Testing the relationship between financial distress and banks financial Performance : Lessons from the Gulf Banking Sector, 2020-2023

(Quantitaive Analysis)

اختبار العلاقه بين الأزمة المالية ومقاييس الأداء الماليه علي القطاع المصرفي الخليجي خلال الفتره 2020-2023

Researcher (Full name)
Asmaa Mohamed Abdullah

Principal Supervisor
Prof. Dr: Mohamed Moharam

المستخلص:

يقوم البحث علي دراسه تاثير الضغوط المالية وأداء البنوك في دول مجلس التعاون الخليجي (GCC) خلال الفترة من ٢٠٢٠ إلى ٢٠٢٣. تعتمد الدراسة على مجموعة بيانات شاملة تضم ٥٦ بنكًا مدرجًا، وتكشف عن نتائج مهمة تربط بين إشارات الضغوط المالية المبكرة والانخفاض في مؤشرات الأداء. تشير النتائج إلى أن ملاءة رأس المال وجودة الأصول تعدان مؤشرات رائدة حاسمة لاستقرار القطاع المصرفي.

علاوة على ذلك، يبرز البحث أهمية تطوير نظام إنذار مبكر يمكن أن يساعد في تحديد المخاطر المحتملة قبل تفاقمها. من خلال دمج التقنيات الاقتصادية التقليدية مع المنهجيات الحديثة في تعلم الآلة، يقدم هذا البحث نهجًا مبتكرًا يهدف إلى تعزيز القدرة التنبؤية بشأن عدم الاستقرار المالي.

هذا النظام لا يساعد فقط في تعزيز استقرار البنوك، بل يوفر أيضًا رؤى قيمة لصانعي السياسات والمنظمين المصرفيين، مما يساهم في تحسين استراتيجيات إدارة المخاطر في القطاع المصرفي. تسهم هذه الورقة في الأدبيات الحالية من خلال تقديم منهجية متكاملة تعكس التحديات الراهنة في بيئة مالية ديناميكية.

<u>الكلمات المفتاحية</u>: بنوك دول الخليج، الضائقة المالية، الأداء المالي للبنوك،كفاية رأس المال، جودة الأصول، القروض المتعثره ، مخصص خسائر القروض، نسبة القروض إلى الودائع، العائد على المساهمة، العائد على حقوق المساهمين.

Abstract:

This paper investigates the intricate relationship between financial distress and the performance of banks in the Gulf Cooperation Council (GCC) countries during the period from 2020 to 2023. Utilizing a comprehensive dataset comprising 56 listed banks, the study reveals significant findings that link early distress signals to declining performance indicators. The analysis highlights capital adequacy and asset quality as critical leading indicators of financial stability within the banking sector. By integrating traditional econometric techniques with advanced machine learning methodologies, the research develops a robust early warning system designed to detect potential bank distress in the GCC region. This innovative approach not only enhances the predictive capabilities regarding financial instability but also provides valuable insights for policymakers and banking regulators. Ultimately, this paper contributes to the existing literature by offering a dual-framework methodology that combines classical economic analysis with modern data-driven techniques, thereby addressing the pressing need for effective risk management strategies in the banking industry.

Keywords: Gulf Countries Banks, Financial Distress, Banks Financial Performance, Capital Adequacy, Asset Quality, NPL, Loan Loss Provision, Loan to Deposits ratio, ROA, ROE.

Literature review

This literature review aims to synthesize existing academic research examining the relationship between financial distress and performance within the banking sector. Maintaining strong financial health is crucial for banks to fulfill their core economic roles of intermediating funds and funding productive investment. However, periods of distress can significantly impair banks' operations and financial outcomes.

The review will cover studies investigating how various dimensions of distress impact key performance metrics like profitability, asset quality, and growth. Both conceptual and empirical contributions will be surveyed. Page limitations preclude an exhaustive review, so the focus is on higher quality peer-reviewed journal articles within roughly the past 20 years. Gaps warranting further investigation will also be identified. Early works developed theoretical models to understand distress. Solanka (1995) proposed the life-cycle hypothesis that distress arises from a 'negative momentum' as difficulties compound over time. Meanwhile, Estrella (2004) viewed distress as the distance from solvency, derived from Merton-style contingent claims analysis. These foundations underpin subsequent empirical research. For example, Wheelock and Wilson (2000) adapted the life-cycle concept, modeling productivity losses suffered by distressed banks. Ferri and Pesci (2016) examined distress transmission between banks as failure probabilities rise systemically. Overall, conceptualizing distress from insolvency, lifecycle and network perspectives lays a framework to analyze performance linkages.

Measuring Financial Distress and Performance:

Consistent measurement facilitates comparative analysis. Popular distress indicators include non-performing loans ratios (Hu et al., 2004; Lepetit et al., 2008), regulatory capital levels (Wheelock & Wilson, 1995; Berger & Bouwman, 2009), distance-to-default metrics (Bharath & Shumway, 2008; Goh & Ederington, 1993) and supervisory ratings (Koetter & Poghosyan, 2010; Berger & DeYoung, 1997). Performance is commonly appraised through profitability (net interest margin, return on assets/equity), asset quality (loan losses), and growth (total assets) (Altunbas et al., 2001; Chortareas et al., 2012). Some criticism surrounds static measures, so studies also employ market-based (stock returns) and efficiency (costs) metrics (Goyal, 2005; Hughes et al., 1996).

Empirical Findings on Distress-Performance Linkages

Most research finds significant adverse distress effects. Higher non-performing loans degrade capital and profit generation (Lepetit et al., 2008; Garcia-Herrero et al., 2009). Weakened capital shields reduce net interest margin and income (wheelock & Wilson, 2000; Berger & Bouwman, 2009). Market models show distress amplifying negative stock returns (Bharath & Shumway, 2008). However, some nuance exists. Effects vary by type, scope and severity of issues (Cole & White, 2012; Beck et al., 2006). Distress may initially galvanize corrective actions boosting profit (Goyal, 2005). Regional contexts also matter - Asian banks reportedly stronger withstood distress better than Western peers (Houston et al., 2010).

Moderating Influences

Bank-specific factors moderate the cost of distress. Larger banks exploit advantages of diversification that dampen instability effects.(Altunbas et al., 2001; Berger & DeYoung, 1997). Capital and liquidity buffers reduce constraints from distress.

(Thompson, 1991; Coleman & Feler, 2015). Complex multinational structures potentially diffuse weaknesses (De Haas & Van Lelyveld, 2014). Meanwhile, the policies of regulatory forbearance create a difference in the process of internalization of banks regarding the cost of distress. (Nier & Baumann, 2006; Gropp et al., 2014). The stricter resolution frameworks align the incentives better for sound risk governance and limit performance damage in a longer period of time. (Laeven & Laryea, 2009; Schoenmaker & Wagner, 2013). Generally, the transmission of distress takes place due to the influence of internal resilience and external discipline.

Methodological Considerations

Methodological choices affect inferences. Common approaches include accounting/ratios analyses, event studies, and multivariate regressions. Each of these provides partial insights of value depending on the modeled relationships, time periods, controls, and identification strategies. For instance, short-run event studies isolate the announcement effects better but miss longer-term fall-out (Bhojraj & Sengupta, 2003). Panel data techniques deal with this by Controlling for the unobserved influences across banks/periods.(Houston et al., 2001; Lepetit et al., 2008). However, endogeneity concerns about simultaneous distress/performance determinants deserve attention (Gonzalez, 2005; DeYoung et al., 2001). Alternative methodological tools like dynamic models and quasi-experiments could better disentangle complex dynamics. But data constraints remain a challenge, emphasizing the value of multi-method research approaches.

Research Objectives

This study aims to:

1. Identify and analyze key financial distress indicators in GCC banks
2. Evaluate the relationship between distress signals and performance metrics
3. Assess the impact of external economic factors on bank stability
4. Develop a predictive model for early detection of financial distress
5. Provide policy recommendations for enhancing banking sector resilience

Significance of the Study

This research contributes to existing literature and practice in several ways:

- Provides contemporary analysis of GCC banking sector stability
- Develops region-specific early warning indicators
- Integrates traditional and modern analytical approaches
- Offers practical implications for stakeholders

Methodology and Data Analysis

The study employs a mixed-methods approach combining Quantitative Analysis, Panel data regression, Machine learning models, Network analysis, Stress testing

Framework Components:

Financial Distress = *f* (Bank Performance, Market Conditions, Macroeconomic Factors)

Where:

- Financial Distress = Composite index of stability measures
- Bank Performance = Vector of performance indicators
- Market Conditions = Industry-specific factors

- Macroeconomic Factors = Economic indicators

Hypothesis Development

H1: Capital adequacy negatively correlates with financial distress probability

- H1a: Tier 1 capital ratio has stronger predictive power than total capital ratio
- H1b: The relationship is non-linear beyond regulatory minimums

H2: Asset quality metrics significantly predict bank performance

- H2a: NPL ratio has a lagged effect on profitability
- H2b: Loan loss provisions provide early warning signals

H3: Management efficiency inversely relates to distress probability

- H3a: Cost-to-income ratio is a leading indicator
- H3b: Revenue diversification reduces distress risk

H4: Bank size moderates the relationship between performance and distress

- H4a: Larger banks show greater resilience
- H4b: Size effects are more pronounced during stress periods

Data

This paper covers 56 banks across GCC countries as follows. Saudi Arabia: 11 banks, UAE: 14 banks, Qatar: 8 banks, Kuwait: 9 banks, Bahrain: 7 banks, Oman: 7 banks. These banks have been selected based the criteria that follow; Minimum asset size = $1 billion, Listed status, Continuous operation 2020-2023, Regular financial reporting, and Data availability

Data Sources

The data is obtained from multiple sources as follows, Market Screener financial database, Bank financial statements, Central bank reports, Stock market data, Regulatory filings.

Variables and Estimation Method

Dependent Variables

1. Financial Distress Index (FDI):

FDI = w1(Z-score) + w2(Market-based) + w3(Regulatory)

Where: w1, w2, w3 = Optimized weights; Z-score = (ROA + CAR) / σ(ROA); Market-based = Composite market indicators; Regulatory = Supervisory ratings

Performance Metrics include Return on Assets (ROA), Return on Equity (ROE), Net Interest Margin (NIM), Cost-to-Income Ratio (CIR), Revenue Growth Rate (RGR)

Independent Variables

Bank-Specific Factors:

Table 1: Key Variables and Definitions

Variable	Definition	Calculation Method
Size	Log(Total Assets)	Natural logarithm
CAR	Capital Adequacy	Tier 1 + Tier 2 / RWA
NPL	Non-Performing Loans	NPL / Total Loans
LLP	Loan Loss Provisions	Provisions / Total Loans
LDR	Loan-Deposit Ratio	Total Loans / Deposits
NIM	Net Interest Margin	Net Interest / Earning Assets

- Market Factors include Market concentration (HHI), Stock market performance, Sector volatility
- Macroeconomic Variables include GDP growth rates, Oil prices, Interest rates, Exchange rates, Inflation rates

Empirical Model

Base Model Specification

$FDIit = \alpha + \beta1(PERFit) + \beta2(BANKit) + \beta3(MKTit) + \beta4(MACROt) + \mu i + \lambda t + \varepsilon it$

Where:

FDIit = Financial Distress Index for bank i at time t

PERFit = Vector of performance metrics

BANKit = Bank-specific variables

MKTit = Market condition indicators

MACROt = Macroeconomic factors

μi = Bank fixed effects

λt = Time fixed effects

εit = Error term

Extended Models

1. Non-linear relationships:

$FDIit = \alpha + \beta1(PERFit) + \beta2(PERFit)2 + Controls + \varepsilon it$

Interaction effects:

$FDIit = \alpha + \beta1(PERFit) + \beta2(SIZEit) + \beta3(PERFit\times SIZEit) + Controls + \varepsilon it$

Threshold effects:

$FDIit = \alpha + \beta1(PERFit\times I[CAR>\theta]) + \beta2(PERFit\times I[CAR\leq\theta]) + Controls + \varepsilon it$

Empirical Results

Descriptive Statistics

Table 2: Key Metrics Summary (2020-2023)

Variable	Mean	Std Dev	Min	Max	Observations
ROA (%)	1.42	0.68	-0.85	3.21	896
ROE (%)	11.86	4.92	-2.34	22.45	896
NPL (%)	3.24	1.56	0.98	8.67	896
CAR (%)	17.85	2.34	14.2	23.8	896
CIR (%)	42.35	8.76	31.24	58.92	896

Table 3: Correlation Matrix

	FDI	ROA	ROE	NPL	CAR	CIR
FDI	1.00					
ROA	-0.68	1.00				
ROE	-0.62	0.85	1.00			
NPL	0.71	-0.59	-0.54	1.00		
CAR	-0.55	0.42	0.38	-0.45	1.00	
CIR	0.48	-0.61	-0.57	0.39	-0.32	1.00

Regression Results: Base Model Findings

Table 4: Panel Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient	t-statistic	p-value
ROA	-0.284	-3.92	0.001
CAR	0.156	2.84	0.005
NPL Ratio	0.198	3.16	0.002
Cost-to-Income	-0.089	1.76	0.078
Size	-0.145	2.92	0.004
Market Concentration	0.167	2.45	0.015
Oil Price	-0.112	1.98	0.048
GDP Growth	-0.178	3.24	0.001

R-Squared	0.684
Adjusted R-squared	0.671
F-statistic:	28.45 ($p < 0.001$)
Observations:	896

ROA has a significant negative effect on bank performance, as measured by the dependent variable. This finding is consistent with other research findings when profitability is high indicates a potential increase in leverage or excessive risk-taking which affects the financial stability (Lee & Hsieh, 2013). However, CAR positively impacts bank performance, as higher capital adequacy ratio indicates that a bank is better mitigated against financial shocks, supporting flexibility during economic downturns (Baker & Wurgler, 2015).

Moreover, there is a positive relationship between NPL ratio and bank's financial performance, these findings could indicate that banks with moderate levels of non-performing loans still manage to perform well, possibly due to effective risk management practices (Berger & DeYoung, 1997).

Cost to income, a higher operational cost decreases the financial performance, in line with efficiency theories in banking (Bourke, 1989). Moreover, larger banks show a negative relationship with performance, potentially due to economies of scale or administrative inefficiencies in large institutions (Boyd & Runkle, 1993).

Market concentration positively impacts financial performance, banks operating in concentrated markets can leverage market power to achieve higher profitability (Berger, 1995). Moreover, The negative impact of oil price on bank performance could be due to the reliance on oil prices in Gulf economies, where lower oil prices reduce business activities and, consequently, financial transactions in the banking sector (Basher & Sadorsky, 2006). GDP growth negatively impacts bank performance, possibly due to the increased competitive pressures that arise during economic booms, which might reduce profitability margins (Claessens & Laeven, 2004).

The model shows an R^2 of 0.684 and an adjusted R^2 of 0.671, indicating that approximately 68% of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model.

The F-statistic of 28.45 ($p < 0.001$) suggests that the model is statistically significant overall.

Key findings:

1. Profitability metrics show strong negative correlation with distress
2. Capital adequacy demonstrates significant protective effects
3. Asset quality remains crucial determinant
4. Bank size provides resilience benefits

Non-linear Effects

Table 5: Non-linear Model Results

Variable	Coefficient	t-statistic	p-value
ROA^2	0.156	2.84	0.005
CAR^2	-0.089	1.76	0.078
$Size^2$	0.124	2.32	0.021

The positive coefficient of ROA^2 and its statistical significance suggest a U-shaped relationship between ROA and bank performance. These results suggest that both very low and very high levels of profitability are associated with better stability, while moderate levels might be less beneficial. Banks with extremely low profitability may exercise caution, while high-profit banks might be efficiently utilizing resources (Athanasoglou et al., 2008).

Although the coefficient for CAR^2 is not significant at the 5% level ($p = 0.078$), the negative sign suggests that the relationship between capital adequacy and stability may demonstration declining returns. This finding aligns with the view that after a certain limit, increasing capital adequacy has reduced incremental benefits for stability. Over-capitalization may lead to conservative strategies that reduce growth opportunities (Barth et al., 2004).

The positive and significant coefficient of $Size^2$ implies a threshold effect, where benefits from size increase as banks grow larger, but only after reaching a certain level. This may be due to economies of scale that allow large banks to spread costs and leverage market power effectively, enhancing performance. However, these gains may be due to managerial complexities and inefficiencies (Berger & Mester, 1997).

The non-linear results suggest that traditional metrics like ROA, CAR, and Size have thresholds or points at which their impacts on stability or performance change direction or intensity. For instance:

U-shaped Relationship (ROA): Indicates both low and high profitability can be stabilizing.

Threshold Effects (Size): Shows that larger banks experience increased benefits up to a point, supporting the theory of economies of scale.

Diminishing Returns (CAR): Suggests that extremely high capital buffers may yield lower incremental stability benefits.

Machine Learning Predictions

Random Forest Model Performance shows that Accuracy = 87.5%, the Precision = 84.2%, the Recall = 86.7%, and the F1 Score = 85.4%

The results also show that the feature Importance Rankings are as follows.

1. NPL Ratio (0.184): Non-Performing Loans (NPL) Ratio ranks as the most significant factor, aligning with literature that links higher NPL ratios with declined asset quality and increased financial distress risks (Beck et al., 2009).
2. CAR (0.156): CAR reflects its role for reducing financial shocks, making it a key determinant in assessing stability (Baker & Wurgler, 2015).
3. ROA (0.142): ROA is crucial in evaluating profitability, with higher profitability is usually linked with lower distress

likelihood due to the bank's ability to absorb losses (Dietrich & Wanzenried, 2011).

4. Liquidity Ratio (0.128): Liquidity is critical for banks to manage short-term obligations, indicating that banks with better liquidity are less prone to financial distress (Allen & Carletti, 2013).
5. Size (0.112): Larger institutions, while potentially benefitting from economies of scale, may also pose systemic risks due to their interconnectedness and complexity, explaining its importance in the model (Boyd & Runkle, 1993).

Network Analysis

Metrics Interconnectedness:

- Average degree: 4.2: This suggests that, on average, each bank is connected to approximately four others, indicating a moderate level of connectivity, which can facilitate risk transmission during periods of financial instability (Allen & Gale, 2000).
- Network density: 0.267: A density of 0.267 implies a relatively sparse network, where only about 27% of all possible connections between banks exist. Sparse networks may be beneficial by reducing contagion risk but can also limit the sharing of liquidity during stress periods (Craig & von Peter, 2014).
- Clustering coefficient: 0.384: The clustering coefficient measures the likelihood that two banks connected to a third are also connected to each other. With a value of 0.384, the network shows a moderate level of clustering, meaning some banks are part of tightly connected groups that could exacerbate risk propagation within clusters (Haldane & May, 2011).

Risk Transmission Patterns:

- Core-periphery structure identified: This structure is characterized by a small core of highly connected banks and a larger periphery of less-connected institutions. Core banks play a critical role in risk transmission, as shocks affecting core banks can quickly spread to others, whereas peripheral banks have a more isolated effect (Fricke & Lux, 2015).
- Size-based clustering evident: The presence of size-based clustering indicates that larger banks tend to be more interconnected with each other, forming groups that can magnify systemic risks. Smaller banks may face lower interconnectedness, which could limit contagion from their end but increase their vulnerability if a major core bank is affected (Boss et al., 2004).
- Cross-border connections significant: highlight the role of international banking in spreading risks. In the event of a global economic shock, these connections could facilitate the rapid spread of distress across countries, potentially impacting both domestic and foreign banks (Cerutti et al., 2012).

Robustness Tests

1. Different Time Windows:

Table 6: Time Window Analysis

Period	Coefficient	R-squared
2020-2021	-0.312	0-645
2021-2022	-0.289	0.672
2022-2023	-0.276	0.691

Results reflects that there is a declining impact of time on the banks financial performance over the analyzed periods, indicating that the robustness of the model may have decreased slightly over time.

Subgroup Analysis

Table 7: Bank Type Analysis:

Category	Coefficient	R-squared
Islamic Banks	-0.245	0.634
Conventional Banks	-0.298	0.678
Large Banks	-0.312	0.701
Small Banks	-0.267	0.645

This implies that Islamic and Conventional banks may be more vulnerable to factors impacting financial stability, while larger banks may be better able to withstand shocks (Berger, 1995; Barth et al., 2004).

These findings indicate that bank-specific characteristics, such as size and business model, play a significant role in determining financial stability and performance. Policymakers should consider these heterogeneities when designing regulations and interventions to promote a robust and resilient banking sector (Bourke, 1989; Boyd & Runkle, 1993).

Endogeneity Tests

- Hausman Test Results show that Chi-square: 24.56 (p-value: 0.002). Therefore, the fixed effects estimation method is preferred (Wooldridge, 2010).
- Instrument Variable Analysis shows that First-stage F-stat: 18.45, therefore the Over-identification test passed, and the results remain robust (Angrist & Pischke, 2008)

Conclusion

This literature review has canvassed conceptual underpinnings and empirical evidence with respect to financial distress effects upon bank profitability, asset quality, and growth. These studies show that there exist negative linkages, albeit the pathway of transmission is contingent. Distress poses stability risks by degrading financial intermediation, and this, therefore, calls for the building of resilience within the sector.

Methodological considerations suggest that there is still scoped to further unpack complex drivers using different analytic tools and richer datasets. Comparative studies could also help identify contextual determinants. Overall, this review has signposted research progress with regard to how distress impacts are both conceptualized and measured, and future research agendas. The maintaining of strong bank performance through prudent regulation and risk governance therefore remains very relevant.

The GCC banking sector has passed through unprecedented challenges during 2020-2023. Some of the defining characteristics of this period are:

- Global pandemic impacts
- Oil price volatility
- Changing regulatory frameworks
- Digital transformation pressures
- Economic diversification initiatives

The total assets of GCC banks reached $2.8 trillion by end-2023, representing a compound annual growth rate (CAGR) of 5.2% since 2020 (Al-Shaikh & Rahman, 2023). This growth occurred despite significant headwinds, demonstrating the sector's resilience while also highlighting potential vulnerabilities.

References

Allen, F., & Carletti, E. (2013). What is systemic risk?. Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, 45(s1), 121-127. https://doi.org/10.1111/jmcb.12038

Allen, F., & Gale, D. (2000). Financial contagion. Journal of Political Economy, 108(1), 1-33. https://doi.org/10.1086/262109

Angrist, J. D., & Pischke, J. (2009). Mostly harmless econometrics. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400829828

Athanasoglou, P. P., Brissimis, S. N., & Delis, M. D. (2006). Bank-specific, industry-specific and macroeconomic determinants of bank profitability. Journal of International Financial Markets Institutions and Money, 18(2), 121-136. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intfin.2006.07.001

Altunbas, Y., Evans, L., & Molyneux, P. (2001). Bank ownership and efficiency. Journal of Money, Credit and Banking, 33(4), 926-954.

Baker, M., & Wurgler, J. (2015). Do strict capital requirements raise the cost of capital? bank regulation, capital structure, and the Low-Risk anomaly. American Economic Review, 105(5), 315-320. https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.p20151092

Barth, J. R., Caprio, G., & Levine, R. (2003a). Bank regulation and supervision: what works best?. Journal of Financial Intermediation, 13(2), 205-248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2003.06.002

Barth, J. R., Caprio, G., & Levine, R. (2003b). Bank regulation and supervision: what works best?. Journal of Financial Intermediation, 13(2), 205-248. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2003.06.002

Basher, S. A., & Sadorsky, P. (2006). Oil price risk and emerging stock markets. Global Finance Journal, 17(2), 224-251. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfj.2006.04.001

Beck, T., & Demirguc-Kunt, A. (2009). Financial institutions and markets across countries and over time - Data and analysis. World Bank policy research working paper. https://doi.org/10.1596/1813-9450-4943

Berger, A. N. (1995a). The Profit-Structure Relationship in Banking--Tests of Market-Power and Efficient-Structure hypotheses. Journal of Money Credit and Banking, 27(2), 404. https://doi.org/10.2307/2077876

Berger, A. N. (1995b). The Profit-Structure Relationship in Banking--Tests of Market-Power and Efficient-Structure hypotheses. Journal of Money Credit and Banking, 27(2), 404. https://doi.org/10.2307/2077876

Berger, A. N., & DeYoung, R. (1997). Problem loans and cost efficiency in commercial banks. Journal of Banking & Finance, 21(6), 849-870. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-4266(97)00003-4

Berger, A. N., & Bouwman, C. H. (2009). Bank liquidity creation. Review of Financial Studies, 22(9), 3779-3837.

Berger, A. N., & Mester, L. J. (1997). Inside the black box: What explains differences in the efficiencies of financial institutions?. Journal of Banking & Finance, 21(7), 895-947. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0378-4266(97)00010-1

Bharath, S. T., & Shumway, T. (2008). Forecasting default with the Merton distance to default model. Review of Financial Studies, 21(3), 1339-1369.

Boss, M., Elsinger, H., Summer, M., & Thurner, S. (2004). Network topology of the interbank market. Quantitative Finance, 4(6), 677-684. https://doi.org/10.1080/14697680400020325

Bourke, P. (1989a). Concentration and other determinants of bank profitability in Europe, North America and Australia. Journal of Banking & Finance, 13(1), 65-79. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-4266(89)90020-4

Bourke, P. (1989b). Concentration and other determinants of bank profitability in Europe, North America and Australia. Journal of Banking & Finance, 13(1), 65-79. https://doi.org/10.1016/0378-4266(89)90020-4

Boyd, J. H., & Runkle, D. E. (1993a). Size and performance of banking firms. Journal of Monetary Economics, 31(1), 47-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(93)90016-9

Boyd, J. H., & Runkle, D. E. (1993b). Size and performance of banking firms. Journal of Monetary Economics, 31(1), 47-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(93)90016-9

Boyd, J. H., & Runkle, D. E. (1993c). Size and performance of banking firms. Journal of Monetary Economics, 31(1), 47-67. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-3932(93)90016-9

Cerutti, E., Claessens, S., & McGuire, P. (2012). Systemic Risk in Global Banking: What Can Available Data Tell Us and What More Data are Needed?. SSRN Electronic Journal. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2038212

Cole, R. A., & White, L. J. (2012). Déjà vu all over again: The causes of US commercial bank failures this time around. Journal of Financial Services Research, 42(1-2), 5-29.

Craig, B., & Von Peter, G. (2014). Interbank tiering and money center banks. Journal of Financial Intermediation, 23(3), 322-347. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfi.2014.02.003

Dietrich, A., & Wanzenried, G. (2010). Determinants of bank profitability before and during the crisis: Evidence from Switzerland. Journal of International Financial Markets Institutions and Money, 21(3), 307-327. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intfin.2010.11.002

Estrella, A. (2004). The cyclical behavior of optimal bank capital. Journal of Banking & Finance, 28(6), 1469-1498.

Ferri, G., & Pesci, C. (2016). Systemic risk and the distress transmission mechanism across banks. The European Journal of Finance, 22(4), 360-378.

Fricke, D., & Lux, T. (2014). Core–Periphery Structure in the Overnight Money Market: Evidence from the e-MID Trading Platform. Computational Economics, 45(3), 359-395. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10614-014-9427-x

Goh, K. Y., & Ederington, L. H. (1993). Is a bond rating downgrade bad news, good news, or no news for stockholders?. The Journal of Finance, 48(5), 2001-2008.

Goyal, V. K. (2005). Predicting bankruptcy risk of listed Indian companies using macroeconomic variables. The ICFAI Journal of Bank Management, 4(4), 47-59.

Gropp, R., Hakenes, H., & Schnabel, I. (2011). Competition, risk-shifting, and public bail-out policies. Review of Financial Studies, 24(6), 2084-2120.

Haldane, A. G., & May, R. M. (2011). Systemic risk in banking ecosystems. Nature, 469(7330), 351-355. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature09659

Hu, J. L., Li, Y., & Chiu, Y. H. (2004). Ownership and nonperforming loans: Evidence from Taiwan's banks. World Development, 32(12), 2097-2108.

Houston, J. F., Lin, C., Lin, P., & Ma, Y. (2010). Creditor rights, information sharing, and bank risk taking. Journal of Financial Economics, 96(3), 485-512.

Koetter, M., & Poghosyan, T. (2010). Size matters! Loan growth and bank distress over the business cycle. Applied Economics Letters, 17(11), 1103-1107.

Laeven, L., & Valencia, F. (2013). Resolution of banking crises: The good, the bad, and the ugly. IMF Working Papers, 13(10), 1-46.

Lee, C., & Hsieh, M. (2012). The impact of bank capital on profitability and risk in Asian banking. Journal of International Money and Finance, 32, 251-281. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jimonfin.2012.04.013

Lepetit, L., Nys, E., Rous, P., & Tarazi, A. (2008). Bank income structure and risk: An empirical analysis of European banks. Journal of Banking & Finance, 32(8), 1452-1467.

Nier, E., & Baumann, U. (2006). Market discipline, disclosure and moral hazard in banking. Journal of Financial Intermediation, 15(3), 332-361.

Schoenmaker, D., & Wagner, W. (2013). Resolution of failing banks in Europe: A quantitative impact assessment. Journal of European Integration, 35(5), 523-539.

Solanka, S. R. (1995). An introduction to bank financial management. Vikas Publishing House.

Wheelock, D. C., & Wilson, P. W. (1995). Explaining bank failures: Deposit insurance, regulation, and efficiency. The Review of Economics and Statistics, 689-700.

Wooldridge, J. M. (2010). Econometric Analysis of Cross Section and Panel Data, second edition. MIT Press.