the consequences of regulation decisions on the private and public banking sectors with the largest share of Non-Performing Assets [22]. In analyzing banks in the public sector, the findings show few substantial unusual returns, with only Dena Bank's results demonstrating abnormally high returns at the 10% threshold of relevance. Particularly, the implementation of regulations increased systemic danger for IDBI and Dena Bank, whereas the passage of the Banking Ordinance Act increased continuous risk for Punjab National Bank, Central Bank, and UCO Bank. In addition, the market's response to the Act appeared unfavorable for various banks, indicating anticipated negative consequences for specific institutions, as seen by large negative coefficients [22]. For banks in the private sector, ICICI Bank saw positive anomalous returns surrounding regulatory pronouncements, whereas Union Bank experienced a rise in systematic danger after regulatory moves. However, the passage of the Banking Ordinance Act had no substantial impact on overall risk for banks or other industries evaluated [22]. When specific banks' net loss accounts and responses to regulatory changes were examined, a substantial decrease in overall risk was identified predominantly among banks in the private sector, but certain banks in the public sector suffered a rise in systematic danger. Notably, after regulatory statements, Dena Bank showed favorable unusual earnings and a reduction in systematic danger [22].

5.2. Case Study- China

Banking reform has been prioritized in China, to address NPAs and increase reserves of capital. This has included significant capital from the public, with a focus on the four main state-owned banks. Initial evaluations indicate a slight increase in the quality of assets, particularly among recapitalized banks. In 2009, China Construction Bank (CCB), one of the nation's main state-owned financial institutions, encountered substantial issues due to an elevated number of non-performing assets (NPAs) on its books of accounts [24]. CCB used a holistic approach, which included stringent risk evaluation procedures, debt restructuring activities, and stronger recovery methods. Utilizing sophisticated data analysis and technological advances, the bank improved its capacity to detect and manage potential credit problems early on [24]. In addition, CCB concentrated on improving engagement with customers to create realistic recovery arrangements and reduce asset depreciation. Through these aggressive actions, CCB significantly lowered its NPA ratio, boosting confidence among investors and its financial health. The case of CCB is an inspiring instance of effective NPA reinterpretation in the Chinese banking sector [24].

6. Factors Influencing NPA Dynamics in India and China

6.1. Economic factors

Several economic factors have a substantial impact on the dynamics of nonperforming assets (NPAs) in the banking sector [25]. To begin, inadequate confirmation of the borrower's evidence of earnings or earnings tax returns, combined with an inability to scrutinize credit rating data may contribute to increased NPA levels. Furthermore, ignoring the evaluation of borrower bank records and private communications from current banks along with difficulties in processing employment/business and residency authentication, as well as insufficient market reporting, might exacerbate NPA problems [25]. Obstacles in loan approval processes, a lack of quick turnaround trackers, and inaccurate external or internal evaluations of credit all trigger NPA development. Additionally, negligence in validating Know Your Customer (KYC) paperwork and deeds of title, as well as overestimation of financed characteristics, increases the risk. Personal prejudices lead to over-financing or incorrect funding, and several illegal financings on an identical property worsen NPA issues [25].

6.2. Political and institutional factors

The examination of Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) exposes a two-fold category of variables: those that contribute to their formation and those that sustain their continued existence. Policy reactions to NPAs are correspondingly divided [25]. One group concentrates on preventing resources from degrading into NPAs, whereas the other attempts to facilitate restoration in the case of failure. Although Public Sector Banks (PSBs) bear some of the blame for NPAs, the fundamental difficulty resides in the securities market. Strategies intended for eliminating NPAs include initiatives that provide flexibility within financial constraints [25].

6.3. Social factors

Non-performing assets (NPAs) are impacted by a variety of socioal and external influences, as well as internal financial industry concerns [25]. External factors like economic downturns, natural disasters like floods and accidents, and shifts in monetary policy and innovation can all have a substantial impact on non-performing assets. Financial crises can lower company profitability and increase rates of default, whereas catastrophic events interrupt economic activity and limit borrowers' capacity to fulfill their loans [25].

7. Implications and Recommendations

Effective management rather than outright removal of Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) is viewed as reasonable, particularly given the greater growth rates and bank spreads in emerging nations [26]. NPAs may be permitted to a non-zero level, providing a suitable balance of risk and rewards. In addition, the establishment of a strong capital market is critical for restructuring NPAs. A robust capital market improves flexibility by offering an avenue for loan write-offs, eliminating the requirement for banks to use methods such as evergreening [26]. However, the two nation's debt market is still relatively immature, needing efforts to increase stability and volume. Furthermore, laws and regulations should take a contextual approach, taking into account circumstances such as transitory liquidity issues to help in decision-making [26]. In China, where security is widely implemented, India may benefit from effective approaches to create its privatization market, notably in mortgage-backed securities. Also, legal processes must be reinforced to deal with issues of defaulters and bribes, assuring proper penalties for both, the defaulters and authorized authorities [26].

8. Conclusion

In conclusion, the study of Non-Performing Asset (NPA) dynamics in newly industrialized nations such as India and China has yielded some crucial findings. For starters, controlling NPAs rather than simply eliminating them seems to be a more sensible strategy, especially considering the higher inflation rates and bank margins found in these countries. This adaptive method enables more appropriate risk-return compromises, which is consistent with India and China's distinct socioeconomic environments. Furthermore, this study is significant because it sheds light on the multiple elements that influence NPA dynamics in emerging markets. Recognizing the complexities of NPA management, from the problems given by poor legal systems to the opportunity offered by creating strong capital markets, is critical for developing effective policies. Finally, the changing patterns of NPAs in emerging nations, particularly India and China, highlight the intricate interaction of socioeconomic status, regulatory, and institutional concerns. While both nations have implemented steps to reduce non-performing assets (NPAs), there are still ongoing difficulties that must be addressed. In general, appropriate laws and regulations, proactive risk mitigation methods, and reforms to institutions are required to guarantee the resilience and stability of the financial services industry in India and China. By resolving these difficulties, these countries may promote long-term development and economic growth while limiting the negative impact of NPAs on their financial systems.

References:

1. H. Kaur and N. K. Saddy, “A Comparative study of non-performing assets of public and private sector banks.,” *International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management*, vol. 2, no. 9, 2014.
2. N. Lalitha, “Non-performing assets: status & impact a comparative study of public & private sector banks: with special reference to SBI, Canara, HDFC and Karur Vysya Banks.,” School of Distance Education, Andhra University, 2013.
3. R. Kumari, P. K. Singh, and V. C. Sharma, “Impact of Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) on Financial Performance of Indian banking Sector,” 2017.
4. R. Parmar, “Non Performing Assets (NPAs): A Comparative Analysis of SBI and ICICI Bank,” vol. 3, no. 3, 2014.
5. V. Swamy, “Impact of Macroeconomic and Endogenous Factors on Non Performing Bank Assets,”

International Journal of Banking and Finance, vol. 9, 2012, doi: 10.32890/ijbf2012.9.1.8447.

6. A. Demirguc-Kunt and E. Detragiache, "Monitoring banking Sector Fragility: A Multivariate Logit Approach," *World Bank Economic Review*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 287–307, 2000.
7. T. Beck, A. Demirguc-Kunt, and R. Levine, "Bank Concentration and Fragility: Impact and Mechanics," National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, MA, w11500, Aug. 2005. doi: 10.3386/w11500.
8. S. F. de Lis, J. M. Pagés, and J. Saurina, "CREDIT GROWTH, PROBLEM LOANS AND CREDIT RISK PROVISIONING IN SPAIN," 2000.
9. I. Rajaraman, S. Bhaumik, and N. Bhatia, "NPA Variations Across Indian Commercial Banks," 1999.
10. A. Das, "Efficiency of Public Sector banks: An application of Data Envelopment Model," *Prajnan*, vol. 8, 1999.
11. S. Kwan and R. A. Eisenbeis, "Bank Risk, Capitalization and Operating Efficiency," *Journal of Financial Services Research*, vol. 12, no. 2/3, pp. 117–131, 1997, doi: 10.1023/A:1007970618648.
12. R. Ranjan and S. C. Dhal, "Non-Performing Loans and Terms of Credit of Public Sector Banks in India: An Empirical Assessment," 2003.
13. U. Sekaran, "Research Methods for Business: A Skill-Building Approach," *John and Wiley Sons*, vol. 4, 2003.
14. P. Bamoriya and R. Jain, "NPA and Select Key Financial Heads: an Empirical study of Commercial Banks of India using Multiple Regression Modelling," vol. 3, no. 2, 2013.
15. K. Chaudhary and M. Sharma, "Performance of Indian Public Sector Banks and Private Sector Banks: A Comparative Study," *International Journal of Innovation*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2011.
16. S. Patidar and A. Kataria, "Analysis of NPA in priority sector lending: A comparative study between public sector banks and Private sector banks of India.," *Bauddhik*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 54–69, 2012.
17. A. Podpiera and J. Podpiera, "Deteriorating cost efficiency in commercial banks signals an increasing risk of failure.," *Praha: Czech National Bank*, 2005.
18. S. Haron, "Determinants of Islamic Bank Profitability," *Global Journal of Finance and Economic*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 274–291, 2007.
19. "Financial System Stability Assessment. IMF Country Report No. 17/358," IMF Washington DC, Internattional Monetary Fund., 2017.
20. R. U. Arora and Q. Zhang, "Banking in the Shadows: A Comparative Study of China and India," *Aust Econ Hist Rev*, vol. 59, no. 1, pp. 103–131, Mar. 2019, doi: 10.1111/aehr.12167.
21. Z. Song and W. Xiong, "Risks in China's financial system," BOFIT Discussion Papers. Helsinski, The Bank of Finland Institute for Economies in Transition, 2018.
22. M. Sethi and D. Krishnakumar, "Equity market reaction to regulatory reforms: a case study of Indian banks," *JFRC*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 431–464, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.1108/JFRC-09-2019-0114.
23. A. Garcia-Herrero, "China's Banking Reform: An Assessment of its Evolution and Possible Impact," *CESifo Economic Studies*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 304–363, Apr. 2006, doi: 10.1093/cesifo/ifl006.
24. "China Construction Bank Corporation Announces 2009 Q1 Results." [Online]. Available: https://www.ccb.com/eng/2021-01/22/article_20210122154204422579.shtml
25. S. S and C. P, "Institutional Factors influencing Non-Performing Assets (NPA) in Indian Banking Sector and use of Artificial Intelligence as a remedial tool.," 2018.
26. P. K. Reddy, "A comparative study of Non Performing Assets in India in the Global context - similarities and dissimilarities, remedial measures," *SSRN Journal*, 2003, doi: 10.2139/ssrn.361322.