

International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies

Research Article / Survey Paper / Case Study

Available online at: www.ijarcsms.com

Trends and Patterns of NPAs in the Indian Banking Industry (2008–2018): A Detailed Analysis

Sushil Kumar¹

Research Scholar,
IMSAR, MDU Rohtak, India.

Manju Katarya²

Research scholar, Public Administration,
HPU, Shimla (Himachal Pradesh), India.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.61161/ijarcsms.v7i4.2>

Abstract: *Non-Performing Assets (NPAs) have become a defining challenge for the Indian banking sector, affecting profitability, credit growth, and the stability of the financial system (Das & Ghosh, 2007; Rajeev & Mahesh, 2010; Singh & Prasad, 2018). This paper offers a comprehensive analysis of NPA trends and patterns from 2008 to 2018, a period marked by regulatory evolution, macroeconomic volatility, and significant changes in lending practices (Swami, 2012; SRCC, 2018; Swati & Raju, 2018). Using secondary data from the Reserve Bank of India and peer-reviewed research, the study explores the evolution of NPAs across public, private, and foreign banks, highlighting the sharpest deterioration post-2015 following the RBI's Asset Quality Review (IIBF, 2017; Ghosh, 2017). Detailed tables and sectoral analyses reveal that public sector banks (PSBs) bore the brunt of the crisis, while private and foreign banks demonstrated better asset quality due to stronger governance and risk management (Gupta, 2012; Mohan, 2017). The paper concludes with policy recommendations, emphasizing the need for structural reforms and robust risk management to restore confidence in the Indian banking sector (Dey, 2018; Satbir Singh et al., 2018).*

I. INTRODUCTION

The Indian banking sector has been instrumental in supporting the country's economic growth by mobilizing savings and channeling credit to productive sectors (RBI, 2017; Rajeev & Mahesh, 2010). However, the decade from 2008 to 2018 was marked by an unprecedented surge in Non-Performing Assets (NPAs), which undermined the health of banks and posed systemic risks (Das & Ghosh, 2007; SRCC, 2018). NPAs, defined as loans overdue for more than 90 days, are a critical indicator of asset quality and banking sector stability (Singh & Prasad, 2018; IIBF, 2017).

Initially, Indian banks withstood the global financial crisis of 2008 with relative resilience, but the subsequent domestic slowdown, aggressive lending, and regulatory forbearance set the stage for a mounting NPA crisis (Ghosh, 2017; Swami, 2012). Public Sector Banks (PSBs), which dominate the sector, were particularly vulnerable due to their exposure to large corporate and infrastructure loans (Gupta, 2012; Satbir Singh et al., 2018). The Asset Quality Review (AQR) initiated by the Reserve Bank of India in 2015 exposed the true extent of stressed assets, leading to a sharp spike in reported NPAs (IIBF, 2017; Swati & Raju, 2018).

The persistent rise in NPAs eroded profitability, constrained credit growth, and exposed weaknesses in governance and risk management (Mohan, 2017; Dey, 2018). This crisis had far-reaching implications for economic growth, as banks' ability to extend fresh credit was severely hampered (RBI, 2017; Swami, 2012). This paper aims to dissect the trends and patterns of NPAs across different bank groups and sectors, identify the key drivers behind the surge, and analyze the systemic implications for the Indian economy (Singh & Prasad, 2018; SRCC, 2018).

By presenting and interpreting detailed tables based on authoritative secondary data, the study provides a nuanced understanding of the NPA phenomenon (Satbir Singh et al., 2018; Ghosh, 2017). The research also seeks to inform ongoing policy debates on banking sector reforms, risk management, and regulatory oversight (Swati & Raju, 2018; Dey, 2018). Ultimately, it highlights the critical lessons for sustaining financial stability and fostering a robust, resilient banking system in India (IIBF, 2017; Rajeev & Mahesh, 2010).

II. TRENDS AND PATTERNS OF NPAs (2008-2018)

Overall Growth of NPAs

Table 1: Gross NPA Ratio of Scheduled Commercial Banks (2008–2018)

Year	Gross NPA Ratio (%)
2008	2.2
2009	2.3
2010	2.4
2011	2.5
2012	3.1
2013	3.8
2014	4.4
2015	5.1
2016	9.3
2017	10.2
2018	11.2

Source: SRCC, 2018; RBI, 2017; Singh & Prasad, 2018

Table 1 shows that the gross NPA ratio for Scheduled Commercial Banks (SCBs) remained relatively stable between 2008 and 2011, but began to rise sharply from 2012 onwards (SRCC, 2018; Ghosh, 2017). The most dramatic escalation occurred after 2015, coinciding with the RBI's Asset Quality Review (IIBF, 2017; RBI, 2017). By 2018, the gross NPA ratio reached 11.2%, indicating systemic weaknesses in credit appraisal, monitoring, and recovery (Singh & Prasad, 2018; Rajeev & Mahesh, 2010).

Bank Group-wise Trends

Public Sector Banks (PSBs)

Table 2: Gross NPA Ratio of Public Sector Banks (2008–2018)

Year	Gross NPA Ratio (%)
2008	2.0
2009	2.1
2010	2.2
2011	2.3
2012	3.3
2013	4.4
2014	4.7

2015	5.0
2016	9.3
2017	12.5
2018	14.6

Source: SRCC, 2018; Singh & Prasad, 2018; Ghosh, 2017

Table 2 highlights that PSBs experienced the most severe deterioration in asset quality, with the NPA ratio rising modestly until 2011, then accelerating sharply after 2015 (Ghosh, 2017; SRCC, 2018). By 2018, the ratio reached 14.6%, meaning nearly one in seven rupees lent by PSBs was non-performing (Singh & Prasad, 2018; Satbir Singh et al., 2018). This underscores PSBs' vulnerability to asset quality shocks, largely due to their exposure to large corporate loans and infrastructure projects, as well as governance and risk management challenges (Gupta, 2012; Dey, 2018).

Private Sector Banks

Table 3: Gross NPA Ratio of Private Sector Banks (2008–2018)

Year	Gross NPA Ratio (%)
2008	2.1
2009	2.0
2010	2.0
2011	1.8
2012	1.9
2013	2.0
2014	1.8
2015	2.1
2016	3.0
2017	4.0
2018	4.6

Source: SRCC, 2018; Mohan, 2017; Singh & Prasad, 2018

Table 3 shows that private sector banks maintained a relatively stable and low NPA ratio until 2014, generally below 2% (Mohan, 2017; SRCC, 2018). The ratio began to rise from 2015, reaching 4.6% by 2018, but remained significantly lower than that of PSBs (Singh & Prasad, 2018). This suggests that private banks, with more robust credit appraisal systems and diversified portfolios, were less affected by the NPA crisis (Gupta, 2012).

Foreign Banks

Table 4: Gross NPA Ratio of Foreign Banks (2008–2018)

Year	Gross NPA Ratio (%)
2008	1.9
2009	2.0
2010	1.8
2011	2.3
2012	2.5

2013	3.0
2014	3.6
2015	3.9
2016	4.2
2017	3.8
2018	3.2

Source: SRCC, 2018; Mohan, 2017; Ghosh, 2017

Table 4 indicates that foreign banks consistently reported lower NPA ratios compared to PSBs and private banks, peaking at 4.2% in 2016 before declining to 3.2% in 2018 (Mohan, 2017; SRCC, 2018). Their better performance can be attributed to stringent global risk management standards and selective lending (Ghosh, 2017).

Bank-wise Patterns among PSBs

Table 5: Selected PSBs with Highest GNPA Ratios in 2018

Bank Name	GNPA Ratio (%)
IDBI Bank	28.0
State Bank of Mysore	25.7 (2017)
Indian Overseas Bank	17.4 (2016)
UCO Bank	16.7 (2018)
United Bank of India	15.3 (2018)
Central Bank of India	11.1 (2018)

Source: Singh & Prasad, 2018; Satbir Singh et al., 2018; SRCC, 2018

Table 5 shows that certain PSBs, such as IDBI Bank, had GNPA ratios as high as 28% in 2018, indicating severe stress (Singh & Prasad, 2018). Other banks like State Bank of Mysore and Indian Overseas Bank also reported alarming figures in recent years, reflecting the impact of the AQR and the banks' exposure to risky sectors (Satbir Singh et al., 2018).

Sectoral Distribution of NPAs

Table 6: Sector-wise NPA Trends

Year	Agriculture	Industry	Services	Personal Loans
2012	4.0	5.6	3.2	2.1
2015	5.2	7.9	4.6	2.4
2018	6.1	13.8	7.2	2.7

Source: Swati & Raju, 2018; IIBF, 2017; RBI, 2017

Table 6 reveals that the industry sector experienced the sharpest rise in NPAs, from 5.6% in 2012 to 13.8% in 2018, reflecting the stress in large corporate and infrastructure lending (Swati & Raju, 2018; IIBF, 2017). Agriculture and services also saw increases, but personal loans remained relatively stable, indicating that retail lending was less risky during this period (RBI, 2017).

III. PERIOD OF SHARPEST DETERIORATION

The period from 2015 to 2018 saw the sharpest increase in NPAs, particularly after the RBI's Asset Quality Review, which led to the recognition of previously hidden bad loans (IIBF, 2017; Ghosh, 2017; Swati & Raju, 2018). The GNPA ratio of PSBs rose from 5% in 2015 to 14.6% in 2018, marking a watershed in the Indian banking sector (SRCC, 2018).

IV. SYSTEMATIC IMPLICATION

The escalation in NPAs led to higher provisioning requirements, eroding bank profitability and constraining their ability to lend (Satbir Singh et al., 2018; Dey, 2018). Many PSBs reported net losses due to increased provisioning for bad loans. Mounting NPAs reduced banks' capacity to extend credit, leading to slower credit growth and affecting investment and economic expansion (RBI, 2017; Swami, 2012). The asset quality of Indian banks, especially PSBs, reached its lowest point in 2018, exposing weaknesses in governance, transparency, and accountability (Ghosh, 2017; SRCC, 2018).

V. DISCUSSION

The NPA surge was driven by a combination of factors: economic slowdown, aggressive corporate lending, delayed recognition of bad loans, and regulatory interventions such as the Asset Quality Review (Singh & Prasad, 2018; IIBF, 2017; Dey, 2018). PSBs experienced the sharpest and most sustained rise in NPAs, while private and foreign banks managed to limit the growth due to better governance and risk management (Gupta, 2012; Mohan, 2017).

VI. CONCLUSION

The decade from 2008 to 2018 was transformative for the Indian banking sector. The gross NPA ratio for Scheduled Commercial Banks rose from 2.2% in 2008 to 11.2% in 2018, with PSBs alone accounting for the lion's share at 14.6% (SRCC, 2018; Singh & Prasad, 2018). This surge was driven by aggressive corporate lending, economic slowdown, delayed recognition of bad loans, and regulatory interventions (Swati & Raju, 2018; Ghosh, 2017). While private and foreign banks were not immune, their more prudent lending practices and robust risk management frameworks enabled them to contain the damage (Gupta, 2012).

The sectoral analysis underscores the disproportionate risk associated with non-priority sector lending, particularly to large corporates and infrastructure projects (Swati & Raju, 2018; IIBF, 2017). High NPAs have eroded bank profitability, constrained credit growth, and exposed deep-rooted weaknesses in governance and risk management (Satbir Singh et al., 2018; Dey, 2018). The resultant credit crunch has had a cascading effect on investment and economic growth, making the resolution of NPAs a national priority (RBI, 2017).

The NPA crisis of 2008–2018 offers several lessons. There is an urgent need for structural reforms in the banking sector, including improved credit appraisal processes, stronger internal controls, and more effective recovery mechanisms (Singh & Prasad, 2018; IIBF, 2017; Ghosh, 2017). Regulatory oversight must be vigilant and proactive, ensuring timely recognition and resolution of stressed assets. Strengthening the governance of PSBs, encouraging global best practices, and fostering a culture of accountability are essential for restoring confidence in the banking system (Gupta, 2012; Mohan, 2017).

In conclusion, while the NPA crisis has exposed vulnerabilities, it also presents an opportunity for the Indian banking sector to emerge stronger and more resilient. The path ahead requires sustained reforms, technological innovation, and a renewed commitment to sound banking principles (SRCC, 2018; Swati & Raju, 2018).

References

1. Das, A., & Ghosh, S. (2007). Determinants of credit risk in Indian state-owned banks: An empirical investigation. *Economic Issues*, 12(2), 48–66.
2. Dey, S. (2018). Recovery of poor loans of Indian commercial banks: A comparative analysis of DRTs, Lok Adalats and SARFAESI Act. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 22(1), 133–148.
3. Ghosh, S. (2017). Sectoral analysis of non-performing loans in India. *Economic and Political Weekly*, 52(10), 85–93.
4. Gupta, B. (2012). A comparative study of non-performing assets of public and private sector banks in India. *International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services & Management Research*, 1(7), 67–79.
5. Indian Institute of Banking & Finance (IIBF). (2017). Non-performing assets of banks in India: Efficiency in management. IIBF Research Report.
6. Mohan, R. (2017). Non-performing assets in Indian banks: Issues and concerns. *Reserve Bank of India Bulletin*, 71(3), 15–27.
7. Rajeev, M., & Mahesh, H. P. (2010). Banking sector reforms and NPA: A study of Indian commercial banks. Working Paper No. 252, Institute for Social and Economic Change.

8. Reserve Bank of India (RBI). (2017). Report on Trend and Progress of Banking in India 2016–17. Mumbai: RBI.
9. Satbir Singh, S., Shobha, & Kajal Nagpal. (2018). Non-performing assets (NPAs) and Indian public sector banks. *Purva Mimaansa*, 10(1–2), 261–269.
10. Singh, A. K., & Prasad, R. (2018). A trend analysis of NPAs of banks in India for 2008–2018. *Business Analyst*, 41(1), 23–53.
11. SRCC. (2018). A trend analysis of NPAs of banks in India for 2008–2018. SRCC Working Paper Series, 2018(15), 1–40.
12. Swami, V. (2012). Non-performing assets (NPAs) and its impact on Indian banking sector. *International Journal of Marketing, Financial Services & Management Research*, 1(9), 67–79.
13. Swati, & Raju, S. (2018). Non-performing assets of banks in India: Efficiency in management. IIBF Research Report, 1–60.

::. How to Cite this ARTICLE ::.

Kumar, S., & Katarya, M. (2019). Trends and Patterns of NPAs in the Indian Banking Industry (2008–2018): A Detailed Analysis. *International Journal of Advance Research in Computer Science and Management Studies*, 7(4), 164-169.
<https://doi.org/10.61161/ijarcsms.v7i4.2>