



IMPACT OF ORGANIZATIONAL CITIZENSHIP BEHAVIOUR ON MANAGERIAL EFFECTIVENESS OF MANAGERS IN PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR BANKS OF WEST BENGAL

Dr. Binay Krishna Halder

Deputy Controller of Examinations, University of Gour Banga, W. B. India

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra13999>
DOI No: 10.36713/epra13999

ABSTRACT

The aim of the present study is to identify the organizational citizenship behaviour as a predictor of managerial effectiveness of managers in both public and private sector banks of West Bengal. The sample consisted of 348 managers, out of which 174 were public and 174 were private banks managers. Stratified random sampling is used to collect the data. The standardized structured questionnaire named "Managerial Effectiveness Scale" was developed by Prof. S. Gupta (1996) and "Organizational Citizenship Behavior Check List" (OCB-C) was developed by Suzy Fox and Paul E. Spector (2009) was administered. Mean, SD, t-test, correlation and regression analysis were used to test the five hypotheses formulated in the study. The results indicated that there is no significant mean difference between the managerial effectiveness of managers of public and private sector banks. The results revealed a statistically significant positive correlation between organizational citizenship behavior and managerial effectiveness. The study concludes that organizational citizenship behaviour is a significant predictor of managerial effectiveness of managers.

KEYWORDS: *Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Managerial Effectiveness, Managers, Banks.*

INTRODUCTION

In this global economy, it is time for all types of public and private sector banks to think about managerial effectiveness to prepare plans after taking into account the knowledge and information, to consider the cost in terms of money, time and effort to focus on the end results rather than the tools or techniques to be used.

In the edge of competitive market it is necessary to discuss to relevancy of managerial effectiveness in banks. Globalization, Liberalization, and Privatization have affected in banks. To sustain in the arena of cutthroat competitive market in banking sector and rapidly changing government policies, the traditional management is not compatible in banks. Now, it is time for all types of public and private sector banks to think about managerial effectiveness because effective managers prepare plans after taking into account the knowledge and information, effective manager know where there time goes and how it is spent, effective managers focus on results that can be achieved rather than the tools or techniques to be used.

Managerial Effectiveness focused on the managerial ability of managing self like personality and stress, managing subordinates and relationship, (communication and interpersonal effectiveness, delegation and team leadership), managing change and decision making (understanding change and change management, decision making process and technique). Managerial effectiveness is a leader's ability to achieve desired results where results are influenced by the organization's culture. Managerial effectiveness is the key to success and growth of any organization. It is a complex and

multifaceted phenomenon, incorporated in a three parts model, proposed by Campbell et al., (1970), consisting of the 'person' considering the traits and characteristics of the manager, the 'product' measured in terms of results, and the 'process' depicted in terms of on-the-job behavior and actions. Two-factor models of managerial behaviours, such as those developed as part of the Ohio State (Fleishman, 1951, 1953, 1957; Halpin & Winer, 1957) or the Michigan studies (Katz & Kahn, 1952; Katz, Maccoby, & Morse, 1950), have dominated the theoretical and empirical studies of the relationships between managerial behaviours and employees' attitudes and managers' performance (Yukl, 1994). Campbell et al., (1970) introducing the concept of 'managerial behaviour' pointed out that it is a function of ability, motivation and opportunity as reflected in various situational circumstances.

Effective management is about doing the right things at the right time. In the face of downsizing, mergers, etc., bank needs manager who are not only efficient but also effective. Efficient manager do things right whereas an effective manager does the right things. Effective managers are both effective and efficient.

The bank manager has to be not only effective leader but also an effective manager. Manager has to try the best of his level for managerial effectiveness that will lead to organizational effectiveness and excellence.

The present study is an effort to examine the managerial effectiveness of managers in both public and private sector banks considering the variable organizational citizenship behavior.



Organizational citizenship behavior is assumed to be a desirable phenomenon within a bank. Managers should be trying to encourage organizational citizenship behavior within their bank. Two major ways of doing this is by treating employees fairly and motivating them by using transformational leadership. As a tool for measuring organizational citizenship behavior of an organization researchers found two ways gauging it. On one hand, superiors can rate their colleagues. On the other hand, employees can rate themselves in their work environment.

Organizational citizenship behavior is a cluster of behaviors that outcomes focused on the benefit of the organization and individuals within bank. It also focused on the relationship between individual engagement in organizational citizenship behavior and their job performance. Benefit for the individuals are related to receipt of praise and encouragement increasing activity and responsibility, adoption and implementation of different ideas, warmth, trust, intimacy and enthusiasms. In a bank, organizational citizenship behavior plays an important role in various areas such as, innovative approaches to training volunteering, involvement in individual and collective extra-curricular activities to promote greater responsibilities; tolerance and respect in subordinates invest additional efforts to achieve the objectives of bank cohesion in team. If manager and his subordinates are dedicated to their work, the levels of the organizational citizenship behavior are higher in the whole bank. Trust is a more important factor that leads to increase the organizational citizenship behavior in manager. Subordinates commitment is an important mediating variable between relational trusts between managers and subordinates.

Organizational Citizenship Behavior is a unique aspect of individual activity at work. According to Organ's (1988), organizational citizenship behavior is an "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directly or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and in the aggregate promotes the efficient and effective functioning of the organization". Organizational citizenship behavior is the thought to benefit the organization (Bolino, Turnley, & Niehoff, 2004). Organizational citizenship behaviors are the activities of employee that support the social, psychological, or environmental context of an organization, but are not part of the formal job requirements (Borman and Motowidlo, 1997). According to Mackenzie, Podsakoff and Fetter (1993, p.71) Organizational citizenship behavior can be defined as "discretionary behaviors on the part of a sales person that directly promote the effective functioning of an organization, without necessarily influencing a sales person's objective sales productivity". Barnard (1938) defined the concept of "willingness to cooperate" is the first origin of the concept of organizational citizenship behavior. Kartz (1964) described a frame of citizenship behaviors from other organizational behaviors and discussed employees' motivation for doing them and proposed those behaviors which are essential for proper functioning organization. Organizational citizenship behavior provides knowledge to managers and employees to achieve organization's objectives.

Organizational citizenship behavior can be defined as the organization depend daily on a myriad of acts of cooperation, helpfulness, suggestions, gestures of goodwill, altruism, and

other instances (Smith, Organ and Near (1983). Organ (1988) defined organizational citizenship behavior as "individual behavior that is discretionary, not directed or explicitly recognized by the formal reward system, and that in the aggregate promotes the effective functioning of the organization" Later Organ (1997) modified the definition as the organizational citizenship behavior is "the performance that supports the social and psychological environment in which task performance takes place". According to Podsakoff and Mackenzie (1997), organizational citizenship behavior contributes the organization's productivity by allowing the company to adapt to change and workers to cooperate. Podsakoff, Ahearne and Mackenzie (1997) suggested that organizations that employ individuals who exhibit levels of organizational citizenship behavior are more likely to have effective work groups within their organization. Past research has found the quality of leader-member exchange to be positively related to organizational citizenship behavior (Setton et al., 1996; Hofmann, Morgeson and Gerras, 2003; Lapierre and Hackett 2007; Wayne, Shore and Liden, 1997; Deluga, 1998). Lepine, Erez, and Johnson, D. E. 2002; O' Brien and Allen, Organ 1997 Williams and Anderson, 1998, suggested that organizational citizenship behavior has two factors based on the target of the behavior i.e. organizationally-targeted behaviors and interpersonally-targeted organizational citizenship behavior. Bienstock et al., (2003) says, organizational citizenship behavior looks for identification, management and evaluation of extra role behaviors of the employees of the organization that increase the effectiveness of the organization.

RATIONALE OF THE STUDY

Though a lot of empirical work has been done using perception of subordinates to measure effectiveness of managers and most management research was concerned with industrial production. Relatively less attention was given to service sectors and their effectiveness. No attempt has been made to predict managerial effectiveness using the organizational citizenship behavior as predictor variable. Therefore, the researcher wants to investigate how the variable like OCB is playing a significant role to understand managerial effectiveness of managers of public and private sector banks.

Objective of the Study

The major objectives of this study are to examine the managerial effectiveness of managers in public and private sector banks of West Bengal with respect to the variable organizational citizenship behavior. The following are the objectives of the study:

1. To examine the relationship between ME and OCB in both public (SBI, UBI and AB) and private (HDFC, ICICI and AXIS) banks.
2. To find out the relationship between managerial effectiveness (ME) and organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) among managers of both public and private banks.
3. To understand the managerial effectiveness of high and low organizational citizenship behavior in the sample.
4. To study managerial effectiveness of managers with high and low organizational citizenship behavior



- (OCB) separately for public as well as private banks.
5. To find out the relationship between managerial effectiveness and organizational citizenship behavior.
 6. To predict managerial effectiveness from organizational citizenship behavior.

Hypotheses of the study

- H₁: The Managerial Effectiveness of public sector banks will differ significantly from private sector banks.
- H₂: Managerial Effectiveness will be positively correlated with Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB).
- H₃: The mean of Managerial Effectiveness of High OCB managers will be significantly different from Low OCB managers.
- H₄: The Managerial Effectiveness of High and Low OCB managers will be significantly different in public and also in private sector banks.
- H₅: Organizational Citizenship Behavior will be significant predictor of Managerial Effectiveness.

METHODOLOGY OF THE STUDY

Methodology includes sample, measures / test or adaptation of tools, and administration of tests for collection of data.

Population and Sample

The population of the study consists of managers in different categories like branch manager, customer manager, credit manager, service manager and the like, of a particular branch in both public and private sector banks. The sampling procedure used is stratified random sampling under probability sampling technique. The public sector banks including SBI, UBI, and AB and private sector banks including HDFC, ICICI, and AXIS banks, have been considered having highest number of branches in West Bengal, according to the sources of RBI Kolkata. Total number of branches of both public and private sector banks under study in West Bengal are 3255. Out of which 2675 branches are in public sector banks and 580 branches are from private sector banks. The population of the sample for the study is 11,316 out of which public bank managers are 9,750 and private bank managers are 1566. The researcher has taken 348 managers from total number of bank managers. The sample consisted of 348 managers consisting of 174 managers from the Public sector banks and 174 managers from Private sector banks managers working at various positions of management. The managers were chosen from 20 districts keeping the representativeness of all districts of West Bengal.

Measures / Tests

The study attempted to find out the relationship between dependent variable and independent variable. In the present study, managerial effectiveness is the dependent variable and organizational citizenship behavior is the independent.

Tools used in the study

i. The Managerial Effectiveness Scale

The Managerial Effectiveness Scale was designed and developed by Prof. S. Gupta (1996) consisting the nineteen characteristics / dimensions are: 1. Beliefs about subordinates, 2. Dependence, 3. Innovation and inspiration, 4. Organizational

goals / personal goals, 5. Assignment of tasks, 6. Planning / Coordinating, 7. Training and development, 8. Motivating / Reinforcing, 9. Managing conflict, 10. Communication, 11. Public image, 12. Socializing / Politicizing, 13. Management of boss, 14. Management of colleagues, 15. Discipline & example setting, 16. Client management, 17. Management of control and market environment, 18. Control function, and 19. Networking.

It consisted of 45 items. 35 items are positive and 10 items are negative. 1 - 5 Likert rating scale (where 1 = Never, 2 = Sometimes, 3 = Undecided, 4 = Usually, and 5 = Always) was used to anchor all managerial effectiveness items. A few items (10 items) were worded negatively for which the scoring was reverse. A high score indicates high managerial effectiveness. The test-retest reliability was found to be .73 which is high and split-half reliability was found to be .73.

ii. Organizational Citizenship Behavior Check List (OCBC):

“Organizational Citizenship Behavior Check List” (OCB-C) questionnaire was developed by Suzy Fox and Paul E. Spector (2009). Initially it is a 42 - item instrument. It was then refined and shortened to 36 items and then finally to 20 items. Some items ask about altruistic acts that help co-workers with personal as opposed to work place issues, other reflect acts that benefit the organization.

The scoring technique for the OCB-C questionnaire follows a direct scoring pattern. The OCB-C uses a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = Never to 5 = Every day. The item responses like Never, Once or twice, Once a month, Once or twice a week, Every day, are scored as 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 respectively. A total score is the sum of responses to all items. For example, if items 8 9 10 11 12 13 where ticked as 2 3 5 3 2 respectively, the score will be 2+3+5+3+2 = 15. High score assessed the frequency of organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) performed by employees is high and low score assessed the frequency of organizational citizenship behavior performed by employees is low. Fox and Spector (2009) reported a coefficient alpha of 0.91 and a concurrent validity of 0.83 for the scale.

Test Administration

The study is based mainly on primary data and supported by secondary data. The primary data is collected from the managers to assess the managerial effectiveness. For this purpose, the above mentioned standardized questionnaires are administered by the researcher to measure the managerial effectiveness. There are two ways of administering of questionnaires: self-administering of questionnaires and mailing the questionnaires.

Hence the study completed the managerial effectiveness of 566 managers of both public and private banks of 20 districts of West Bengal were considered.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

H₁: The Managerial Effectiveness of public sector banks will differ significantly from private sector banks.

In order to test hypothesis H₁, t-test has been applied. The result is shown below in Table 1.

Table1:t-test comparing means of Managerial Effectiveness of Public and Private Sector Bank Managers

Groups of Managers	N	Mean	SD	t	Level of Significance
Public	174	161.64	23.17	-.297	.893
Private	174	162.38	23.08		

Table 1 reveals that the value of $t = -.297$, which is not significant and the significant value (.893) is $> 0.05, .01$. Thus the alternative hypothesis (H_1) is rejected. The result leads to infer that the managerial effectiveness of the managers of public sector banks and private sector banks do not differ significantly.

H2: Managerial Effectiveness (ME) will be positively correlated with Organizational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB).

In order to understand the relationship between ME and OCB the following analysis has been done.

Table 2: Correlation between ME and OCB of all managers of Public and Private Banks

	N	Mean	SD	r	Level of Significance
ME	348	162.01	23.10	.636**	0.000
OCB	348	73.23	8.89		

From the above Table 2, it was found that the correlation coefficient (r) is 0.636 with a p (significance level, two-tailed) = 0.000. As the table showed $p < 0.05$, the alternative

hypothesis (H_2) is accepted.

H3: The mean of Managerial Effectiveness of High OCB managers will be significantly different from Low OCB managers.

Table 3: t-test of ME of High and Low OCB managers of the Banks

	OCB	N	M	SD	t	Level of Significance
ME	High	174	168.07	23.25	5.39	0.05
	Low	174	155.95	21.47		

From the above Table 3, the observed result showed that the calculated value of $t = 5.39$, with a p (significance level two-tailed) = 0.05. As the result indicated $p < 0.05$, the alternative hypothesis (H_3) is accepted.

H4: The Managerial Effectiveness of High and Low OCB managers will be significantly different in public and also in private sector banks.

Table 4: t-test between means of Managerial Effectiveness of High vs. Low OCB managers of public and private bank managers

	Type of Bank – OCB	N	Mean	SD	t	Level of Significance
ME	Public - Low OCB	100	154.66	20.11	-4.963	.000
	Public - High OCB	74	171.46	24.45		
	Public - Low OCB	100	154.66	20.11	-.730	.466
	Private - Low OCB	85	156.92	21.90		
	Public - Low OCB	100	154.66	20.11	-4.020	.000
	Private - High OCB	89	167.16	22.63		
	Public – High OCB	74	171.46	24.45	3.953	.000
	Private – Low OCB	85	156.92	21.90		
	Public – High OCB	74	171.46	24.45	1.164	.246
	Private - High OCB	89	167.16	22.63		
	Private – Low OCB	89	167.16	22.63	3.031	.003
	Private – High OCB	85	156.92	21.90		

Above Table 4, indicates that the value of $t = -4.963, -4.020, 3.953$ and 3.031 are significant. Thus the results infer that mean scores of the managerial effectiveness are significantly different so far as High vs. High, Low vs. Low and Low vs. High OCB managers of public and private banks are concerned. As the value of $t = -.730$ and 1.164 are not significant, there is no significant difference between High vs. Low OCB managers of

public and also of private sector banks. However, overall OCB scores of private banks are higher than public banks.

H5: Organizational Citizenship Behaviour will be significant predictor of Managerial Effectiveness.

The correlation co-efficient between the variables are given below:

Table 5.1: Correlation between ME and OCB

		ME	OCB
ME	Pearson Correlation	1	.636**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
OCB	Pearson Correlation	.636**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	348	348

From the above Table 5.1 it was found that the predictor / independent variable like organizational citizenship behavior is positively correlated ($r = .636$) with the dependent variable (managerial effectiveness). So, it is concluding that the Organizational Citizenship Behavior of the managers is

significantly related to the managerial effectiveness of public and private sector banks. Therefore, the researcher intends to conduct linear regression analysis between the dependent and independent variable to frame the prediction equation for the study.

Table 5.2: Model Summary of OCB

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.636 ^a	.404	.402	17.858

a. Predictors: (Constant), OCB

Table 5.2 indicates that the correlation co-efficient (r) between ME and OCB is 0.636 and the adjusted R^2 is 0.402 meaning that 40 % of the variance in managerial effectiveness can be

predicted from the organizational citizenship behavior. Adjusted R^2 is lower than the unadjusted R^2 .

Table 5.3: Results of ANOVA^a in terms of OCB

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	
1	Regression	74829.681	1	74829.681	234.656	.000 ^b
	Residual	110336.273	346	318.891		
	Total	185165.954	347			

a. Dependent Variable: ME

b. Predictors: (Constant), OCB

From the Table 5.3, it was found that the calculated value of F is 234.656 and the corresponding significant value is 0.000 which is lower than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Hence the alternative

hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that organizational citizenship behavior is a significant predictor of managerial effectiveness.

Table 5.4: Results of Coefficients of ME and OCB

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	41.086	7.952		5.167	.000
	OCB	1.651	.108	.636	15.318	.000

a. Dependent Variable: ME

From the above Table 5.4, it was found that the $t = 15.318$ with a p (significance level, two-tailed) = 0.004. As the Table showed $p < 0.05$, the alternative hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, it can be concluded that organizational citizenship behavior is a significant predictor of managerial effectiveness. The predictor equation would be as follows:

Managerial Effectiveness (ME) = 41.086 + 1.651 OCB

CONCLUSION

The findings are summarized below to conclude:

1. The difference between the mean scores of the Managerial Effectiveness of public and private sector bank managers are statistically not significant. It is found that the managers are effective.
2. Managerial effectiveness is positively correlated with the

organizational citizenship behavior for the total sample considering both public and private banks. Higher the OCB, higher is the effectiveness. To become an effective manager, one must have high level of organizational citizenship behavior.

3. High levels of organizational citizenship behavior managers are more effective than low level of organizational citizenship behavior managers in public as well as private banks.
4. Organizational citizenship behavior is a significant predictor of managerial effectiveness of managers in both public and private sector banks and 40 % of the variance in managerial effectiveness can be predicted from organizational citizenship behavior.



Implications for Practice

The findings of this research have a number of implications for analyzing and improving the effectiveness of managers considering Organizational Citizenship Behavior.

The study is important from the academic as well as theoretical perspectives. The findings of the present study are empirically valid with respect to the relationship between Managerial Effectiveness and the Organizational Citizenship Behavior. The study reveals strong positive relationship between the dependent and independent variables that can be used for developing new performance models in the area of Managerial Effectiveness in both public and private banking sectors of West Bengal and of India.

REFERENCES

1. Barnard, C. I. (1938). *The functions of the executive*. Cambridge, MA:HarvardUniversity Press.
2. Bienstock, C. C., Demoranville, W. C. & Smith, K. R. (2003). *Organizational citizenship behavior and service quality*, *Journal of services marketing*, 17 (4), 357- 378.
3. Bolino, M. C., Turnley, W. H., & Niehoff, B. P. (2004). *The other side of the story: reexamining prevailing assumptions about organizational citizenship behavior*. *Hum. Resour. Manag.* 14, 229–246. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2004.05.004
4. Campbell, J. P., Dunnette, M. D., Lawler, E. E. III, & Weick, K. E. (1970). *Managerial Behavior, Performance, and Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill
5. Deluga, R. J. (1998). *Leader-member exchange quality and effectiveness ratings: The role of subordinate-supervisor conscientiousness similarity*. *Group and Organization Management*, 23, 189–216.
6. Fleishman, E. A. (1951, 1953, 1957). *The Description of supervisory Behavior*. *Personnel Psychology*. 37, 1-6.
7. Gupta, S. (1996). "Managerial Effectiveness: Conceptual Framework and Scale Development," *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 31.
8. Halpin, A.W. and Winer, B. J. (1957). *A functional study of the Leader Behavior description*. Bureau of Business Research. Ohio State University search.
9. Hofmann, D. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Gerras, S. J. (2003). *Climate as a moderator of the relationship between leader-member exchange and content specific citizenship: Safety climate as an exemplar*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 170-178.
10. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1952). *Some recent findings in human relations research*. In E. Swanson, T. Newcombe, & E. Hartley (Eds). *Readings in socialpsychology*, (pp. 650-665). New York, NY: Holt, Reinhart and Winston.
11. Katz, D. Maccoby, N. & Morse, N. (1950). *Productivity, supervision and morale in an office situation*. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.
12. Katz, D. (1964). *The motivational basis of organizational behavior*. *Behavioral Science*, 9(2), 131-146. doi:10.1002/bs.3830090206
13. Lapierre, L. M., & Hackett, R. D. (2007). *Trait conscientiousness, leader-memberexchange, job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behaviour: A test of an integrative model*. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 80(3), 539–554.
14. LePine, J. A., Erez, A., & Johnson, D. E. (2002). *The nature and dimensionality oforganizational citizenship behavior: A critical review and meta-analysis*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87: 52-65.
15. MacKenzie, S. B., Podsakoff, P. M., & Fetter, R. (1993). *The*

impact of organizational Citizenship behaviour on evaluations of salesperson performance. *The Journal of Marketing*, 57(1), 70-80.

16. Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmitt, M. J. (1997). *A theory of some basic differences in task and contextual performance*. *Human Performance*, 10, (2), 71- 83.
17. Organ, D. W. (1988). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: The good soldier syndrome*. Lexington, M. A: Lexington Books.
18. Organ, D. W. (1997). *Organizational citizenship behaviour: It's construct clean-up time*. *Human Performance, OCB measurement*, 30510, 85-97.
19. *Organizational Citizenship Behavior Checklist (OCB-C)*. (2011). Retrieved in November, 2013, from <http://shell.cas.usf.edu/~pspector/scales/ocbcpage.html>.
20. Podsakoff, P. M., Ahearne, M., & MacKenzie, S. B. (1997). *Organizational citizenship behaviour and the quantity and quality of work group performance*. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 262-270.
21. Settoon RP, Bennet, N. and Liden, R.C (1996). *Social Exchange in Organizations: The Differential Effects of Perceived Organizational Support and Leader Member Exchange*. *J. Applied Psychology*, 81: 219- 239.
22. Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near's, J. P. (1983). *Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents* *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 655–663.
23. Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). *Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective*. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 82-111.
24. Williams, J. M., & Andersen, M. B. (1998). *Psychosocial antecedents of sport injury: Review and critique of the stress and injury model*. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 10(1), 5-25.
25. Yukl, G. (1994). *Leadership in Organizations (3rd Ed.)*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ:Prentice-Hall.

REPORT

1. "The Advent of Modern Banking in India: 1720 to 1850s". ReserveBank of India. Retrieved 12 January 2015.

WEB SITES

1. www.rbi.org.in
2. www.financeindia.org