CHAPTER 5
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.0 Introduction

This chapter shows the result summary of data analysis. The data collected was analyzed both quantitatively and qualitatively. The data were collected in response to the problems identified in chapter one of the research work. The analysis is divided into two parts A and B.

The qualitative analysis was based on the study of CG disclosure index using content analysis through the study of annual reports and whether there was any relationship with a number of corporate frauds occurred and amount involved in these frauds with regards to the banking sector.

The quantitative analysis was undertaken by conducting a survey to know stakeholders opinion on how CG can be an effective tool in combating corporate frauds. To test the reliability and validity of the scales the researcher has applied factor analyses and Cronbach Alpha. Testing of hypotheses was undertaken by using statistical tools, scoring of the disclosure index, percentages, and Friedman chi square test, Friedman Rank Test, Spearman’s Rho and Binomial Test. The hypothetical model was assessed using IBM SPSS Amos 20.

5.1 Analysis of Part A

In part A of the data analysis the researcher has used disclosure index method to analyze CG disclosure practices in selected public and private sector banks for the period of three years (2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14). The data on corporate frauds in selected public and private sector banks was collected from RBI through Right to Information (RTI). The objective was to understand CG disclosure practices and its relationship with number and amount of corporate frauds published and reported in the selected public and private sector banks in India.
A. Whether there is a relationship between CG disclosure index and the number of fraud cases reported in the banking institutions for the period of three years (2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14).

Testing of assumption of Normality
The assumption of normality was tested using Shapiro-Wilk test. An insignificant test statistics of Shapiro-Wilk suggest normality. The null hypothesis that is tested in Shapiro-Wilk is data equals to normality.

TABLE 5.1: TEST OF NORMALITY FOR PUBLIC SECTOR BANKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2011-12)</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Frauds Cases 2011-12</td>
<td>.956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt. Involved in frauds (Rs. In Crore) 2011-12</td>
<td>.572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2012-13)</td>
<td>.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Cases 2012-13</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2012-13</td>
<td>.812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of CG Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2013-14)</td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Fraud Cases 2013-14</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2013-14</td>
<td>.820</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NV: Normality Violated  NM: Normality Met

Interpretation: The above Table 5.1 reveals that normality is violated in almost all the cases. Except in the number of fraud cases reported in year (2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14) for public sector banks. Hence non-parametric version of correlation that is spearman’s rank order correlation was performed to study association between variables.
**Objective of the Study:** To study if there is a relationship between corporate governance disclosure percentage and the number of fraud cases reported, also to study if there is a relationship between CG disclosure percentage and amount of frauds involved for the period of past 3 years i.e., 2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14 for public sector banks.

**Statistical Test Applied:** Spearman’s Rank order correlation

The Spearman's rank-order correlation is the nonparametric version of the Pearson product-moment correlation. Spearman's correlation coefficient measures the strength of association between two ranked variables. The test is used when the normality is violated.

**Variables and Measurement:** CG Disclosure Index for past 3 years (2011-12, 2012-13, 2013-14) measured in percentages.\(^\text{17}\)

---

\(^{17}\) Note: Test of Significance was not performed hence no hypotheses were tested since the data represented the entire population and the researcher has done census study.
### TABLE 5.2: ASSOCIATION OF CORPORATE GOVERNANCE DISCLOSURE INDEX PERCENTAGE WITH NUMBER OF FRAUDS CASES AND THE AMOUNT REPORTED IN PUBLIC SECTOR BANKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Strength &amp; direction of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2011-12 and No. of fraud cases reported in 2011-12)</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td>Positive weak relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2011-12 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2011-12)</td>
<td>-.065</td>
<td>Negative weak relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2012-13 and No. of fraud cases reported in 2012-13)</td>
<td>-.162</td>
<td>Negative weak relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2012-13 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2012-13)</td>
<td>-.228</td>
<td>Negative weak relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2013-14 and No. of fraud cases reported in 2013-14)</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>Positive weak relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2013-14 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2013-14)</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>Positive very strong relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Spearman's rank-order correlation interpretation: The end result should always be between the value of +1 and -1. Correlation is an effect size and so we can verbally describe the strength of the correlation using the following guide for the absolute value of:

1. .00-.19 “very weak”
2. .20-.39 “weak”
3. .40-.59 “moderate”
4. .60-.79 “strong”
5. .80-1.0 “very strong”

Interpretation of Result: From the above Table 5.2 it can be seen there is a positive relationship between
A. There is a positive weak relationship between Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2011-12 and No. of fraud cases reported in 2011-12).
B. There is a positive weak relationship between Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2013-14 and No. of fraud cases reported in 2013-14).
C. There is a positive strong relationship between Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2013-14 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2013-14).

And there is a negative correlation between

E. There is a negative weak relationship between Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2011-12 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2011-12).
F. There is a negative weak relationship between Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2012-13 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2012-13).
G. There is a negative weak relationship between Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2013-14 and No. of fraud cases reported in 2013-14).
B. Whether there is a relationship between CG disclosure index and the number of fraud cases reported in the private sector banks for the year (2011-12)\textsuperscript{18}.

Testing of assumption of Normality

The assumption of normality was tested using Shapiro-Wilk test. An insignificant test statistics of Shapiro-Wilk suggest normality. The null hypothesis that is tested in Shapiro-Wilk is data equals to normality.

Table 5.3: Tests of Normality for Private Sector Banks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Df</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>Result</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2011-12)</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of Frauds Cases 2011-12</td>
<td>.152</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.548</td>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amt. Involved in frauds (Rs. In Crore) 2011-12</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.961</td>
<td>NM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NV: Normality Violated  NM: Normality Met

Interpretation: The above table 5.3 reveals that normality is met all the cases. Hence non-parametric version of correlation that is spearman’s rank order correlation was performed to study association between variables.

Objective of the Study: To study if there is a relationship between CG disclosure percentage and the number of fraud cases reported, also to study if there is a relationship between CG disclosure percentage and amount of frauds involved for the year 2011-12 for private sector banks.

Statistical Test Applied: Spearman’s Rank order correlation

Variables and Measurement: CG Disclosure Index for the year (2011-12) measured in percentages.

*Notes: Test of Significance was not performed hence no hypotheses were tested since the data represented the entire population and the researcher has done census study.

\textsuperscript{18} Fraud data of one year was only available in case of private sector banks (2011-12)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Spearman's rho</th>
<th>Strength &amp; direction of relationship</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2011-12 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2011-12</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>Negative weak relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2012-13 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2012-13</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>Negative weak relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2013-14 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2013-14.</td>
<td>-.227</td>
<td>Negative weak relationship</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Interpretation:** From the above Table 5.4 it can be seen there is a negative relationship between

A. There is a negative weak relationship between Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2011-12 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2011-12).

B. There is a negative weak relationship between Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2012-13 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2012-13).

C. There is a negative weak relationship between Percentage of Corporate Disclosure Index (Annual Report 2013-14 and amount of fraud involved Amt. Involved (Rs. in Crore) 2013-14).
5.2 Analysis of Part B

Stakeholder’s Questionnaire Analysis

Part B of the data analysis depicts the outcome of questions asked to the respondents with the aid of questionnaire.

5.2.1 Business ethics and corporate social responsibility should be kept ahead of maximization.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “whether organizations should keep business ethics and corporate social responsibility ahead of profit maximization” Using a 4 point scale (1= Agree (A), 2 = Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “business ethics and corporate social responsibility should be kept ahead of profit maximization.”

CHART 5.1: BUSINESS ETHICS AND CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY AHEAD OF PROFIT MAXIMIZATION.
The above clustered Bar chart 5.1 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “whether business ethics and corporate social responsibility should be kept ahead of profit maximization” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.1 out of 277 respondents (bank employees and customers) 49.71% agree that organizations should keep business ethics and corporate social responsibility ahead of profit maximization, 42.86% strongly agree, 7.4% respondents and none of the respondents strongly disagree.

5.2.2 Are your organizations ethically and socially responsible?
Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “whether their organizations are ethically and socially responsible” Using a 4 point scale (1= Agree (A), 2 = Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “their organizations are ethically and socially responsible.”

CHART 5.2: ORGANIZATION ETHICALLY AND SOCIALLY RESPONSIBLE

The above clustered Bar chart 5.2 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “whether their organizations are ethical and socially responsible” across bank
employees and customer/shareholder from the above clustered bar chart 5.2. From the above clustered bar chart out of 277 respondents, 47.43% agree that their organizations are ethical and socially responsible, 45.71% strongly agreed, 6.3% respondents disagreed and 0.6% strongly disagreed.

5.2.3 Category of the stakeholders

Out of the total 277 respondents selected, the bank employees were 175 in number and customer/stakeholders were 102 in number.

CHART 5.3: CATEGORY OF STAKEHOLDERS

The above pie diagram 5.3 shows that out of the total respondent’s bank employees were 63.18% and customers/stakeholders were 38.82%.
Objective of the study: To study the factors which influence the investment decision of the stakeholders?

Research Question: Is there a difference in the importance respondent’s attached to the factors that influence their investment decision?

Respondents: Bank employees

Statistical Test: Friedman Chi Square Test

Variables & Measurement: Respondents were presented with following factors which influences their investment decision and were asked to rate each factor on the basis of important factors that influence their investment decision. Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C).

A. Profitability
B. Legal Compliance
C. Business Ethics
D. Corporate Governance
E. Corporate Social Responsibility

H₀: There is no significant difference in the importance respondents attached to the factors that influences investment decision of the stakeholders.

H₁: There is significant difference in the importance respondents attached to the factors that influences investment decisions of the stakeholders.

Level of Significance: \( \alpha = 0.05 \)
TABLE 5.5 TEST STATISTICS OF THE FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE INVESTMENT DECISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statisticsa</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>4.625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation: (4) = 4.6  p=0.328  N=175  \( \chi^2 \)

The value chi-square test 4.625 and level of significance p=0.328

Conclusion: Since the P=0.328 is more that the level of significance (0.05) the Null hypotheses is retained.

In order to find out where we refer to the ranks table 5.6:

TABLE 5.6: RANKS RESULT SUMMARY OF THE FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE THEIR INVESTMENT DECISION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Ranks</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Profitability</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Compliance</td>
<td>2.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Ethics</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Social Responsibility</td>
<td>2.91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the ranks table 5.6 it can be seen that the profitability has a mean rank of 3.14, CG has a mean rank of 3.08, Legal Compliance has a mean rank of 2.98, Corporate Social Responsibility has a mean rank of 2.91 and Business Ethics has a mean rank of 2.89.

H0: There is no significant difference in the importance respondents attached to the factors that influences investment decision of the stakeholders.
5.2.5 Training sessions on CG for Board of Directors.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “whether training sessions on CG should be provided to BOD” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether there should be training sessions for BOD.

CHART 5.4: TRAINING ON CG FOR DIRECTORS

The above clustered Bar chart 5.4 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “training on CG for BOD” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart out of 175 bank employees 87% were of the opinion that CG training for the BOD should be necessary 5.7% were of the opinion that CG training for BOD is not required and remaining 7.4% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.4 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 87% were of the opinion that CG training for the BOD should be necessary 3% were of the opinion that CG training for BOD is not required and remaining 9.8% had no opinion.
5.2.6 Training sessions on CG for Top Level Executive

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “whether training sessions on CG should be provided to top level executives” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether there should be training sessions for top level executives.

CHART 5.5: TRAINING ON CG FOR EXECUTIVES

The above clustered Bar chart 5.5 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “training of CG for top level executives” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart out of 175 bank employees 83% were of the opinion that “training of CG for top level executives” should be necessary 6.3% were of the opinion that “training of CG for top level executives” is not required and remaining 10.7% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.5 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 88% were of the opinion that training of CG for top level executives should be necessary, 5.9% were of the opinion that “training of CG for top level executives is not required and remaining 6.1% had no opinion.
5.2.7 Training sessions on CG for employees

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “whether training sessions on CG should be provided to employees” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether there should be training sessions for employees.

CHART 5.6: TRAINING ON CG FOR EMPLOYEES

The above clustered Bar chart 5.6 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “training of CG for employees” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.6 out of 175 bank employees 81% were of the opinion that “CG training for employees” should be necessary 10.3% were of the opinion that “CG training for employees” is not required and remaining 8.7% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.6 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 91.2% were of the opinion that “CG training for employees” should be necessary 2.9% were of the opinion that “CG training for employees” is not required and remaining 5.9% had no opinion.
5.2.8 **CG as an effective tool in controlling corporate frauds.**

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “CG as an effective tool in controlling frauds” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether CG as an effective tool in controlling frauds.

**CHART 5.7: CG TOOL IN CONTROL FRAUDS**

The above clustered Bar chart 5.7 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “CG as an effective tool in controlling frauds” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart out of 175 bank employees 76.6% were of the opinion that “CG as an effective tool in controlling frauds”, 8.6% were of the opinion that “CG is not an effective tool in controlling frauds” and remaining 14.8% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.7 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 70.6% were of the opinion that CG as an effective tool in controlling frauds should be necessary, 11.8% were of the opinion that CG is not an effective tool in controlling fraud and remaining 17.6% had no opinion.
5.2.9 CG practices in India are at par with global practices.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “CG practices in India are at par with global practices” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether CG practices in India are at par with global practices.

CHART 5.8: CG PRACTICES AT PAR WITH GLOBAL PRACTICES

The above Pie chart 5.8 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “CG practices in India are at par with global practices” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above pie chart 5.8 out of 277 respondents 28.38% were of the opinion that CG practices in India are at par with global practices, 52.71% were of the opinion that CG practices in India are not at par with global practices, 24.91% had no opinion.
5.2.10 Adherence to CG practices will increase cost.
Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “adherence to CG practices will increase cost” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “adherence to CG practices will increase cost”.

CHART 5.9: ADHERENCE TO CG WILL INCREASE COST

The above clustered Bar chart 5.9 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “adherence to CG practices will increase cost” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.9 out of 175 bank employees 51.4% were of the opinion that adherence to CG practices will increase cost should be necessary 30.3% were of the opinion that adherence to CG practices will not increase the cost and remaining 18.3% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.9 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 43.1% were of the opinion that adherence to CG practices will increase cost, 31.4% were of the opinion that adherence to CG practices will not increase cost and remaining 25.5% had no opinion.
5.2.11 CG parameters for enabling good governance

A. Sound risk management is important for enabling good governance.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “Sound risk management important for enabling good governance” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether Sound risk management is important for enabling good governance”

CHART 5.10: SOUND RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

The above clustered Bar chart 5.10 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “Sound risk management is important for enabling good governance” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.10 out of 175 bank employees 5.1% considered it unimportant, 14.3% considered it slightly important, for 40% it is important, 28% are of the opinion that it is very important and 12.6% have considered it critical.
From the above clustered bar chart 5.10 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 5.9% considered it unimportant, 3.9% considered it slightly important, for 34.3% it is important, 22.5% are of the opinion that it is very important and 33.3% have considered it critical.

B. Data Management and Analysis is important for enabling good governance.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “data management and analysis is important for enabling good governance” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether data management and analysis is important for enabling good governance”

CHART 5.11: DATA MANAGEMENT AND ANALYSIS

The above clustered Bar chart 5.11 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “data management and analysis is important for enabling good governance” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.11
out of 175 bank employees 4.6% considered it unimportant, 10.9% considered it slightly important, for 33.1% it is important, 42.3% are of the opinion that it is very important and 9.1% have considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.11 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 2% considered it unimportant, 3.9% considered it slightly important, for 25.5% it is important, 34.3% are of the opinion that it is very important and 34.3% have considered it critical.

C. **Code of Conduct for Board of Directors is important for enabling good governance.**

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “Code of Conduct for Board of Directors is important for enabling good governance” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “effective board composition is important for enabling good governance”
CHART 5.12 : CODE OF CONDUCT FOR BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The above clustered Bar chart 5.12 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “code of conduct for board of directors is important for enabling good governance” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.12 out of 175 bank employees 4% considered it unimportant, 10.9% considered it slightly important, for 29.7% it is important, 42.3% are of the opinion that it is very important and 13.1% have considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.12 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 3% considered it unimportant, 6.9% considered it slightly important, for 32.4% it is important, 42.2% are of the opinion that it is very important and 15.7% have considered it critical.
D. Internal and external control systems are important for enabling good governance.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “internal and external control system” using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “internal and external control system.”

CHART 5.13 : INTERNAL & EXTERNAL CONTROL SYSTEM

The above clustered Bar chart 5.13 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “internal and external control system is important for enabling good governance” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.13 out of 175 bank employees 1.1% considered it unimportant, 16% considered it slightly important, for 28% it is important, 43.4% are of the opinion that it is very important and 11.4% have considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.13 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 2% considered it unimportant, 7.8% considered it slightly important for 25.5% it is important, 43.1% are of the opinion that it is very important and 21.7% have considered it critical.
E. Forensic accounting is important for enabling good governance.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “forensic accounting is important for enabling good governance” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “forensic accounting is important for enabling good governance”

CHART 5.14: FORENSIC ACCOUNTING

The above clustered Bar chart 5.14 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “forensic accounting” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.14 out of 175 bank employees 5.1% considered it unimportant, 16% considered it slightly important, for 28% it is important, 43.4% are of the opinion that it is very important and 11.4% have considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.14 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 2% considered it unimportant, 7.8% considered it slightly important, for 25.5% it is important, 43.1% are of the opinion that it is very important and 21.7% have considered it critical.
F. The Independent auditor’s role is important for enabling good governance.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “Independent auditor’s is important for enabling good governance” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “Independent auditor’s is important for enabling good governance.”

CHART 5.15 INDEPENDENT AUDITOR’S ROLE

The above clustered Bar chart 5.15 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “Independent auditor’s is important for enabling good governance” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.15 out of 175 bank employees 1.7% considered it unimportant, 10.3% considered it slightly important, for 30.3% it is important, 34.9% are of the opinion that it is very important and 22.9% have considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.15 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 13.7% considered it unimportant, 35.3% considered it slightly important, for 31.4% it is
important, 19.6% are of the opinion that it is very important and none of them consider it as critical.

G. Role of Top Management is important for enabling good governance.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “role of top management is important for enabling good governance” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “role of top management is important for enabling good governance.”

CHART 5.16 ROLE OF TOP MANAGEMENT

The above clustered Bar chart 5.16 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “role of top management is important for enabling good governance” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.16 out of 175 bank employees 2.3% considered it unimportant, 7.4% considered it slightly important, for 20.6% it is important, 37.7% are of the opinion that it is very important and 32% have considered it critical.
From the above clustered bar chart 5.16 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 1% considered it unimportant, 3% considered it slightly important, for 24.5% it is important, 33.3% are of the opinion that it is very important and 38.2% have considered it critical.

**H. Whistle blowing policy is important for enabling good governance.**

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “Whistle blowing policy is important for enabling good governance” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “Whistle blowing policy is important for enabling good governance.”

**CHART 5.17 WHISTLE BLOWING POLICY**

The above clustered Bar chart 5.17 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “Whistle blowing policy is important for enabling good governance” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.17 out of 175 bank employees 3.4% considered it unimportant, 17.1% considered it slightly important, for 32.6% it is important, 24.6% are of the opinion that it is very important and 28% have considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.17 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 3.9% considered it unimportant, 10.8% considered it slightly important, for 29.4% it is
important, 26.5% are of the opinion that it is very important and 29.4% have considered it critical.

5.2.12 Objective of the study: To study the CG parameters that are important for the banking institution for enabling good governance.

Research Question: Is there a difference in the important respondent’s attached to the various CG parameters?

Respondents: Bank employees

Statistical Test: Friedman Chi Square Test

Variables & Measurement: Respondents were presented with the following CG parameters and were asked to rate each parameter on the basis of importance for enabling good governance in banking institutions. Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C)

A. Sound Risk Management Framework
B. Data Management and Analytics
C. Code of Conduct for BOD
D. Internal & External Control System
E. Forensic Accounting
F. Independent Auditor’s Role
G. Role of Top Management
H. Whistle blowing Policy

H₀: There is no significant difference in importance respondents attached to the CG parameters important for enabling good governance.

H₁: There is significant difference in importance respondents attached to the CG parameters important for enabling good governance.

Level of Significance: \( \alpha = 0.05 \)
TABLE 5.7 TEST RESULTS OF CG PARAMETERS IMPORTANT FOR ENABLING GOOD GOVERNANCE.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>109.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation:** \( \chi^2 (7) = 109.4 \) p=0.000 \( N=175 \)

**Conclusion:** Since the P=0.000 is less than the level of significance (0.05) the Null hypotheses is rejected, hence it is concluded that there is a significant difference respondent attached to the CG parameters important for enabling good governance.

In order to find out where we refer to the ranks table

TABLE 5.8 SUMMARY OF RESULTS OF CG PARAMETERS IMPORTANT FOR ENABLING GOOD GOVERNANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mena Ranks&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sound risk management framework</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management and Analysis</td>
<td>4.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct for BOD</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal &amp; External Control system</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Accounting</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent auditor's role</td>
<td>5.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of top management</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistle blowing Policy</td>
<td>4.88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the ranks table 5.8 it can be seen that the Role of top management has a mean rank of 5.56, Independent auditor’s role has a mean rank of 5.03, whistle blowing policy has a mean rank of 4.88, code of conduct for BOD has a mean rank of 4.47, Internal and external control has a mean rank of 4.36, Data Management & Analytics has a mean rank of 4.22, Sound risk management has a mean rank of 3.80, forensic accounting has a mean rank of 3.68.

Hence it can be concluded that the top 3 CG parameters important for enabling good governance are:

- Role of Top Management
Independent auditors role

Whistle Blowing policy

H1: CG parameters i.e., role of top management, independent auditor’s role and whistle blowing policy are extremely crucial for enabling good governance.

5.2.13 Objective of the study: To study the CG parameters that are important for the banking institution for enabling good governance.

Research Question: Is there a difference in the important respondent’s attached to the various CG parameters?

Respondents: Customers/stakeholders

Statistical Test: Friedman Chi Square Test

Variables & Measurement: Respondents were presented with following CG parameters and were asked to rate each parameter on the basis of importance for enabling good governance in banking institutions. Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C)

A. Sound Risk Management Framework

B. Data Management and Analytics

C. Code of Conduct for BOD

D. Internal & External Control System

E. Forensic Accounting

F. Independent Auditor’s Role

G. Role of Top Management

H. Whistle blowing Policy

H0: There is no significant difference in importance respondents attached to the CG parameters important for enabling good governance.

Hi: There is significance difference in importance respondents attached to the CG parameters important for enabling good governance.

Level of Significance: $\alpha = 0.05$
TABLE 5.9: TEST RESULTS ON CORPORATE GOVERNANCE PARAMETERS IMPORTANT FOR ENABLING GOOD GOVERNANCE (STAKEHOLDERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>70.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation: $\chi^2 (7) = 70.85$ $p=0.000$ $N=102$

Conclusion: Since the $P=0.000$ is less that the level of significance (0.05) the Null hypotheses is rejected, hence it is concluded that there is a significance respondent attached to the various CG parameters important for enabling good governance.

TABLE 5.10: SUMMARY OF RESULTS ON CORPORATE GOVERNANCE PARAMETERS IMPORTANT FOR ENABLING GOOD GOVERNANCE (STAKEHOLDERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mean Ranks&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sound risk management framework</td>
<td>4.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management and Analysis</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code of Conduct for BOD</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal &amp; External Control system</td>
<td>4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic Accounting</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent auditor's role</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of top management</td>
<td>5.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistle blowing Policy</td>
<td>4.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the ranks table 5.10 it can be seen that the Role of top management has a mean rank of 5.36, Data Management & Analytics has a mean rank of 5.22, Sound risk management has a mean rank of 4.72, Internal and external control have a mean rank of 4.62, whistle blowing policy has a mean rank of 4.43, code of conduct for BOD has a mean rank of 4.28, Independent auditor’s role has a mean rank of 4.17, forensic accounting has a mean rank of 3.20.

Hence it can be concluded that the top 3 CG practices important for enabling good governance are:
Role of Top Management

Data Management & Analytics

Sound Risk Management

H1: CG parameters, i.e., role of top management, data management and sound risk management are extremely crucial for enabling good governance.

5.2.14 Unethical practices which can be threat to Indian organizations?

A. Asset misappropriation is threat to Indian organizations.
Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “unethical practice like asset misappropriation is a threat to organizations” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “unethical practice like asset misappropriation is a threat to organizations.”

CHART 5.18: ASSET MISAPPROPRIATION THREAT TO INDIAN ORGANIZATION
The above clustered Bar chart 5.18 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “unethical practice like asset misappropriation is a threat to organizations” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.18 out of 175 bank employees 5.1% considered it unimportant, 15.4% considered it slightly important, for 2.7% it is important, 40% are of the opinion that it is very important and 12.6% have considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.18 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 4.9% considered it unimportant, 8.8% considered it slightly important, for 26.5% it is important, 24.5% are of the opinion that it is very important and 35.3% have considered it critical.

B. Unethical practices like money laundering is threat to Indian organizations.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “unethical practice like money laundering is a threat to organizations” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important
(VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on
whether an unethical practice like money laundering is a threat to organizations.”

CHART 5.19: MONEY LAUNDERING THREAT TO ORGANIZATION

The above clustered Bar chart 5.19 shows the frequency distribution for the variable
“unethical practice like money laundering is a threat to organizations” across bank
employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.19 out of
175 bank employees 1% considered it unimportant, 14.3% considered it slightly
important, for 26.9% it is important, 36% are of the opinion that it is very important
and 22.3% have considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.19 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 1%
considered it unimportant, 2.9% considered it slightly important, for 25.5% it is
important, 25.5% are of the opinion that it is very important and 43.1% have
considered it critical.
C. Unethical practices like accounting frauds is threat to Indian organizations.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “unethical practice like accounting frauds is a threat to organizations” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “unethical practice like accounting frauds is a threat to organizations.”

CHART 5.20 ACCOUNTING FRAUD THREAT TO ORGANIZATION

The above clustered Bar chart 5.20 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “unethical practice like accounting frauds is a threat to organizations” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.20 out of 175 bank employees 2.3% considered it unimportant, 4% considered it slightly important, for 38.9% it is important, 23.4% are of the opinion that it is very important and 31.4% have considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.20 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 2% considered it unimportant, 4% considered it slightly important, for 15.7% it is
important, 36.3% are of the opinion that it is very important and 42.3% have considered it critical.

D. Unethical practices like frauds committed by senior management are threat to Indian organizations.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “unethical practice like frauds committed by senior management is a threat to organizations” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “unethical practice like frauds committed by senior management is a threat to organizations.”

CHART 5.21: FRAUD COMMITTED BY SENIOR MANAGEMENT

The above clustered Bar chart 5.21 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “unethical practice like frauds committed by senior management is a threat to organizations” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.21 out of 175 bank employees 7.4% considered it unimportant,
26.3% considered it slightly important, for 36% it is important, 30.3% are of the opinion that it is very important and none of the respondents considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.21 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 3.9% considered it unimportant, 5% considered it slightly important, for 18.6% it is important, 36.3% are of the opinion that it is very important and 36.3% have considered it critical.

E. Unethical practices like bribery and corruption is threat to Indian organizations.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “unethical practice like bribery and corruption is a threat to organizations” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “unethical practice like bribery and corruption is a threat to organizations.”

CHART 5.22: BRIBERY AND CORRUPTION THREAT TO ORGANIZATION
The above clustered Bar chart 5.22 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “unethical practice like bribery and corruption is a threat to organizations” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.22 out of 175 bank employees 1.7% considered it unimportant, 5.1% considered it slightly important, for 21.7% it is important, 36% are of the opinion that it is very important and 35.4 the respondents considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.22 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 2.9% considered it unimportant, 2% considered it slightly important, for 15.7% it is important, 2.9% are of the opinion that it is very important and 50% have considered it critical.

F. Unethical practices like Regulatory non-compliance is threat to Indian organizations.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “unethical practice like regulatory non-compliance is a threat to organizations” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “unethical practice like regulatory non-compliance is a threat to organizations.”
The above clustered Bar chart 5.23 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “unethical practice like regulatory non-compliance is a threat to organizations” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.23 out of 175 bank employees 1.1% considered it unimportant, 6.9% considered it slightly important, for 34.3% it is important, 39.9% are of the opinion that it is very important and 18.9% the respondents considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.23 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 2.9% considered it unimportant, 10.9% considered it slightly important, for 39.2% it is important, 29.4% are of the opinion that it is very important and 17.6% have considered it critical.

G. Unethical practices like Insider trading is threat to Indian organizations.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “unethical practice like insider trading is a threat to organizations” Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI),
5=Critical(C). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “unethical practice like insider trading is a threat to organizations.”

Chart 5.24: Insider Trading Threat to Indian Organization

The above clustered Bar chart 5.24 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “unethical practice like insider trading is a threat to organizations” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.24 out of 175 bank employees 1.7% considered it unimportant, 5.7% considered it slightly important, for 24.6% it is important, 40% are of the opinion that it is very important and 28% the respondents considered it critical.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.24 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 2% considered it unimportant, 4.9% considered it slightly important, for 35.3% it is important, 41.2% are of the opinion that it is very important and 16.7% have considered it critical.
5.2.15 **Objective of the study:** To study unethical practices which are the biggest threat to the organizations.

**Research Question:** Is there a difference in weightage respondent’s attached to the various unethical practices the biggest threat to the banking sector?

Respondents = Bank employees

**Statistical Test:** Friedman Chi Square Test

**Variables & Measurement:** Respondents were presented with following unethical practices and were asked to rate them on the basis of a threat for the organization. Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slightly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C)

- A. Asset misappropriation
- B. Money laundering
- C. Accounting fraud
- D. Fraud committed by senior mgt.
- E. Bribery and corruption
- F. Regulatory non-compliance
- G. Practice of Insider trading and selective

H₀: There is no significant difference in the weightage respondents attached to the unethical practices which are a bigger threat to the organization.

H₁: There is a significance difference in the weightage respondents attached to the unethical practices which are a bigger threat to the organization.

**Level of Significance:** \( \alpha = 0.05 \)

**TABLE 5.11: TEST RESULTS ON UNETHICAL PRACTICES WHICH ARE THREAT TO ORGANIZATIONS (BANK EMPLOYEES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics(^{a,b})</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>77.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation:** \( \chi^2 (6) = 77.23 \ p=0.000 \quad N=175 \)

**Conclusion:** Since, the \( P=0.000 \) is less that the level of significance (0.05) the Null hypotheses is rejected, hence it is concluded that there is a significant difference in the
importance respondents attached to the various unethical practices which are a bigger threat to the organization.

In order to find out ranks refer to the ranks table.

**TABLE 5.12: SUMMARY OF RESULTS ON UNETHICAL PRACTICES WHICH ARE THREAT TO ORGANIZATIONS (BANK EMPLOYEES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset misappropriation</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money laundering</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Fraud</td>
<td>4.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud committed by senior mgt</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribery and corruption</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory non-compliance</td>
<td>3.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of insider trading</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and selective leak of sensitive data and information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the ranks table 5.12 it can be seen that the Bribery and corruption has a mean rank of 4.54, accounting fraud has a mean rank of 4.42, fraud committed by senior mgt has a mean rank of 4.33, practice of insider trading has a mean rank of 4.17, money laundering has a mean rank of 3.71, regulatory non-compliance has a mean rank of 3.68, asset misappropriation has a mean rank of 3.14.

Hence, it can be concluded that the top 3 unethical practices, biggest threat to banking institutions:

A. Bribery and corruption

B. Accounting frauds

C. Frauds committed by senior management

**H1 : Unethical practices i.e., Bribery and corruption, accounting frauds, frauds committed by senior management are the three biggest threat to the organization.**
5.2.16 Purpose: To study unethical practices which are the biggest threat to the organizations.

Research Question: Is there a difference in weightage respondent’s attached to the various unethical practices that biggest threat to the banking sector?

Respondents: Customers/stakeholders

Statistical Test: Friedman Chi Square Test

Variables & Measurement: Respondents were presented with following unethical practices and were asked to rate them on the basis of threat for the organization. Using a Five point scale (1=Unimportant (UN), 2=Slighly important (SI), 3=Important (I), 4=Very Important (VI), 5=Critical(C)

A. Asset misappropriation
B. Money laundering
C. Accounting fraud
D. Fraud committed by senior mgt.
E. Bribery and corruption
F. Regulatory non-compliance
G. Practice of Insider trading and selective

H₀: There is no significant difference in the weightage respondents attached to the unethical practices which are a bigger threat to the organization.

H₁: There is a significant difference in the weightage respondents attached to the unethical practices which are a bigger threat to the organization.

Level of Significance: $\alpha = 0.05$

TABLE 5.13: TEST RESULTS ON UNETHICAL PRACTICES WHICH ARE THREAT TO ORGANIZATIONS(STAKEHOLDERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>72.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observation: $\chi^2 (6) = 70.85$  p=0.000      N=102
**Conclusion:** Since, the P=0.000 is less than the level of significance (0.05) the Null hypotheses is rejected, hence it is concluded that there is a significant difference in the importance respondents attached to the unethical practices which are threat to the organization.

In order to find out where we refer to the ranks table

**TABLE 5.14: SUMMARY OF RESULTS ON UNETHICAL PRACTICES WHICH ARE THREAT TO ORGANIZATIONS (STAKEHOLDERS)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranksa</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset misappropriation</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money laundering</td>
<td>4.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Fraud</td>
<td>4.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud committed by senior mgt</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bribery and corruption</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory non-compliance</td>
<td>3.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice of insider trading and selective</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leak of sensitive data and information</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the ranks table 5.14 it can be seen that the Bribery and corruption has a mean rank of 4.74, accounting fraud has a mean rank of 4.54, money laundering has a mean rank of 4.45, fraud committed by senior mgt has a mean rank of 4.09, asset misappropriation has a mean rank of 3.78, practice of insider trading has a mean rank of 3.38, regulatory non-compliance has a mean rank of 3.02.

Hence it can be concluded that the top 3 unethical practices biggest threat to banking institutions:

A. Bribery and corruption

B. Accounting frauds

C. Money laundering

**H1 : Unethical practices i.e., Bribery and corruption, accounting frauds, and money laundering are the three biggest threat to the organization.**
5.2.17 Losses in investments due to frauds

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “losses in investment due to frauds” using a nominal scale with 2 response options (1=Yes or 2=No). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on “whether they have faced losses in investment due to frauds”.

CHART 5.23: LOSSES DUE TO FRAUDS

The above clustered Bar chart 5.23 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “losses in investment due to frauds” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.23 out of 175 bank employees 30.6% said that they have faced losses in investment due to frauds, 69.1% said no. From the above clustered bar chart 5.23 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 14% said that they have faced losses in investment due to frauds, 86% said no.
5.2.18 Should there be stringent laws in India to curb corporate frauds.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “should there be stringent laws in India to curb frauds” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether there should be stringent laws in India to curb frauds.

CHART 5.24: STRINGENT LAWS IN INDIA TO CURB CORPORATE FRAUDS

The above clustered Bar chart 5.24 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “there should be stringent laws in India to curb frauds” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.24 out of 175 bank employees 64.6% were of the opinion that “there should be stringent laws in India to curb frauds”, 5.7% were of the opinion that it’s not required and remaining 14.8% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.24 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 61.8% were of the opinion that “should there be stringent laws in India to curb frauds” 5.9% were of the opinion that it’s not required and remaining 31.4% had no opinion.
5.2.19 CG parameters which can help in combating corporate frauds.

A. Strict code of conduct for Board of Directors helps in combating corporate frauds

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “strict code of conduct for BOD” Using a Four point scale (1 = Agree (A), 2 = Strongly Agree (SA), 3 = Disagree (D), 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “strict code of conduct for BOD helps in combating corporate frauds.”

CHART 5.25: STRICT CODE OF CONDUCT FOR BOARD OF DIRECTORS

The above clustered Bar chart 5.25 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “strict code of conduct for BOD helps in combating corporate frauds” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.25 out of 175 bank employees 42.9% agree that strict code of conduct for BOD helps in combating corporate frauds, 52% strongly agree, 4% disagree and 1.1% strongly disagree.
From the above clustered bar chart 5.25 out of 102 customers/stakeholders employees 52% agree that strict code of conduct for BOD helps in combating corporate frauds, 28.4% strongly agree, 8.8% disagree and 10.8% strongly disagree.

B. **Strong whistle blowing policy helps in combating corporate frauds**

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “that strong whistle blowing policy helps in combating corporate frauds” Using a 4 point scale (1= Agree (A), 2 = Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “that strong whistle blowing policy helps in combating corporate frauds.”

CHART 5.26: STRONG WHISTLE BLOWING POLICY

The above clustered Bar chart 5.26 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “that strong whistle blowing policy helps in combating corporate frauds” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.26 out of 175 bank employees 33.1% agree that strong whistle blowing policy helps in combating corporate frauds, 56.6% strongly agree, 7.4% disagree and 2.9% strongly disagree.
From the above clustered bar chart 5.26 out of 102 customers/stakeholders employees 41.2% agree that strong whistle blowing policy helps in combating corporate frauds, 35.3% strongly agree, 18.6% disagree and 4.9% strongly disagree.

C. Role of top management helps in combating corporate frauds

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “role of top management helps in combating corporate frauds” Using a 4 point scale (1= Agree (A), 2 = Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “role of top management helps in combating corporate frauds.”

CHART 5.27: ROLE OF TOP MANAGEMENT

The above clustered Bar chart 5.27 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “role of top management helps in combating corporate frauds” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.27 out of 175 bank
employees 44% agree that role of top management helps in combating corporate frauds, 40% strongly agree, 14.3% disagree and 1.7% strongly disagree.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.27 out of 102 customers/stakeholders employees 38.2% agree that role of top management helps in combating corporate frauds, 31.3% strongly agree, 26.5% disagree and 3.9% strongly disagree.

D. Strong risk management framework helps in combating corporate frauds

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “strong risk management framework helps in combating corporate frauds” Using a 4 point scale (1= Agree (A), 2 = Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “strong risk management framework helps in combating corporate frauds.”
CHART 5.28: STRONG RISK MANAGEMENT FRAMEWORK

The above clustered Bar chart 5.28 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “strong risk management framework helps in combating corporate frauds” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.28 out of 175 bank employees 38.9% agree that strong risk management framework helps in combating corporate frauds, 45.1% strongly agree, 13.1% disagree and 2.9% strongly disagree.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.28 out of 102 customers/stakeholders employees 24.5% agree that strong risk management framework helps in combating corporate frauds, 49% strongly agree, 21.6% disagree and 4.9% strongly disagree.

E. Forensic Accounting helps in combating corporate frauds

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “forensic accounting helps in combating corporate frauds” Using a 4 point scale (1= Agree (A), 2 = Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “forensic accounting helps in combating corporate frauds.”
The above clustered Bar chart 5.29 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “forensic accounting helps in combating corporate frauds” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.29 out of 175 bank employees 44% agree that forensic accounting helps in combating corporate frauds, 38.3% strongly agree, 16% disagree and 1.7% strongly disagree.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.29 out of 102 customers/stakeholders employees 32.3% agree that forensic accounting helps in combating corporate frauds, 33.3% strongly agree, 26.5% disagree and 7.8% strongly disagree.

F. Role of Independent auditor in combating corporate frauds

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “role of independent auditor in combating corporate frauds” Using a 4 point scale (1= Agree (A), 2 = Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “role of independent auditor in combating corporate frauds.”
The above clustered Bar chart 5.30 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “role of independent auditor in combating corporate frauds” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.30 out of 175 bank employees 18.3% agree that role of independent auditor in combating corporate frauds, 69.73% strongly agree, 8.6% disagree and 3.4% strongly disagree.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.30 out of 102 customers/stakeholders employees 19.6% agree that role of independent auditor in combating corporate frauds, 55.8% strongly agree, 14.7% disagree and 9.9% strongly disagree.

**G. Data Management & Analytics helps in combating corporate frauds**

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “data management & analytics” Using a 4 point scale (1= Agree (A), 2 = Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “data management & analytics.”
The above clustered bar chart 5.31 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “data management & analytics” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.31 out of 175 bank employees 22.9% agree that data management & analytics, 57.1% strongly agree, 5.7% disagree and 14.3% strongly disagree.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.31 out of 102 customers/stakeholders employees 14.7% agree that data management & analytics, 44.1% strongly agree, 14.7% disagree and 26.4% strongly disagree.

H. Internal & External control helps in combating corporate frauds

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “internal & external control” Using a 4 point scale (1= Agree (A), 2 = Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4 = Strongly Disagree (SD). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “internal & external control.”
The above clustered Bar chart 5.32 shows the frequency distribution for the variable “data management & analytics” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.32 out of 175 bank employees 22.9% agree that data management & analytics, 57.1% strongly agree, 5.7% disagree and 14.3% strongly disagree.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.32 out of 102 customers/stakeholders employees 10% agree that data management & analytics, 49% strongly agree, 19.6% disagree and 21.6% strongly disagree.

5.2.20 Purpose: To study CG practices that can help banking institutions to combating corporate frauds.

Research Question: Is there a difference in weightage respondents attached to the various CG parameters that can help banking institutions in combating frauds?

Respondents= Bank employees
**Statistical Test: Friedman Chi Square Test**

**Variables & Measurement:** Respondents were presented with following CG practices and were asked to rate each parameter on the basis of importance which can help the organizations to combat corporate frauds. Using a 4 point scale (1=Agree (A), 2=Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4=Strongly Disagree (SD))

A. Strict code of conduct for BOD  
B. Strong whistle blowing policies  
C. Role of Top Management  
D. Strong risk management framework  
E. Encouraging forensic accounting tools  
F. Independent Auditor’s role  
G. Data Management & Analytics  
H. Internal & External Control

H₀: There is no significant difference in weightage respondents attached to the various CG parameters that can help organizations in combating frauds.

H₁: There is significant difference weightage respondents attached to the various CG parameters that can help organizations in combating frauds.

**Level of Significance:** \( \alpha = 0.05 \)

**TABLE 5.15: TEST RESULTS ON CORPORATE GOVERNANCE PARAMETERS THAT CAN HELP ORGANIZATIONS IN COMBATING FRAUDS (BANK EMPLOYEES)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics(^{a,b})</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>110.359</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation:** \( \chi^2 (7) = 110.359 \quad p=0.000 \quad N=175 \)

**Conclusion:** Since the \( P=0.000 \) is less that the level of significance (0.05) the Null hypotheses is rejected hence it is concluded that there is a significant difference in the importance respondents attached to the various CG parameters which can be an effective tool in combating corporate frauds.

In order to find out where we refer to the ranks table
TABLE 5.16: SUMMARY OF RESULTS ON CORPORATE GOVERNANCE PARAMETERS THAT CAN HELP ORGANIZATIONS IN COMBATING FRAUDS (BANK EMPLOYEES)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks³</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strict code of conduct for BOD</td>
<td>4.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong whistle blowing policies</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Top Management</td>
<td>4.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong risk management framework.</td>
<td>4.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging forensic accounting tools</td>
<td>4.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent auditor’s role</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management &amp; Analytics</td>
<td>3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal &amp; External Control</td>
<td>3.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the ranks table 5.16 it can be seen that independent auditor’s role has mean rank of 5.45, Strong risk management framework has a mean rank of 4.85, Strong whistle blowing policies has a mean rank of 4.85, Encouraging forensic accounting tools has a mean rank of 4.63, role of top management has mean rank 4.57 and Strict code of conduct for BOD has a mean rank of 4.33, internal & external control has mean rank of 3.79 and data management & analytics has mean has of 3.54.

Hence it can be concluded that the top 3 CG practices that can help the organization to combat corporate frauds:

A. Independent auditor’s role

B. Strong whistle blowing policy

C. Strong risk management systems

H1: CG practices that can be an effective tool in combating corporate frauds are Independent auditor’s role, Strong whistle blowing policy and Strong risk management systems.
5.2.21 Purpose: To study CG practices that can help banking institutions to combating corporate frauds.

Research Question: Is there a difference in weightage respondents attached to the various CG parameters that can help banking institutions in combating frauds?

Respondents= customers/stakeholders

Statistical Test: Friedman Chi Square Test

Variables & Measurement: Respondents were presented with following CG practices and were asked to rate each parameter on the basis of importance which can help the organizations to combat corporate frauds. Using a 4 point scale (1=Agree (A), 2=Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4=Strongly Disagree (SD)

A. Strict code of conduct for BOD
B. Strong whistle blowing policies
C. Role of Top Management
D. Strong risk management framework
E. Encouraging forensic accounting tools
F. Audit Committee
G. Data Management & Analytics
H. Internal & External Control

H0 : There is no significant difference in weightage respondents attached to the various CG parameters that can help organizations in combating frauds.
H1 : There is significant difference in weightage respondents attached to the various CG parameters that can help organizations in combating frauds.

Level of Significance: \( \alpha = 0.05 \)
TABLE 5.17: TEST RESULTS ON CORPORATE GOVERNANCE PARAMETERS THAT CAN HELP ORGANIZATIONS IN COMBATING FRAUDS (STAKEHOLDERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics&lt;sup&gt;a,b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chi-Square</td>
<td>101.424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig.</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Observation:** $\chi^2 (7) = 101.424 \quad p=0.000 \quad N=102$

**Conclusion:** Since the $p=0.000$ is less that the level of significance (0.05) the Null hypotheses is rejected hence it is concluded that there is a significant difference in the importance respondents attached to the various CG parameters which can be an effective tool in combating corporate frauds.

In order to find out where we refer to the ranks table

TABLE 5.18: SUMMARY OF RESULTS ON CORPORATE GOVERNANCE PARAMETERS THAT CAN HELP ORGANIZATIONS IN COMBATING FRAUDS (STAKEHOLDERS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strict code of conduct for BOD</td>
<td>4.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong whistle blowing policies</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of Top Management</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong risk management framework</td>
<td>5.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging forensic accounting tools</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit Committee</td>
<td>5.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management &amp; Analytics</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal &amp; External Control</td>
<td>3.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From the ranks table 5.18 it can be seen that independent auditor’s role has mean rank of 5.42, Strong risk management framework has a mean rank of 5.22, Encouraging forensic accounting tools has a mean rank of 5.10, Strong whistle blowing policies has a mean rank of 4.55, role of top management has mean rank 4.68 and Strict code of
conduct for BOD has a mean rank of 4.26, internal & external control has mean rank of 3.88 and data management & analytics has mean has of 3.88.

Hence it can be concluded that the top 3 CG practices that can help organizations to combat corporate frauds:

A. Independent auditor’s role
B. Strong whistle blowing policy
C. Encouraging forensic accounting tools

H1 : CG practices that can be an effective tool in combating corporate frauds are Independent auditor’s role, Strong whistle blowing policy and encouraging forensic accounting tools.

5.2.22 Objective of the study: To study if CG parameters are an effective tool in combating corporate frauds.

Research Question: Whether majority of respondents agree that CG is an effective tool in combating frauds?

Statistical Test: Binominal Test

Variables & Measurement: Respondents were offered the following CG practices which are assumed to combat corporate frauds. Further, they were asked to rate each practice using a 4 point scale (1=Agree (A), 2=Strongly Agree (SA), 3=Disagree (D), 4=Strongly Disagree (SD). Later the 4 point scale was converted to 2- point scale for convenience of data analysis using a cut point option in SPSS.

Test proportion selected for Binomial test was 50%. Proportion of responses more than 50% to a response category indicates majority for this response category. Hence P=0.05 in the current test.

Ho: Agreeing proportion of respondents is less than or equal to 50% into (P<= .5)
H1: Agreeing proportion of respondents is more than 50% into (P>= .5)

Level of significance: α = 0.05
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Code of conduct for Board of directors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree 1 &lt;= 2</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 2 &gt; 2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whistle blowing policies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree 1 &lt;= 2</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 2 &gt; 2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role of top management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree 1 &lt;= 2</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 2 &gt; 2</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk management framework</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree 1 &lt;= 2</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 2 &gt; 2</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forensic accounting tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree 1 &lt;= 2</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 2 &gt; 2</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent auditor’s role</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree 1 &lt;= 2</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 2 &gt; 2</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data Management &amp; Analytics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree 1 &lt;= 2</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 2 &gt; 2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal &amp; External Control system</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree 1 &lt;= 2</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree 2 &gt; 2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Observation: Strict code of conduct of Board of directors  
   Observation proportion= .90  
   Test proportion = .50  
   P= 0.000

2. Observation: Whistle blowing policy  
   Observation proportion= .85  
   Test proportion = .50  
   P= 0.000

3. Observation: Role of Top Management  
   Observation proportion= .79  
   Test proportion = .50  
   P= 0.000

4. Observation: Strong risk management framework  
   Observation proportion= .80  
   Test proportion = .50  
   P= 0.000

5. Observation: Forensic accounting tools  
   Observation proportion= .76  
   Test proportion = .50  
   P= 0.000

6. Observation: Bribery & corruption  
   Observation proportion= .83  
   Test proportion = .50  
   P= 0.00  
   Observation: Strict code of conduct of Board of directors  
   Observation proportion= .90  
   Test proportion = .50  
   P= 0.00
Observation proportion = .90
Test proportion = .50
P= 0.00

Hence null is rejected and it is concluded that more than 50% of the respondents agree that

1. Strict code of conduct for Board of directors is effective in combating frauds.
2. Strong whistle blowing policies is effective in combating frauds.
3. Role of Top Management
5. Encouraging forensic accounting tools
6. Audit Committee
7. Data management & Analytics
8. Internal & External Control

From the above discussion, it’s proved that CG is an effective tool in combating corporate frauds.
5.2.23 Attending of annual general meeting (AGM)

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “whether they attend annual general meeting” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “whether they attend annual general meeting”.

CHART 5.33: ATTENDING AGM

The above clustered Bar chart 5.33 shows the frequency distribution for the “attending annual general meeting” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.33 out of 175 bank employees 44% were of the opinion that attending annual general meeting should be necessary, 53.1% were of the opinion that attending annual general meeting is not required and remaining 2.9% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.33 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 17.6% were of the opinion that attending annual general meeting should be necessary, 46.3% were of the opinion that attending annual general meeting is not required and remaining, 1.7% had no opinion.
5.2.24 Have you ever exercised your voting rights in shareholders meetings.

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “have they ever exercised voting rights in shareholders meeting” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “have they ever exercised voting rights in shareholders meeting”.

CHART 5.34: EXPERIENCED VOTING RIGHTS

The above clustered Bar chart 5.34 shows the frequency distribution for the “have they ever exercised voting rights in shareholders meeting” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.34 out of 175 bank employees 26.9% said that they have exercised their voting rights in shareholders meeting, 68% were of the opinion that exercising voting rights in shareholders meeting is not required and remaining 5.1% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.34 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 10.8% said that they have exercised their voting rights in shareholders meeting, 87% were of the
opinion that exercising voting rights in shareholders meeting is not required and remaining, 2% had no opinion.

5.2.25 Whether they know about audit committee
Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “whether they know about audit committee” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “they know about audit committee”.
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The above Pie chart 5.35 shows the frequency distribution for the “whether they know about audit committee” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.35 out of 277 respondents 66.43% said they know about audit committee, 25.63% they don’t know about audit committee and remaining 7.94% had no opinion.

5.2.26 Audit report is a true indicator of company’s financial condition
Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “audit report is true indicator of company’s financial condition” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “audit report is true indicator of company’s financial condition”.
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The above clustered Bar chart 5.36 shows the frequency distribution for the “audit report is true indicator of company’s financial condition” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.36 out of 175 bank employees 48% said they know about audit committee, 24% they don’t know about audit committee and remaining 28% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.36 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 34.3% said audit report is true indicator of company’s financial condition, 34.3% they don’t know about the same and remaining 31.4% had no opinion.

5.2.27 Whether they know about whistle blowing policy

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “whether they know about whistle blowing policy” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=Don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “whether they know about whistle blowing policy”.

The above clustered Bar chart 5.37 shows the frequency distribution for the “whether they know about whistle blowing policy” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.35 out of 175 bank employees 74.3% said they know about audit committee, 12.6% they don’t know about whistle blowing policy and remaining 13.1% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.37 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 47.1% said they know about whistle blowing policy, 39.2% they don’t know about whistle blowing policy and remaining 13.7% had no opinion.

5.2.28 Whistle blowing is an important tool to detect frauds in banking institutions.
Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “whistle blowing is an important tool to detect frauds in banking institutions” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “whistle blowing is an important tool to detect frauds in banking institutions.”

CHART 5.38 WHISTLE BLOWING POLICY IS IMPORTANT TOOL FOR DETECT FRAUD

The above clustered Bar chart 5.38 shows the frequency distribution for the “whistle blowing is an important tool to detect frauds in banking institutions” across bank employees and customer/shareholder. From the above clustered bar chart 5.38 out of 175 bank employees 65.7% are of the opinion that whistle blowing is an important tool to detect frauds in banking institutions, 14.3% don’t believe so and remaining 20% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.38 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 47.1% are of the opinion that whistle blowing is an important tool to detect frauds in banking institutions, 25.5% they don’t think so and remaining 27.3% had no opinion.
5.2.29 stringent laws to protect whistleblower

Bank employees and customers were asked to comment on “stringent laws to protect the whistleblower” using a nominal scale with 3 response options (1=Yes, 2=No and 3=don’t Know). This question was asked to know the opinion of respondents on whether “stringent laws to protect the whistleblower.”

CHART 5.39: STRINGENT LAWS TO PROTECT THE WHISTLEBLOWER

The above clustered Bar chart 5.39 shows the frequency distribution for the “stringent laws to protect the whistleblower” across bank employees and customer/shareholder from the above clustered bar chart. From the above clustered bar chart 5.39 out of 175 bank employees 76.6% are of the opinion that there should be stringent laws to protect the whistleblower, 9.7% don’t believe so and remaining 13.7% had no opinion.

From the above clustered bar chart 5.39 out of 102 customers/stakeholders 43.1% are of the opinion that there should be stringent laws to protect the whistleblower, 30.4% said no and remaining 26.3% had no opinion.
5.3 Summary Results of Primary Data

Response rate of Bank employees and customers/stakeholder were recorded. Total respondents were 277 in number out of which bank employees were 175 and customers/stakeholders 102 in number.

Objective of the study: To study the CG parameters important for the banking institution for enabling good governance.
H10: There is no significance in the importance respondents attached to the various CG parameters important for enabling good governance.

Objective of the study: To study the factors which influence the investment decision of the stakeholders?
H20: There is no significant difference in the importance respondents attached to the factors that influences investment decision of the stakeholders.

Objective of the study: To study unethical practices which are the biggest threat to the organizations?
H30: There is no difference in the weightage respondents attached to the various unethical practices which are threat to the organization.

Objective of the study: To study CG practices that can help banking institutions to combating corporate frauds.
H40: There is no difference in weightage respondents attached to the various CG parameters that can help organizations in combating frauds.
TABLE: 5.20 SUMMARY OF HYPOTHESES TEST

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>Null Hypotheses</th>
<th>Friedman Chi Square Test</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1a0</td>
<td>There is no significance in the importance bank employees attached to the various CG parameters important for enabling good governance.</td>
<td>Chi-Squ – 109.4</td>
<td>Null Hypotheses Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asymp. Sig- 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1b0</td>
<td>There is no significance in the importance customers/stakeholders attached to the various CG parameters important for enabling good governance.</td>
<td>Chi-Squ – 70.85</td>
<td>Null Hypotheses Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asymp. Sig- 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2a0</td>
<td>There is no difference in the weightage bank employees attached to the various unethical practices which are threat to the organisation.</td>
<td>Chi-Squ - 4.625</td>
<td>Null Hypotheses Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asymp. Sig- 0.382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2b0</td>
<td>There is no difference in the weightage customers/stakeholders attached to the various unethical practices which are threat to the organisation.</td>
<td>Chi-Squ - 4.625</td>
<td>Null Hypotheses Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asymp. Sig- 0.382</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a0</td>
<td>There is no difference in weightage respondents attached to the various CG parameters that can help organizations in combating frauds.</td>
<td>Chi-Squ – 31.77</td>
<td>Null Hypotheses Rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asymp. Sig- 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| H3b₀ | There is no difference in weightage respondents attached to the various CG parameters that can help organizations in combating frauds. | Chi-Squ – 23.10  
Asymp. Sig- 0.00 | Null Hypotheses Rejected |
|------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| H4₀  | There is no significance in the importance respondents attached to the factors that influences investment decisions of the stakeholders. | Chi-Squ - 4.625  
Asymp. Sig- 0.382 | Null Hypotheses Rejected |