

MELEK ACAR BOYACIOGLU

SELCUK UNIVERSITY, TURKEY

IBRAHİM EREM SAHİN

SELCUK UNIVERSITY, TURKEY

RAMAZAN AKTAS

TOBB UNIVERSITY OF ECONOMICS AND TECHNOLOGY, TURKEY

A COMPARISON OF THE FINANCIAL EFFICIENCIES OF COMMERCIAL BANKS AND PARTICIPATION BANKS: THE CASE OF TURKEY

Abstract:

The purpose of this study is to measure the efficiencies of participation banks, which conduct interest-free banking transactions, and commercial banks within the Turkish finance system and determine whether they have made progress in a year-by-year process or not. In this context, using the continuous financial data between the years 2011 and 2013 belonging to 4 participation banks and 16 public and private commercial banks operating in the banking sector, efficiencies of the banks were measured through the Data Enveloping Analysis and whether or not there was progress in their efficiency on a yearly basis was investigated using the Malmquist Total Factor Productivity Index. According to the results of the analysis conducted using input-output components by adopting the mediation approach, although the efficiency levels of the banks exhibited a slight drop by the years, an increase was observed in their total factor productivities. When the efficiency scores of commercial banks and participation banks are evaluated within themselves, it is seen that with the exception of 2013, the mean efficiency values of participation banks are higher than the mean efficiency values of commercial banks.

Keywords:

Participation Banks, Commercial Banks, Turkish Banking Sector, Data Envelopment Analysis, Malmquist Total Factor Productivity Index, Efficiency.

JEL Classification: C14, G21

1. Introduction

Participation banking is a kind of banking that does not use the tool of “interest” in fund collection and use transactions, but instead uses the model of participation in profits and losses in fund collection and, in the fund lending transactions, the models of supplying or leasing goods and services, and profit and loss partnership investment instead of directly giving cash (www.tkbb.org.tr, 2010). Participation banking emerged for the purpose of bringing to economy the mattress savings which are not used in economy since people living Muslim countries do not wish to work with interest-based banks due to their religious beliefs. Today, many leading and universal banks across the world have established interest-free banking units within them. Kuwait, Egypt and Malaysia have the largest share in participation banking (Dağ, 2011: 20).

Participation banks entered the Turkish finance system for the first time in 1983 and thus the infrastructure of a banking system where economic units that are sensitive about the issue of interest could use their savings, and make better contributions to economy by using credits and other banking products (Dağ, 2011: 1). The participation banks in Turkey that engage in interest-free banking have exhibited progress over the years. As of the end of 2012, their share in the total banking sector rose to 5.13 %, their share in total deposits to 6.15 % and their share in total credits to 6.03 % (TKBB, 2013).

Increasing competition in today’s world has brought to the forefront the concept of efficiency in the banking sector and banks have struggled to increase their efficiencies. Banks that have succeeded in increasing their efficiencies can reach larger customer groups at lower costs. Measurement of efficiency demonstrates whether banks use a minimum amount of input to generate a certain amount of output, or whether they can produce maximum output by using a certain amount of input (Fethi and Pasiouras, 2010: 190).

The purpose of this study was to measure the financial efficiencies of the participation banks and commercial banks operating in the Turkish banking sector using the data envelopment analysis (DEA). In this context, the efficiencies of 4 participation banks and 16 commercial banks operating in the sector between 2011 and 2013 were measured using the DEA method and then whether there was an improvement in the efficiencies of these banks over the years were examined comparatively by making use of the Malmquist Total Factor Productivity Index.

2. Literature Review

There are a large number of studies in the literature concerning the banking sector using DEA. Most of these studies concentrate on the technical efficiency of the banks. Efficiency measurement indicates whether the banks have used a minimum number of inputs in order to produce a certain number of outputs or whether they can produce maximum output using a certain number of inputs (Fethi and Pasiouras, 2010: 190). On the other hand, although the samples and variables of the academic studies conducted in this regard have been different, their common purpose has been to measure inefficiency of the banks or in a more general sense the service sector (Çukur, 2005: 19). Some prominent ones among these studies are given below.

Berger and Mester (1997) attempted to measure the efficiencies of the banks in the USA between 1990 and 1995 by using econometric efficiency frontier models. According to the findings of the study, while the average cost efficiencies of the American banks were at the level of 86 %, their average profit efficiency scores were 47 %. According to these results, the American banks were able to manage their cost efficiency well but they suffered from serious shortcomings regarding profit efficiency.

Kwan and Wilcox (1999), Akhavein et al. (1997), Berger et al. (1999) and DeYoung and Hasan (1998) concluded in their studies that bank mergers increased efficiency.

In their study on the efficiencies of the banks in Australia, Sturm and Williams (2008) demonstrated that the efficiency levels of the banks with foreign capital were higher and the reason for this was the management mentality of these banks and the regulations they made on banking.

Rezitis (2008), on the other hand, studied the effects of merger and acquisition activities on the efficiency and total factor productivity of Greek banks. According to the results of the study, where Malmquist productivity index was applied, merger and acquisition activities had a negative effect on the technical efficiency and total factor productivity of the Greek banks. In particular, technical efficiencies of the banks that merged fell in the period after the merger. Besides this, the decrease in the total factor productivity that was experienced after the merger was attributed to the increase in technical inefficiency and to the disappearance of the economy of scale.

Berger et al. (2009) conducted a study to measure the efficiency of the Chinese banks in the period between 1994 and 2003 and determine the influence of the privatization and foreign partnerships within the framework of the Chinese government's reform efforts on the Chinese banks. According to the results of the study, it has been observed that banks with foreign capital attained the highest levels of efficiency. Banks with foreign partners that had minority shares, on the other hand, increased their efficiency considerably on a yearly basis. It was also seen that the four largest public banks that dominated the country's banking sector had the lowest efficiency values. On the basis of the findings of their study, Berger et al. pointed out that if these four largest banks joined forces with a foreign partner, even if with a minority share, their performance could increase significantly.

Das and Ghosh (2009) conducted a study using DEA aimed at determining the effects of financial deregulation on the cost and profit efficiencies of the commercial banks in India between 1999 and 2004. They found out in this study that higher levels of cost efficiency and lower levels of profit efficiency indicated the inefficiency of the income part of the banking activity. They emphasized that the decrease in profit efficiency resulted from allocation inefficiency. According to Das and Ghosh, the size of banks, their ownership structure, product diversity and positive financial indicators are important variables that lead to differences in efficiency levels.

There are several studies in the relevant literature on efficiency and productivity analyses in the Turkish banking system. Studies conducted by Aydođan and apođlu (1989), Zaim (1993), Dađlı (1995), Yolalan (1996), Ertuđrul and Zaim (1996), Ergin and Aypek (1997), İnan (2000), Cingi and Tarım (2000), olak and Altan (2002) and Atan and atalbař (2005) can be given as examples in this regard. A common point in these studies is that they use financial rates that are determined using the production or intermediation approach in measuring the performance of the banking sector both individually and as a sector and make efficiency and productivity evaluations.

In addition to these studies, Aydođan (1992), Yolalan (1996), Denizer et al. (2000), Iřık (2000) and Yiđidim (2001) investigated whether the rapid change that took place in the banking sector after the financial liberation in Turkey altered efficiency of the whole sector and the banks individually. Moreover, Arslan and Erge (2010) and Dađ

(2011) investigated the efficiencies of the participation banks and deposit banks in Turkey through the data envelopment analysis.

3. Methodology

Since the model of analysis that will be used in the measurement of efficiency and the differences among the data that will be used in the model will have an effect on the results of the analysis, selection of model and variables is extremely important. Methods for measuring efficiency in the banking sector are divided into three, namely ratio analysis, parametric and non-parametric methods.

Ratio analysis is a method that is applied by monitoring in the course of time the ratio that arises from a comparison of a single input with a single output and is the most frequently used efficiency method. The ratio analysis method is based on the calculation of the items on financial tables of companies as percentages or multiples of one another. However, ratio analysis is stationary by virtue of its nature. Data obtained using this method reflects performance of businesses only by periods. Each ratio handled in the analyses made using this method concentrates on only one of the dimensions related to efficiency and ignores other factors connected with efficiency. When it is viewed from the perspective of productivity of the banking sector, this situation does not allow a comprehensive analysis as it involves a lot of inputs and outputs. The facts that the ratio that is obtained needs to be observed on a yearly basis and other values are also required for a comparison are weaknesses of this method (Büker et al., 2009: 81). Moreover, difficulties are experienced in determining inputs and outputs in the banking sector in terms of their quality. A ratio that is considered an input in one approach can be considered an output in another approach and there are situations where inputs and outputs are not expressed using the same units (İnan, 2000: 83). Due to all these drawbacks, ratio analyses may prove to be insufficient in evaluating the productivity of the banking sector from a wider and accurate perspective.

Measurement of efficiency in parametric methods is based on the assumption that there is an analytical function concerning production in the relevant branch of industry and an attempt is made to determine the parameters of this function (Yeşilyurt and Alan, 2003: 93). Methods of this kind involve the parametric relationship between technical efficiency in the output and input levels. An advantage of parametric

methods is that they include the term error in the development of the efficiency value. However, when the term error is included, this time the question of separating it from the term error that arises from inefficiency emerges (Weill, 2003: 579). In general, these methods suffer from three shortcomings. First, since multiple regression takes into account only one output, it requires that all outputs be reduced to a single value via the common unit. This situation renders this method extremely impractical in such a sector as the banking where there are very many outputs. Therefore, the units that are found to be efficient as a result of investigation are only units that have a productivity level above the average. Finally, regression analysis attempts to define the production function parametrically. The assumption that the production function must be defined only in one way does not fit the nature of decision units that are subject of efficiency analysis in the banking analysis.

Non-parametric methods, on the other hand, attempt to measure the distance to the efficient frontier by using linear-programming-based techniques. Since these methods, as in the case of parametric methods, do not have to be based on behavioral assumptions related to the structure of the production unit, they are relatively more advantageous. Moreover, the methods in question enjoy the additional advantage of being able to use more than one explanatory and explained variable (Seyrek and Ata, 2010: 69). However, besides these advantages, they may transfer data and measurement errors and chance and other errors to the model as they do not possess a random error term and determine the efficient frontier wrongly.

There are two fundamental approaches in the relevant literature as non-parametric efficiency measurement methods, Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) and Free Disposal Hull (FDH) (Berger and Humprey, 1997: 200). Of these two methods, the one that is more frequently used in the banking sector is the DEA method, which was developed by Charnes et al. in 1978.

DEA is a linear programming-based technique that aims to measure the relative efficiency and productivity of the decision-making units in cases where inputs and outputs measured with more than one and different scales or having different measurement units render making comparison difficult (Uzgören and Şahin, 2011: 196).

The method in question is used for performance evaluations in relations of production that involve multiple inputs and outputs and where the classic regression technique cannot be applied. DEA, which produces the same kind of outputs by using the same kind of inputs that are assumed to be homogeneous, compares the decision-making units among themselves, determines the best observation which generates the highest number of outputs by using the fewest number of inputs and adopts this as the efficient frontier. It tries to measure the relative efficiencies of other decision-making units according to this efficient frontier (Cihangir, 2004: 170). The important thing about DEA is that the efficiency of the calculated efficiency values of the units are measured according to the units that constitute the observation set.

DEA can be used both ways, namely input oriented or output oriented. Input-oriented DEA models investigate what the most appropriate input composition should be to generate a certain output composition in the most efficient way. Output-oriented DEA models, on the other hand, investigate the highest possible number of output compositions using a certain input composition (Atan and Çatalbaş, 2005: 52).

In this study, the DEA method, which is frequently used in measuring efficiency of banks, was used to determine the efficiency values of 4 participation banks and 16 public and private capital commercial banks operating in the Turkish banking sector on the basis of their annual data for the 2011-2013 period.

4. Data Set

There are three basic approaches, namely production, intermediation and profitability approaches, in studies intended to measure efficiency in the banking sector regarding what the banking products and inputs are. The production approach regards banks as units that use production factors such as capital and workforce as input and produce balance sheet items such as deposits, credits, securities portfolio. The intermediation approach concentrates on the banks' function as intermediary in financial markets and is based on the assumption that banks obtain funds by drawing deposits to be turned into credits, securities and other assets. According to this approach, deposits and other resources are considered inputs whereas interest costs and workforce and real capital costs are regarded as total cost components. The profitability approach, on the other hand, sees banks as firms that seek to get profits and hence adopts profitability as one of the most important components for banks to continue their activities. Within

the framework of this approach, items that are classified as interest expenses in the income statement are used as inputs whereas items that provide interest revenues are used as outputs.

The intermediation approach was used in this study to measure the efficiency and productivity of banks. Four participation banks and 16 commercial banks were subjected to analysis in this study. The analysis was conducted in the DEA under the assumption of constant returns to scale using the DEAP 2.1. package software. The model formed in this study was input-oriented, constant focus multiple-stage DEA.

In the study, the data about the participation banks were obtained from the balance sheets and income statements included in the independent audit reports of the relevant banks whereas the data about the commercial banks were obtained from the official web page of the Banks Association of (www.tbb.org.tr). The input-oriented approach was adopted with the assumption that banks had more influence on the inputs. What is important about this choice is that input and output-oriented models predict exactly the same frontiers and the decision-making units on the efficient frontier are the same. Only the levels of efficiency of inefficient decision-making units may exhibit variation in these approaches (Bumin and Cengiz, 2009: 81).

In this study, the efficiency levels of the banks between the years 2011 and 2013 were measured using DEA and efficient and inefficient banks were determined. The target input and output levels of the inefficient banks were formed. Likewise, reference sets were formed for the inefficient banks.

4.1. Determination of Decision-Making Units

Input and output variables that constitute the data set need to be selected reliably and accurately in order to conduct efficiency measurement using DEA. To what extent the results of the analysis will be significant is, by virtue of the nature of DEA, directly correlated with the fact that the selected inputs and outputs should be to the point and correct items. This is so much so that the model will determine the decision-making units that it will classify as efficient or inefficient at the end of the analysis thanks to the input and output variables to be determined.

In order to measure the efficiency of decision-making units, it is necessary to determine the input and output variables belonging to these units and at the same

time in order for the DEA model to yield successful results in the decision-making problem, the number of inputs and outputs need to be as many as possible. However, all of the selected input and output components need to be used for each decision-making unit. If the number of inputs selected for a DEA model is (m) and the number of outputs is (p), at least (m+p+1) decision-making units are a requisite constraint for the reliability of the study. Moreover, the number of decision-making units must be at least twice the number of variables (Çolak and Altan, 2002: 44-45).

Since 3 input and 3 output variables were used in the model that was applied in the study, the number of the decision-making units must be at least;

Number of Inputs + Number of Outputs + 1 = 7 and (Number of Inputs + Number of Outputs) x 2 = 12.

In the light of this information, 4 participation banks and 16 commercial private and public capital banks operating in the Turkish banking sector between the years 2011 and 2013 were determined as decision-making units. Thus, conditions required for the reliability and accuracy of the study were met. Table 1 shows decision-making units.

Table 1. Set of Decision-Making Units

Code	Banks	Code	Banks
1	Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Ziraat Bankası A.Ş.	11	Türkiye İş Bankası A.Ş.
2	Türkiye Halk Bankası A.Ş.	12	Yapı ve Kredi Bankası A.Ş.
3	Türkiye Vakıflar Bankası T.A.O.	13	Arap Türk Bankası A.Ş.
4	Akbank T.A.Ş.	14	Citibank A.Ş.
5	Anadolubank A.Ş.	15	Denizbank A.Ş.
6	Şekerbank T.A.Ş.	16	Finans Bank A.Ş.
7	Tekstil Bankası A.Ş.	17	*Albaraka Türk Katılım Bankası A.Ş.
8	Turkish Bank A.Ş.	18	*Kuveyt Türk Katılım Bankası A.Ş.
9	Türk Ekonomi Bankası A.Ş.	19	*Asya Katılım Bankası A.Ş.
10	Türkiye Garanti Bankası A.Ş.	20	*Türkiye Finans Katılım Bankası A.Ş.

* Participation Banks

4.2. Determination of Input and Output Variables

Besides the decision-making units, determination and selection of input and output variables is one of the most important issues in analyses of non-parametrical efficiency. A joint decision cannot be taken in determining inputs and outputs especially in the efficiency analyses of banks. A fundamental reason for this is that the services that banks produce (outputs) cannot be observed concretely and therefore do not have measurable counterparts.

While on the one hand studies in the relevant literature were made use of in the selection of inputs and outputs that would be used in the study, an evaluation was also made in terms of banking on the other hand. Determination of inputs and outputs to be used in the best possible manner is important in increasing the reliability and validity of the study and providing better feedback about in what way and how the improvements to be recommended to the inefficient decision-making units can be performed Table 2 shows the inputs and outputs that are used in the intermediation approach.

Table 2. Inputs and Outputs Used in the Intermediation Approach

INPUT		OUTPUT	
1	Deposits / Collected Funds	1	Loans and receivables / Funded Credits
2	Interest Expenses / Profit Share Expense	2	Interest Income / Profit Share Income
3	Personnel Expenses	3	Net Fees and Commissions Income

The intermediation approach is one of the three approaches frequently used in efficiency analyses in banking together with the production and profitability approaches. According to this, “Deposits / Collected Funds”, “Interest Expenses / Profit Share Expense” and “Personnel Expenses” were determined as inputs within the scope of the intermediation approach. On the other hand, “Loans and receivables / Funded Credits”, “Interest Income / Profit Share Income” and “Net Fees and Commissions Income” were determined as outputs respectively. Whether the banks operated efficiently or not according to the intermediation approach will be analyzed using the before mentioned inputs and outputs. First, efficiency scores of the banks will be obtained and efficient and inefficient banks will be determined. After the

efficiency values of the banks have been determined, the number of times efficient banks have been referred to and potential improvement tables of inefficient banks will be prepared and they will be provided guidance in reaching their objectives.

5. Experimental Results

In the intermediation approach, first the Charnes, Cooper, Rhodes (CCR) model was used and Total Efficiency Values were calculated for each year. Then, Malmquist Index, Technical Efficiency, Change in Technology, Pure Technical Efficiency and Scale Efficiency values were calculated using the Malmquist Total Factor Productivity Analysis and they were shown in tables by year. Thus, the sources of the changes in the productivity of commercial banks that constitute the observation set will be revealed.

Table 3 shows the total efficiency scores by year of the participation and commercial banks in the observation between the years 2011 and 2013 according to the intermediation approach.

Table 3. Efficiency Values for the Observation Set According to the Intermediation Approach (2011-2013)

Code	Banks	Technical Efficiency (2011)	Technical Efficiency (2012)	Technical Efficiency (2013)
1	Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Ziraat Bankası A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	0.990
2	Türkiye Halk Bankası A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	1.000
3	Türkiye Vakıflar Bankası T.A.O.	0.993	0.991	1.000
4	Akbank T.A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	1.000
5	Anadolubank A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	0.969
6	Şekerbank T.A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	0.940
7	Tekstil Bankası A.Ş.	0.923	0.885	0.968
8	Turkish Bank A.Ş.	0.788	0.768	0.802
9	Türk Ekonomi Bankası A.Ş.	1.000	0.933	0.982
10	Türkiye Garanti Bankası A.Ş.	1.000	0.967	1.000

11	Türkiye İş Bankası A.Ş.	0.893	0.981	0.995
12	Yapı ve Kredi Bankası A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	1.000
13	Arap Türk Bankası A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	1.000
14	Citibank A.Ş.	1.000	0.953	1.000
15	Denizbank A.Ş.	1.000	0.966	0.987
16	Finansbank A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	1.000
17	*Albaraka Türk Katılım Bankası A.Ş.	0.919	0.824	0.785
18	*Kuveyt Türk Katılım Bankası A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	0.974
19	*Asya Katılım Bankası A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	1.000
20	*Türkiye Finans Katılım Bankası A.Ş.	1.000	1.000	1.000
	Average	0.976	0.963	0.970

* Participation Banks

There are seven banks that are efficient in all years according to the intermediation approach. These banks are Türkiye Halk Bankası A.Ş., Akbank T.A.Ş., Yapı ve Kredi Bankası A.Ş., Arap Türk Bankası A.Ş., Finansbank A.Ş., Asya Katılım Bankası A.Ş., Türkiye Finans Katılım Bankası A.Ş.. The number of banks that were efficient in 2011 was fifteen. While the number of banks that were efficient in 2012 was eleven, the efficient banks in 2013 were ten. These banks were Türkiye Halk Bankası A.Ş., Türkiye Vakıflar Bankası T.A.O., Akbank T.A.Ş., Türkiye Garanti Bankası A.Ş., Yapı ve Kredi Bankası A.Ş., Arap Türk Bankası A.Ş., Citibank A.Ş., Finansbank A.Ş., Asya Katılım Bankası A.Ş. and Türkiye Finans Katılım Bankası A.Ş.. When the banks that have the lowest levels of efficiency by year are examined, it is observed that Turkish Bank A.Ş. is the one with the lowest efficiency in the years 2011 and 2012. Albaraka Türk Katılım Bankası A.Ş. is the one with the lowest efficiency in 2013.

Table 4. Average Statistics by Year According to the Intermediation Approach

	2011	2012	2013
Level of Average Efficiency	0.976	0.963	0.970
Number of Banks that Constitute the Observation Set	20	20	20

Number of Efficient Units	15	11	10
Average of Inefficient Units	0,9032	0,9186	0,9292
Level of Lowest Efficiency	0.788	0.768	0.785

The first line of Table 4, which includes average statistics concerning efficiency values of the banks calculated separately for each year according to the intermediation approach, shows the average of the efficiency levels of the banks in the observation set for the relevant years, whereas the second line shows the number of banks that constitute the observation set by year. When average efficiencies are considered, it is seen that they were 97.6%, 96.3% and 97 % respectively in 2011, 2012 and 2013.

According to the values given in Table 4, 2011 was the year when the banks' efficiency levels were at their highest while it was at the same time the year when the number of efficient banks was the highest (fifteen banks). Whereas 2011 was the year when the average of inefficient banks was at the lowest with 90.32 %, 2012 was the year which had the lowest efficiency value with 76.8 % among the inefficient years.

In the period when the analysis was made, the banks attained an average decrease of 0.0133 only in 2012 in their efficiency scores in terms of the average intermediation function. An examination of whether the efficient banks maintained their efficiency throughout the period or not and whether the inefficient banks improved their efficiency scores or not reveals that six banks could not maintain their efficiency values in 2011 and experienced a decrease in their efficiency values as of the end of 2013 whereas four banks increased their efficiency values. On the other hand, efficiency scores of seven banks did not change between the year the analysis started and the year it ended and remained constant. These banks were at the same time fully efficient banks that enjoyed an efficiency level of 1,0. According to the data in Table 4, five banks in 2011, nine banks in 2012 and ten banks in 2013 could not demonstrate technical efficiency. In other words, these banks remained below the level of output that they could have attained within the sector according to their scale with their current inputs.

When the efficiency values of the commercial banks and the participation banks were examined separately, the mean efficiency values of the participation banks were, as can be seen in Table 5, above the mean efficiency values of the commercial banks in

the year 2011 whereas in the years 2012 and 2013 the mean efficiency values of the commercial banks were higher than the mean efficiency values of the participation banks.

Table 5. Mean Statistics of the Commercial and Participation Banks over the Years According to the Intermediation Approach

	2011	2012	2013
Mean Efficiency Values of Commercial Banks	%97,75	%96,47	%97,75
Mean Efficiency Values of Participation Banks	%97,79	%95,6	%93,97

In the final stage of the analysis made using the intermediation approach, Malmquist Production Index was in order to distinguish between technical efficiency and technological change due to the time dimension. Malmquist Production Index was calculated separately for two periods, namely 2012 and 2013.

Table 6. Results of the Malmquist Index Analysis of the Participation Banks and Commercial Banks that Constituted the Observation Set According to the Intermediation Approach

<i>Banks</i>	<i>Malmquist Index</i> <i>(2012)</i>	<i>Malmquist Index</i> <i>(2013)</i>
Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Ziraat Bankası A.Ş.	1.033	0.899
Türkiye Halk Bankası A.Ş.	1.018	0.966
Türkiye Vakıflar Bankası T.A.O.	1.040	1.014
Akbank T.A.Ş.	0.990	1.052
Anadolubank A.Ş.	1.112	0.884
Şekerbank T.A.Ş.	1.170	0.874
Tekstil Bankası A.Ş.	0.975	1.103
Turkish Bank A.Ş.	1.162	0.972
Türk Ekonomi Bankası A.Ş.	0.967	1.070
Türkiye Garanti Bankası A.Ş.	0.964	1.058
Türkiye İş Bankası A.Ş.	1.145	1.045
Yapı ve Kredi Bankası A.Ş.	0.950	1.095

Arap Türk Bankası A.Ş.	0.979	1.125
Citibank A.Ş.	1.165	1.159
Denizbank A.Ş.	0.985	1.037
Finansbank A.Ş.	1.171	0.909
*Albaraka Türk Katılım Bankası A.Ş.	0.971	1.025
*Kuveyt Türk Katılım Bankası A.Ş.	0.934	1.120
*Asya Katılım Bankası A.Ş.	0.933	1.127
*Türkiye Finans Katılım Bankası A.Ş.	1.000	1.094
Avarage	1.030	1.028

* Participation Banks

In Table 7, the results obtained for all of the participation banks and commercial banks constituting the observation set as a consequence of the implementation of Malmquist Index for the period of 2012-2013 are shown as annual averages.

Table 7. Periodical Comparison of Malmquist Indexes Calculated for the Observation Set According to the Intermediation Approach

Year		Technical Efficiency Change (TE)	Technological Change (TC)	Pure Technical Efficiency Change (PTE)	Scale Efficiency Change (SE)	Malmquist Production Index (M)
2011-2012	Observation Set	0.987	1.044	0.991	0.995	1.030
2012-2013	Observation Set	1.007	1.021	0.999	1.008	1.028

The values given in Table 7 were obtained by calculating the geometrical averages of the Malmquist Production Index values found for each bank. The figures in the last column of the tables indicate the change in the total factor productivity that is the Malmquist Production Index value. If this value is greater than one, it shows an increase in total factor productivity whereas if it is smaller than one, it shows a decrease. If Malmquist production index is equal to one, it indicates that there is no change in total factor efficiency between the two periods that are compared.

When the values in the last column of Table 7 are examined, it is observed that total productivity of the banks in the observation set increased by 3 % in 2012 in comparison to 2011. The Malmquist index for 2012-2013, on the other hand, was 1,028. In other words, total productivity of the banks in the observation set increased by 2.8 % in 2013 in comparison to 2012.

It is possible to explain the change in total factor productivity by using four different indexes. To this end, first, it is necessary to investigate the effects of technical efficiency change (TE) and technological change (TC), which are two of the major components of the Malmquist production index. An index value greater than 1.00 indicates a positive contribution in these indexes whereas a value below one points to a negative contribution.

When the third (TE) and the fourth (TC) columns of Table 7 are examined, it is observed that within the framework of the intermediation approach, in terms of the total factor productivity, the technical efficiency variation of the banks exhibited a decrease of about 1.3 % compared with the previous year whereas the technological variation made a positive contribution by increasing at the level of 4.4 %. The fact that technology displayed a positive change although technical variation was negative led to a 3 % rise in total factor productivity in the year 2012 in comparison with the previous year.

While there was a slight development of 0.7 % in the technical efficiency of the banks, which constituted the observation group in the 2013, there was a development of 2.1 % in technological variation. On the other hand, there was a rise of 2.8 % in total factor productivity.

5. Conclusions

The developments that occurred in the banking sector in the international financial system and the increasing importance of banks in global economy rendered measurement of the performance and efficiency of banks vital. The banking sector is in a mutual and continuous interaction with economy. The crises that took place in Turkish economy in the past and political and economic instabilities had traumatic effects on the banking sector. The banking sector's reducing its problems arising from the overall economic structure to a minimum is closely linked to having a strong and

healthy financial structure. Banks must avoid wasting sources and work efficiently in order to be competitive in the global environment.

Various studies have been conducted in Turkey and other countries using the DEA regarding the evaluation of efficiency of the banks in the banking sector. The reason why DEA is frequently used in the banking sector is that this sector has many inputs and outputs. An advantage of DEA over other methods of efficiency measurement is that it allows making sound analyses in cases where there are many inputs and outputs and determines inefficient units and sets goals for these inefficient units to attain efficiency.

In this study, efficiencies of 4 participation banks and 16 commercial banks operating in the Turkish banking sector were investigated by using the data that belonged to the 2012-2013 period. The DEA and Malmquist Total Factor Productivity Index were used in the analyses under the assumption of constant returns to scale. The model formed in the study is the input-oriented, constant focus to scale and multiple stages DEA. Analyses were made according to the intermediation approach, which is frequently used in determining what the products and inputs of banks are and the results were evaluated. The efficiency values of the banks were measured to determine efficient and inefficient banks and then target input and output levels of the inefficient banks were formed. Likewise, reference sets were formed for the inefficient banks and finally whether the banks exhibited any development or not were investigated in the light of Malmquist indexes.

According to the findings obtained in the study, the efficiency scores of the banks decreased by 1.3 % in 2012 in comparison to 2011 whereas they demonstrated a slight increase of 0,07 in the year 2013. Seven banks were not able to maintain their efficiency levels in 2011 and had lower efficiency values as of the end of 2013 while four banks increased their efficiency values. On the other hand, efficiency scores of nine banks did not change in the period between the beginning and final years of the analysis and remained constant. Five banks, in 2011, nine banks in 2012 and ten banks in 2013 could not exhibit technical efficiency.

According to the results of a periodical comparison of Malmquist production indexes, total productivity of the banks in the observation set increased by 3 % in 2012 in comparison to

2011. In the year 2013, on the other hand, total productivity of the banks increased by 2.8 % in comparison to 2012.

When the efficiency values of the commercial banks and the participation banks were examined separately, the mean efficiency values of the participation banks were above the mean efficiency values of the commercial banks in the year 2011 whereas in the years 2012 and 2013 the mean efficiency values of the commercial banks were higher than the mean efficiency values of the participation banks.

References

- Akhavein, J. D., Berger, A. N., and Humphrey, D. B. (1997). "The Effect of Megamergers on Efficiency and Prices: Evidence from A Bank Profit Function", *Review of Industrial Organization*, 12, pp. 95-139.
- Arslan, B. G. and Ergeç E. H. (2010). "The Efficiency of Participation and Conventional Banks in Turkey: Using Data Envelopment Analysis", *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, 57, pp. 156-168.
- Atan, M. and Çatalbaş, G. K. (2005). "Bankacılıkta Etkinlik ve Sermaye Yapısının Bankaların Etkinliğine Etkisi", *İktisat, İşletme ve Finans Dergisi*, 20, 237, pp. 49-62.
- Aydoğan, K. And Çapoğlu, G. (1989). *Bankacılık Sistemlerinde Etkinlik ve Verimlilik: Uluslar Arası Bir Karşılaştırma*, Milli Prodüktivite Merkezi Yayınları, Yayın No: 397, Ankara.
- Aydoğan, K. (1992). "Finansal Liberalizasyon ve Türk Bankacılık Sektörü", *Yeni Forum*, pp. 23-29.
- Berger, A. N., and Mester, L. J. (1997). "Inside The Black Box: What Explains Differences in The Efficiencies of Financial Institutions?", *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Vol: 21, pp. 895-947.
- Berger, A. N., Demsetz, R. S., and Strahan, P. E. (1999). "The Consolidation of The Financial Services Industry: Causes, Consequences, and Implications for The Future", *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Vol: 23, No: 2, pp. 135-194.
- Berger, A., N., Hasan, I. and Zhou, M. (2009). "Bank Ownership and Efficiency in China: What Will Happen in The World's Largest Nation?", *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Vol: 33, pp. 113-130.
- Berger, A. N. and Humphrey, D. B. (1997). "Efficiency of Financial Institutions: International Survey and Directions for Future Research", *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol: 98, pp.175-212.
- Bumin, M. and Cengiz, A. (2009). "Banka Birleşme ve Devralmalarının Etkinlik Üzerine Etkisi: Pamukbank'ın Halkbank'a Devredilmesi", *İktisat İşletme ve Finans*, Cilt 24, Sayı 279, Haziran, pp. 68-96.

- Büker, S., Aşıkoğlu, R. and Sevil, G. (2009). *Finansal Yönetim*, Sözkesen Matbaacılık, 5. Baskı, Ankara.
- Charnes, A., Cooper, W. W., and Rhodes, E. (1978). "Measuring the Efficiency of Decision Making Units", *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol: 2, pp. 429-444.
- Cihangir, M. (2004). Türkiye'de Banka Birleşmeleri ve Birleşen Bankaların Verimlilik ve Etkinliğinin Ölçülmesi Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı-Uygulamalı Bir İnceleme, *Yayınlanmamış Doktora Tezi*, Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Cingi, S. and Tarım, A. (2000). "Türk Banka Sisteminde Performans Ölçümü- DEA Malmquist TFP Endeksi Uygulaması", *TBB Araştırma Tebliğleri Serisi*, 01.
- Çukur, S. (2005). "Türk Ticari Bankacılık Sisteminde Etkinlik Analizi", *İktisat İşletme ve Finans*, Cilt: 20, Sayı: 233, pp. 17-27.
- Çolak, Ö. F. and Altan, Ş. (2002). "Toplam Etkinlik Ölçümü: Türkiye'deki Özel ve Kamu Bankaları İçin Bir Uygulama", *İktisat İşletme ve Finans*, Cilt: 17, Sayı: 196, pp. 45-55.
- Dağ, S., Türkiye'de Katılım ve Mevduat Bankalarının Etkinliklerinin Veri Zarflama Analizi Yöntemiyle Karşılaştırılması, Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Kütahya, 2011.
- Dağlı, H. (1995). "An Analysis of Ownership Structure and Performance Relationship in the Turkish Commercial Banking System", *Ninth World Productivity Congress Proceedings*, Vol: 1, pp. 620-631.
- Das, A. and Ghosh, S. (2009). "Financial Deregulation And Profit Efficiency: A Nonparametric Analysis of Indian Banks", *Journal of Economics and Business*, Vol: 61, pp. 509-528.
- Denizer, C. A., Dinç, M. and Tarımcılar, M. (2000). "The Impact of Financial Liberalization on the Efficiency of the Turkish Banking System: A Two-Stage DEA Application", *Turkish Banks Association Research Proceedings Series*, Turkey, No. 2000-2.
- DeYoung, R., and Hasan, I. (1998). "The Performance of De Novo Commercial Banks: A Profit Efficiency Approach", *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Vol: 22, pp. 565-587.
- Ergin A. and Aypek N. (1997). "Ticari Bankalarda Etkinlik ve Verimlilik", 3. *Verimlilik Kongresi Bildiri Kitabı*, pp. 314-330.
- Ertuğrul, A. and Zaim, O. (1996). *Türk Bankacılığında Etkinlik: Tarihsel Gelişim Kantitatif Analiz*, Bilkamat İşletme ve Finans Yayınları, Ankara.
- Fethi, M. D. and Pasiouras, F. (2010). "Assessing Bank Efficiency and Performance with Operational Research and Artificial Intelligence Techniques: A Survey", *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol: 204, pp. 189-198.

- Işık, İ. (2000). "Financial Deregulation and Total Factor Productivity Change: An Empirical Study of Turkish Commercial Banks, 1981-1990", Financial Management Association 2000 Annual Meeting, Seattle.
- İnan, E. A. (2000). "Banka Etkinliğinin Ölçülmesi ve Düşük Enflasyon Sürecinde Bankacılıkta Etkinlik", *Türkiye Bankalar Birliği Bankacılar Dergisi*, Sayı: 34, pp.82-96.
- Kwan, S. H., and Wilcox, J.A. (1999). "Hidden Cost Reductions in Bank Mergers: Accounting For More Productive Banks", *Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco Working Paper*, 99-10.
- Rezitis, A., N., (2008). "Efficiency and Productivity Effects of Bank Mergers: Evidence From the Greek Banking Industry", *Economic Modelling*, Vol: 25, pp. 236–254.
- Seyrek, İ. H. and Ata, H. A. (2010). "Veri Zarflama Analizi ve Veri Madenciliği İle Mevduat Bankalarında Etkinlik Ölçümü", *BDDK Bankacılık ve Finansal Piyasalar*, Cilt: 4, Sayı: 2, pp. 67-84.
- Sturm, J.-E. and Williams, B. (2008). "Characteristics Determining The Efficiency of Foreign Banks in Australia", *Journal of Banking & Finance*, Vol: 32, pp. 2346–2360.
- Türkiye Katılım Bankaları Birliği (TKKBB), "Türk Finans Sisteminde Katılım Bankaları", 22 Şubat 2013, www.tkbb.org.tr.
- Uzgören, E. and Şahin, G. (2011). "Türk Bankacılık Sektöründeki Mevduat Bankalarının Yeniden Yapılandırma Uygulamaları Sonrası Finansal Etkinlik ve Verimlilik Değişimleri – Veri Zarflama Analizi ve Malmquist Toplam Faktör Verimliliği Endeksi Uygulaması", *Tisk Akademi*, Cilt: 6, Sayı: 12, pp. 185-216.
- Weill, L. (2003). "Banking Efficiency in Transition Economies: The Role of Foreign Ownership", *The European Bank for Reconstruction and Development*, Vol: 11, No. 3, pp.579.
- Yeşilyurt, C. and Alan, M., A. (2003). "Fen Liselerinin 2002 Yılı Göreceli Etkinliğinin Veri Zarflama Analizi (VZA) Yöntemi İle Ölçülmesi.", *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi*, Cilt 4, Sayı 2, pp. 91-104.
- Yiğidim, A. (2001). "Türkiye Ekonomisinde İstikrar Arayışları ve Yapısal Uyum Programı Sürecinde Büyüme için Stratejik Planın Önemi", *Türk Sosyal Bilimler Derneği Ulusal Sosyal Bilimler Kongresi*, 21-23 Kasım.
- Yolalan, R. (1996). "Türk Bankacılık Sektörü İçin Görelî Mali Performans Ölçümü", *Türkiye Bankalar Birliği Bankacılar Dergisi*, Sayı: 19, pp. 35-40.
- Zaim, O. (1993). "Mali Liberalizasyon ve Bankacılık Sektöründe Etkinlik", *İktisat İşletme ve Finans Dergisi*, Cilt: 8, Sayı: 88, pp. 44-51.

www.tbb.org.tr.

www.tkbb.org.tr.