

coordination development type. Jilin (0.41-0.34) degraded from basic coordination development type to moderate recession type. Heilongjiang (0.52-0.38) degraded from basic coordination development type to moderate recession type. The other provinces maintained their coupling coordination type for the whole research period.

Type four, coupling coordination degree of regional financial eco-system increased first and decreased afterwards. 14 provinces are put in this group. Shanghai and Jiangsu from East China, Shanxi, Anhui, Jiangxi, Henan and Hunan from central China, Sichuan, Inner Mongolia, Guizhou, Shaanxi, Gansu, Guangxi and Ningxia from west China. We could conclude from the above information that regional financial eco-system coordination developments have more fluctuations in central and west China, precisely more than 85%. Guizhou kept the largest fluctuation range from 0 in the 9th 5-Year Plan period to 0.18 in the 10th 5-Year Plan period and then back to 0 again in the 11th 5-Year Plan period. Gansu takes the 2nd place and its coupling coordination degree for the three research periods are 0.19, 0.25 and 0.04. Inner Mongolia has the smallest fluctuation range which is 0.03.

4. CONCLUSIONS

This research adopts 29 China provincial statistical data from 1996 to 2010 and empirically examined the coordinated developments of regional financial eco-environment and financial ecological principal parts. The main difficulty in this research is qualitative analyses are usually incomplete in feature, so it can't reflect the relationship between two sub-systems with accuracy. Moreover, the basic coordinated development condition of regional financial eco-environment is a concept of clear connotation but unclear denotation. Thus the concept of coupling coordination degree is selected for description and it is used as an evaluation index in empirical tests of coordinated development levels of financial eco-systems. Results indicate that most of the provinces are in good coordinated development condition, about 60% of the provinces are no worse than basic coordination development type. Only 4 provinces are in serious imbalance and most of them are from west China. But coordination development types in three major economic regions appear to be obviously imbalanced. The trend of financial eco-systems' coupling coordination curve from 1996 to 2010 suggests a ladder fall from east to west. The annual average coupling coordination degree values for east, central and west are 0.72, 0.42 and 0.36 respectively. For the three research periods, Beijing is the one that increased coordination development level consistently and made the biggest progress such as upgrade in development type. Heilongjiang is the one that made the largest decrease, starting from basic coordination development to moderate recession type. That may be due to significant decline in the competitiveness of

financial eco-environment and financial ecological principal parts. Qinghai remained stable during the research period. The reason could be backward financial eco-environment and financial ecological principal parts interact with each other and lead to a long term imbalance status in financial eco-systems.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A Project Supported by Philosophy Social Science Fund of Hunan Province (13YBB088) and Soft Science Program of Hunan Provincial Science & Technology Department (2014ZK3024).

REFERENCES

- [1] F. J. Arcelus and P. Arocena, "Convergence and productive efficiency in fourteen OECD countries: a non-parametric frontier approach," *Int J of Production Economics*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 105-117, Jun. 2000. DOI: [10.1016/S0925-5273\(99\)00116-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-5273(99)00116-4).
- [2] J. B. Breuer, R. McNown and M. Wallance, "Series specific unit root tests with panel data," *Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics*, vol. 64, no. 5, pp. 527-546, Dec. 2002. DOI: [10.1111/1468-0084.00276](https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0084.00276).
- [3] B. Casu and P. Molyneux, "A comparative study of efficiency in European banking," *Applied Economics*, vol. 35, no. 17, pp. 1865-1876, Jun. 2003. DOI: [10.1080/0003684032000158109](https://doi.org/10.1080/0003684032000158109).
- [4] I. Choi, "Unit root tests for panel data," *Int J of Money and Finance*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 249-272, Apr. 2001. DOI: [10.1016/S0261-5606\(00\)00048-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0261-5606(00)00048-6).
- [5] W. Cook, L. Liang, Y. Zha and J. Zhu, "A Modified super-efficiency DEA model for infeasibility," *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 60, no. 2, pp. 276-281, Feb. 2009. DOI: [10.1057/palgrave.jors.2602544](https://doi.org/10.1057/palgrave.jors.2602544).
- [6] E. L. Glaeser and A. Shleifer, "Legal origins," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, vol. 117, no. 4, pp. 1193-1229, Apr. 2002. DOI: [10.2139/ssrn.267852](https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.267852).
- [7] J. Goddard, P. Molyneux and J. O. S. Wilson. "The profitability of European banks: a cross-sectional and dynamic panel analysis," *The Manchester School*, vol. 72, no. 3, pp. 363-381, Jun. 2004. DOI: [10.1111/j.1467-9957.2004.00397.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9957.2004.00397.x).
- [8] I. Hasan and K. Maron, "Development and efficiency of the banking sector in a transitional economy: Hungarian experience," *Journal of Banking & Finance*, vol. 27, no. 12, pp. 2249-2271, Dec. 2003. DOI: [10.1016/S0378-4266\(02\)00328-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4266(02)00328-x).