

Estimating Technical and Scale Efficiency of Malaysian Commercial Banks : A Non-Parametric Approach

SUDIN HARON*

Abstract

The Structure of the Malaysian financial institutions has changed dramatically for the last twenty years. The commercial banks have undergone a tremendous development with the merger exercise. The study attempts to investigate technical and scale efficiency of commercial banks in Malaysia during the period 2000-2006 by using the non-parametric approach-Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA). The results suggest that the degree of scale efficiency was found to be lower than the degree of overall or technical efficiency which indicated that the portion of overall inefficiency is due to producing at an inefficient scale rather than producing below the production frontier. In addition, the results suggest that domestic banks were more efficient compared to foreign banks. The source of domestic banks inefficiency has been pure technical inefficiency implying that domestic banks have been producing below the production frontier. In contrast, foreign banks inefficiency was due to scale inefficiency.

1 Introduction

THE STRUCTURE OF the Malaysian financial institutions has changed dramatically for the last twenty years. In addition, global trend towards liberalization in banking has led to the blurring of demarcation lines separating activities of the different groups of financial institutions and the removal of artificial barrier to competition. Similarly, deposit taking, credit granting, investment, insurance and financial advisory services are being bundled into one financial conglomerate of financial supermarkets. The integration of financial markets within and across borders as well as mergers among banks, reflect attempts to increase financial industry efficiency. The Malaysian experience on the merger exercise is a good example. From 58 financial institutions, the number has to reduce to 10 anchor banks and this is to be completed by 31 December 2000. This was the result of the financial

* President, Kuala Lumpur Business School, Diamond Square Commercial Centre, Suite 4-1-1, Jalan 4/50, Off Jalan Gombak, Kuala Lumpur 53000, MALAYSIA

crisis which has weakened the domestic banking sector and the move towards consolidation is hoped to improve the efficiency of the banking sector.

The commercial banks have undergone a tremendous development with the merger exercise. Theoretically, bank merger could broaden the product mix and reduce cost and definitely large size capital and assets are crucial for a bank to become an efficient, competitive and powerful bank. These elements with good quality service will enable banks to compete with foreign banks at local as well as at international levels.

The objective of this paper is to estimate technical and scale efficiency of commercial banks in Malaysia for the period 2000-2006. The paper is structured as follows: the next section will discuss efficiency measurement in banking followed by methodology and data and specification of bank inputs and outputs. Empirical findings are discussed in the following section followed by conclusion.

II. Efficiency Measurement in Banking

Generally, efficiency means the maximum output that can be produced from any given total of inputs. This refers to the efficiency of a firm which allocates resources in such way as to produce the maximum quantity of output. In the context of efficiency of resource allocation, Shepherd (1997) pinpoints two categories: internal efficiency and allocative efficiency. Internal efficiency refers to effective management within the firm itself; for example, the ways in which management inspires the staff, controls costs and keeps operations lean. However, when a company is increased in size, profit flows are expected to increase too. Hence, management tends to become less effective. Such shortcomings in management are known as X-inefficiencies and can be attributed to the excess of actual costs over the minimum possible costs. In other words, X-inefficiency may be measured as excess costs divided by actual costs.

Early research in banking industry was mainly concerned with estimating the average productivity, using some sort of indices and with cost comparison (Farrell, 1957). Subsequently, researchers tended to proxy efficiency by market share. They assumed that banks with large market shares are expected to earn higher profits because of lower unit costs (Smirlock 1985 and Evanoff and Fortier 1988). In other words, banks with lower cost structures could maximize profits either by maintaining the current level of prices and size or reducing the price levels and expanding, a positive relationship between firms' profits and market structures being attributed to the gains made by more efficient firms.

The financial indicators of bank's operating performance, such as operating costs divided by total assets or the return on equity or assets, have also been used to compare efficiencies, for examples, Rhoades (1986), Cornett and Tehranian (1992) and Srinivisan and Wall (1992) studied the effect of

mergers among banks on efficiency. However, the use of financial ratios has its limitations. According to Berger, Hunter and Timme (1993), the first problem is that, financial ratios are regarded as misleading indicators of efficiency because they do not control for product mix or input prices. Secondly, using the cost-to-asset ratio assumes that all assets are equally costly to produce and all locations have equal costs of doing business. Finally, the use of simple ratios cannot distinguish between X-efficiency gains and scale and scope efficiency gains.

Recent approaches to measure bank efficiency include the parametric and non-parametric approach. These efficiency measurements differ primarily in how much shape is imposed on the frontier and the distributional assumptions imposed on the random error and inefficiency (Berger and Humphrey, 1997). In the research literature, both parametric and non-parametric approaches have been widely used but there is no consensus which of these major approaches is superior (Berger and Humphrey, 1997). There are three main parametric approaches used in estimating relative efficiency; the stochastic frontier approach, the thick frontier approach, the thick frontier and distribution-free estimates approach.

The stochastic frontier approach (SFA), sometimes also referred to as the econometric frontier approach (EFA), was developed by Aigner, Lovell and Schmidt (1977), and Meeusen and Van den Broeck (1977). In this approach, the SFA specifies a functional form for the cost, profit or the production frontier and allows for random error. The SFA modifies a standard cost (production) function to allow inefficiencies to be included in the error term. The predicted standard cost function is assumed to characterize the frontier while any inefficiency is captured in the error term, which is by construction orthogonal to the predicted frontier. This assumption forces any measured inefficiencies be uncorrelated with the regressors and any scale or product mix economies derived linearly from these explanatory variables (Ferrier and Lovell, 1990).

Another assumption needed in the SFA is to distinguish the inefficiencies from random components of the error terms. The random components include short term luck which place individual banks in relatively high or low cost positions and measurement error from excluded explanatory variables, misspecification etc. These two components are separated by assuming that inefficiencies are drawn from asymmetric half-normal distribution, and that random errors are drawn from a symmetric normal distribution. However, it is not possible to decompose individuals' residuals into inefficiency or random variation; therefore, estimating technical inefficiency by observation is impossible. Okuda, Hashimoto and Murakami, (2003) use SFA to estimate the cost function of the Malaysian commercial banks from 1991-1997 and its impact on bank restructuring. The study observed economies of scale but not economies of scope and suggest that Malaysian domestic banks were making unproductive capital investments.

The Thick Frontier Approach (TFA) has been applied to banking by Berger and Humphrey (1991, 1992). This approach, instead of estimating a frontier edge, compares the average efficiencies of groups of banks. A cost function for the lowest average cost quartile of banks is estimated and banks in this quartile are assumed to have greater than average efficiency and form a 'thick frontier'. Similarly, a cost function is also estimated for the highest average cost quartile and banks in this quartile presumably have less than average efficiency. Differences in error terms within the highest and lowest performance quartile of observations (stratified by size class) are assumed to represent random error, while the predicted cost differences between the highest and lowest quartile are assumed to reflect inefficiencies. This inefficiency residual is then decomposed into several types of inefficiencies. The TFA thus imposes no distributional assumptions on either inefficiency or random error except to assume that inefficiencies differ between the highest and lowest cost quartile and that random error exists within these quartiles.

In the distribution-free approach (DFA), a functional form for the frontier is also specified but inefficiencies are separated from random error in a different way. Unlike the SFA, the DFA makes no strong assumptions regarding the specific distributions of the inefficiencies or the random errors. The identifying assumption is that efficiency of each bank is stable over time, while random errors tend to average out over time. The estimates of inefficiency for each bank in a panel data set is then determined as the difference between its average residual and the average of the bank on the frontier with some truncated measure performed to account for the failure of the random error to fully average out. The truncation procedure is similar to the TFA treatment of outliers.¹ Therefore, the truncation procedure is used to remove some of the effects of the extreme observations by treating all the most efficient firms alike and, similarly, all the most inefficient firms alike.² The DFA has been applied to banking by Berger (1993) in the study of the US banking industry. He finds that the frequency distribution of inefficiencies appears to be closer to the shape of symmetric normal distribution than an asymmetric half-normal distribution. Yildirim and Philippatos (2007) use both SFA and DFA to examine the cost and profit efficiency of banking sectors in twelve countries in Europe and find that the average cost efficiency level was 72 percent by DFA and 77 percent by SFA.

Unlike the parametric approach, the non-parametric approach assumes that random error is zero so that all unexplained variations are treated as reflecting inefficiencies. Non-parametric approaches such as Data Envelopment Analysis and Free Disposal Hull, put relatively little structure on the specification of the best-practice frontier. Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) is rooted in the work of Farrell (1957), who used the economic concept of the production frontier and the production possibility set to define technical and allocative efficiencies and later proposed measures of relative inefficiencies. DEA was first introduced by Charnes, Cooper and Rhoades (1978) to describe an application of mathematical programming to observe

data to locate frontier which can then be used to evaluate the efficiency of each of the organizations responsible for the observed output and input quantities. The concept of DEA is similar to that of technical efficiency in the microeconomic theory of production. However, the main difference is that the DEA production frontier is not determined by some specific equation; instead it is generated from the actual data for the evaluated firms (DMUs). Therefore, the DEA efficiency score for a specific firm is defined not by an absolute standard but relative to the other firms under consideration. DEA also assumes that all firms face the same unspecified technology, which defines their production possibility set. The main objective of DEA is to determine which firms are operating on their efficient frontier and which firms are not. If the firm's input-output combination lies on the DEA frontier, the firm is considered efficient; and the firm is considered inefficient if the firm's input-output combination lies inside the frontier.

There are a number of studies examining relative efficiency using DEA (Sufian and Majid, 2007; Li, 2006; Sufian, 2006; Sufian, 2004; Katib and Mathews, 2000). Sufian and Majid, (2007) analyse efficiency change of Singapore commercial banks during the period of 1993-2003. They found that commercial banks in Singapore exhibited an average overall efficiency of 95.4 percent. Li (2006) investigates the scale-efficiency and technology-efficiency of 14 Chinese commercial banks. She concludes that most banks have low comparative-efficiency. She also finds that inefficient banks generally have input surplus. Sufian (2006) investigates the efficiency of non-bank financial institutions in Malaysia for the period 2000-2004. The study finds that finance companies were more efficient than merchant banks and that the inefficiency was the result of pure technical inefficiency rather than scale inefficiency. Using DEA to examine the efficiency effects of bank mergers and acquisition in Malaysia, Sufian (2004) finds that Malaysian banks has exhibited a commendable overall efficiency level of 95.9 percent during 1998-2003 which indicates that merger programme was successful. Katib and Mathews (2000) also use DEA to estimate the efficiency of 20 Malaysian commercial banks from 1989 to 1995. The results suggest that whilst efficiency ranges between 68 percent and 80 percent, the trend in efficiency is downwards.

Free Disposal Hull is a special case of the DEA model where the points on lines connecting the DEA vertices are not included in the frontier. Instead, the FDH production possibility set is composed of only the DEA vertices and the Free Disposal Hull point interior to these vertices. Because the FDH frontier is either congruent with or interior to the DEA frontier, FDH will typically generate larger estimates of average efficiency than DEA. The FDH approach therefore allows for a better approximation or 'envelopment' of the observed data.

III. Methodology

This study uses non-parametric approach-Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) to estimate technical and scale efficiency of Malaysian commercial banks. DEA is based on the concept of efficiency that has been widely used

in engineering and the natural sciences to measure the amount of work performed by a machine in relation to the amount of energy consumed in the process. The concept of DEA is similar to that of technical efficiency in the microeconomic theory of production. However, the main difference is that the DEA production frontier is not determined by some specific equation; instead it is generated from the actual data for the evaluated firms.³ Therefore, the DEA efficiency score for a specific firm is defined not by an absolute standard but relative to the other firms under consideration. This feature differentiates DEA from the parametric approaches discussed earlier, which required a specific functional form. DEA also assumes that all firms face the same unspecified technology, which defines their production possibility set. The main objective of DEA is to determine which firms are operating on their efficient frontier and which firms are not. If the firm's input-output combination lies on the DEA frontier, the firm is considered efficient; and the firm is considered inefficient if the firm's input-output combination lies inside the frontier.

Consider a general situation where we have n decision making units (DMUs) and each consumes the same m inputs to produce the same s outputs. Precisely, DMU _{j} uses x_{ij} ($i = 1, 2, 3, \dots, m$) of input i to produce y_{rj} ($r = 1, 2, \dots, s$) of output r assuming that $x_{ij} > 0$ and $y_{rj} > 0$ (Seiford and Thrall, 1990). The specific DMU being evaluated has to solve the following optimization problem:

$$\text{Max } h_0 = \sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{ro} / \sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{io} \quad (1)$$

subject to the constraints

$$\sum_{r=1}^s u_r y_{rj} / \sum_{i=1}^m v_i x_{ij} \leq 1, \quad u_r \geq 0, \quad (2)$$

for $i = 1, 2, \dots, m; r = 1, 2, \dots, s; j = 1, 2, \dots, n$. where h_0 is the ratio of virtual outputs to virtual inputs, the u_r 's and the v_i 's are the variables and the y_{ro} 's and the x_{jo} 's are the observed output and input values of the DMU to be evaluated. A set of normalizing constraints guarantees that no DMU, including the one evaluated, can obtain an efficiency score that exceeds unity. Thus, DEA establishes a benchmark efficiency score of unity that no individual firm can exceed. If the efficiency score $h_0 = 1$, DMU _{o} satisfies the necessary condition to be DEA efficient; otherwise it is DEA inefficient.

The basic DEA model (CCR model) implied the assumption of constant returns to scale. This assumption was later relaxed to allow for the evaluation of variable returns to scale and scale economies. Specifically, the efficient frontier may be derived using four alternative returns to scale assumptions; constant returns to scale (CR); variable returns to scale (VR), non-increasing returns to scale (NI); and non-decreasing returns to scale (ND). Yue (1992)

defines the following assumptions. A bank exhibits increasing returns to scale if a proportionate increase in inputs and outputs places it inside the production frontier; and constant returns to scale if a proportionate increase or decrease in inputs or outputs move the firm either along or above the frontier. A bank which is not on the frontier is defined as experiencing non-increasing returns to scale if the hypothetical bank with which it is compared, exhibits either constant or decreasing returns to scale. A similar definition applies for non-decreasing returns to scale. A firm which is efficient under the assumption of variable return to scale (VRS) is considered technologically efficient; the VRS score represents pure technical efficiency (PT), whereas a firm which is efficient under the assumption of constant returns to scale (CRS) is technologically efficient and also uses the most efficient scale of operation. Hassan *et. al.*, (1990), suggests that, from the measures of technical (T) and pure technical (PT) efficiency, it is possible to derive a measure of scale efficiency:

$$S = T/PT \text{ or} \quad (3)$$

$$S = CRS/VRS \quad (4)$$

where, $0 < S < 1$, since $CR < VR$. If the value of S equals 1, the firm is scale efficient and all values less than 1 reflect scale inefficiency. If scale inefficiency exists ($S < 1$), the source of inefficiency is the result of operating at either increasing ($NI < VR$) or decreasing ($NI = VR$) return to scale.

IV. Data and Specification of Bank Inputs and Outputs

This study includes all commercial banks where data is available. Nine domestic banks and 13 foreign banks were included (See Table I). The annual balance sheet and income statement were taken from BANKSCOPE - Fitch's International Bank Database.

The evaluation of bank efficiency creates several problems, which arise as a result of the nature and function of financial intermediaries, especially as banks are multi-products firms and they do not produce or market physical products. One of the major problems in the study of bank efficiency is the specification of bank inputs and outputs. There has been long-standing disagreement among researchers over what banks produce. The most debatable issue is the role of deposits and, more specifically, whether they should be treated as inputs and outputs. Some researchers such as Elyasiani and Mehdi (1990), and Lang and Welzel (1996), treat them as inputs, but researchers such as Berger and Humphrey (1991), and Ferrier and Lovell (1990), treat deposits as outputs while other researchers such as Humphrey (1990) and Aly, Grabowski, Pasurka and Rangan, (1990) treat them simultaneously as inputs and outputs.

Generally, there are two ways of measuring bank outputs: the production approach and the intermediation approach. Under the

production approach, banks produce accounts of various sizes by processing deposits and loans, and incurring capital and labour costs. Thus, in this approach, outputs are measured by the number of deposits and loan accounts or the number of transactions performed on each type of service provided, and costs are the operating costs needed to produce these products.

Under the intermediation approach, banks are treated as financial intermediaries that combine deposits, labour and capital to produce loans and investments. The values of loans and investments are treated as output measures; labour, deposits and capital are inputs; and operating costs and financial expenses comprise total cost.

Table I
List of Commercial Banks and Abbreviations

Banks	Abbreviations Used
Domestic Banks	
Affin Bank Berhad	AFB
Alliance Bank Malaysia Berhad	ALB
AmBank Malaysia Berhad	AMB
CIMB Bank Berhad	CIMB
EON Bank Berhad	EON
Hong Leong Bank Berhad	HLB
Malayan Banking Berhad	MBB
RHB Bank Berhad	RHB
Public Bank Berhad	PUB
Foreign Banks	
The Royal Bank of Scotland	RBS
Bangkok Bank Berhad	BBB
Bank of America	BOA
The Bank of Nova Scotia	BNS
Bank of China (Malaysia) Berhad	BOC
Bank of Tokyo-Mitsubishi UFJ (Malaysia) Berhad	BOT
Citibank Berhad	CTB
HSBC Bank Malaysia Berhad	HSBC
United Overseas Bank (Malaysia) Bhd.	UOB
Standard Chartered Bank Malaysia Berhad	SCB
JP Morgan Chase Bank Berhad	MCB
OCBC Bank (Malaysia) Berhad	OCBC
Deutsch Bank	DB

Source: Bank Negara Malaysia

The choice of input and output variables thus constitutes a major difficulty, which must be addressed carefully. Such a choice however, will be influenced by a number of factors, such as, the selected concept of the banking firm and the question under consideration. The availability of reliable information also has some effect on the measures used in published research on this topic. Moreover, whether products should be measured in terms of the number of accounts or dollar values depends on the various reasons being considered. For example, Kolari and Zardkoohi (1987), prefer

to use dollar values for three reasons: firstly, banks compete to increase the market share for dollar amounts, as opposed to the number of accounts; secondly, different accounts have different costs; for example, demand deposit accounts might be more costly to maintain than time deposit accounts (although, if these accounts were to have the same costs, then the use of the number of accounts would be equivalent); finally, banks are multi service firms and the dollar amount is the only common denominator; for example, securities investments cannot be measured in terms of number of accounts.

This study uses the intermediation approach to define bank inputs and outputs. Accordingly, two inputs and one output would be used consisting of:

- Y: Total Earning Assets
 X_1 : Total Deposits
 X_2 : Total Overhead Expenses

Table II presents the descriptive statistics of output and inputs used in the study.

Table II
Descriptive Statistics for Input and Output, 2000-2006 (in RM Million)

	Variable	N	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Dev.
All Banks							
	Y	147	28300.14	19669.00	508.90	189518.10	34256.54
	X_1	147	24477.63	17172.50	190.10	164392.60	29819.88
	X_2	147	1073.91	825.20	6.60	2784.00	1212.98
Domestic Banks							
	Y	59	53196.17	38644.60	8826.00	189518.10	40747.25
	X_1	59	46037.12	33733.30	6955.90	164392.60	35478.75
	X_2	59	761.70	571.90	124.20	2784.00	572.60
Foreign Banks							
	Y	88	11608.48	3124.30	508.90	39324.00	12660.97
	X_1	88	10022.98	2614.20	190.10	35417.30	11249.28
	X_2	88	191.09	63.25	6.60	875.10	231.24

Note: Y = Total earning assets,
 X_1 = Total deposits,
 X_2 = Total overhead expenses

Source: Authors' estimation.

V. Empirical Findings

All computation was performed using DEA Frontier program, a DEA Add-In Microsoft Excel. The efficiency of commercial banks in Malaysia was first examined by applying the DEA approach for each year by using a common frontier. We then examine the analysis by examining the efficiency of domestic banks only, foreign banks only and a pooled common frontier for all banks for all years. Table III reports the means, standard deviations and extreme values of the various efficiency scores for the years 2000, 2001, 2003, 2004, 2005, 2006, domestic banks, foreign banks and all banks for all years.

Table III
Descriptive Statistics of the Efficiency Measures

	Mean	Median	Minimum	Maximum	SD
(a) 2000 (N = 18)					
Overall efficiency	0.843	0.864	0.723	1.000	0.087
Pure technical efficiency	0.948	0.962	0.741	1.000	0.066
Scale efficiency	0.889	0.890	0.747	1.000	0.070
(b) 2001 (N = 20)					
Overall efficiency	0.860	0.845	0.740	1.000	0.080
Pure technical efficiency	0.957	0.994	0.799	1.000	0.058
Scale efficiency	0.898	0.880	0.822	1.000	0.059
(c) 2002 (N = 21)					
Overall efficiency	0.775	0.776	0.609	1.000	0.114
Pure technical efficiency	0.937	0.965	0.762	1.000	0.073
Scale efficiency	0.828	0.804	0.649	1.000	0.103
(d) 2003 (N = 22)					
Overall efficiency	0.821	0.793	0.654	1.000	0.118
Pure technical efficiency	0.930	0.962	0.776	1.000	0.080
Scale efficiency	0.881	0.882	0.763	1.000	0.076
(e) 2004 (N = 22)					
Overall efficiency	0.818	0.769	0.680	1.000	0.107
Pure technical efficiency	0.937	0.950	0.802	1.000	0.069
Scale efficiency	0.872	0.846	0.766	1.000	0.080
(f) 2005 (N = 22)					
Overall efficiency	0.813	0.788	0.633	1.000	0.114
Pure technical efficiency	0.948	0.978	0.835	1.000	0.062
Scale efficiency	0.856	0.830	0.730	1.000	0.084
(g) 2006 (N = 22)					
Overall efficiency	0.815	0.774	0.738	1.000	0.088
Pure technical efficiency	0.952	0.973	0.868	1.000	0.053
Scale efficiency	0.856	0.854	0.744	1.000	0.071
(h) Domestic banks (N = 59)					
Overall efficiency	0.887	0.879	0.788	1.000	0.049
Pure technical efficiency	0.924	0.925	0.807	1.000	0.054
Scale efficiency	0.961	0.975	0.862	1.000	0.036
(i) Foreign Banks (N = 88)					
Overall efficiency	0.733	0.718	0.516	1.000	0.126
Pure technical efficiency	0.915	0.917	0.732	1.000	0.073
Scale efficiency	0.803	0.777	0.574	1.000	0.132
(j) Overall (2000-2006; N = 147)					
Overall efficiency	0.709	0.692	0.516	1.000	0.105
Pure technical efficiency	0.893	0.895	0.726	1.000	0.069
Scale efficiency	0.794	0.771	0.608	1.000	0.098

Note: SD = Standard Deviations

Based on the constructed frontiers, commercial banks have exhibited mean overall efficiency score of 84.3 percent in 2000, increased to 86 percent in 2001, declined to 77.5 percent in 2002 and improved to 82.1 percent in 2003 before gradually decreased slightly to 81.8 percent, 81.3 percent and 81.5 percent in years 2004, 2005 and 2006 respectively. For each year, it appears that pure technical efficiency is higher than scale efficiency, and that bank inefficiency was attributed to scale rather than pure technical.

Our results from Table III suggest that domestic banks have exhibited mean overall efficiency of 88.7 percent compared to foreign banks (73.3

percent). Our results also suggest that domestic banks have exhibited higher pure technical and scale efficiency (92.4 percent and 96.1 percent) than foreign banks (91.5 percent and 80.3 percent) respectively, implying that domestic banks were more managerially efficient in controlling costs and have been operating at the right scale of operation compared to foreign banks. The decomposition of the overall efficiency into pure technical and scale efficiency suggest that domestic banks inefficiency was attributed to pure technical rather than scale. In contrast, foreign banks inefficiency was attributed to scale rather than pure technical.

The results for all commercial banks for all years suggest that commercial banks have exhibited mean overall efficiency of 70.9 percent. Further, the decomposition of the overall efficiency into pure technical efficiency and scale efficiency suggest that scale inefficiency (20.6 percent) dominates pure technical inefficiency (10.7 percent) of Malaysian commercial banks during all years under investigation. This implies that during 2000 to 2006, commercial banks in Malaysia have been operating at an inefficient scale.

Most of technical inefficiency exhibited by the banks stem from operating at the wrong scale; either operating at a scale that was too large (DRS) or operating at a scale that was too small (IRS). This study then examines further the trend in the returns to scale of Malaysian commercial banks. As Table IV shows, 198 banks or 87.1 percent experiencing either increasing returns to scale (11 banks or 7.5 percent) or decreasing returns to scale (117 banks or 79.6 percent). The number of banks experiencing increasing returns to scale has decreased from 3 in 2000 to 0 in 2006, whereas the number of banks experiencing decreasing returns to scale has increased from 12 in 2000 to 21 in 2006.

Table IV
Returns to Scale (RTS) in Malaysian Commercial Banks

Year	No. of Banks/ Percentage Share	RTS			Total
		IRS	CRS	DRS	
2000	No. of banks	3.0	3.0	12.0	18.0
	% Share	16.7	16.7	66.7	100.0
2001	No. of banks	4.0	3.0	13.0	20.0
	% share	20.0	15.0	65.0	100.0
2002	No. of banks	1.0	2.0	18.0	21.0
	% Share	4.8	9.5	85.7	100.0
2003	No. of banks	0.0	4.0	18.0	22.0
	% Share	0.0	18.2	81.8	100.0
2004	No. of banks	2.0	3.0	17.0	22.0
	% Share	9.1	13.6	77.3	100.0
2005	No. of banks	1.0	3.0	18.0	22.0
	% Share	4.5	13.6	81.8	100.0
2006	No. of banks	0.0	1.0	21.0	22.0
	% Share	0.0	4.5	95.5	100.0
All (2000-2006)	No. of banks	11.0	19.0	117.0	147.0
	% Share	7.5	12.9	79.6	100.0

VI. Conclusions

This study attempts to investigate the efficiency of Malaysian commercial banks during the period of 2000-2006. Using non-parametric approach Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) methodology which enable us to distinguish between technical, pure technical and scale efficiencies. We have run tests for each year, domestic banks, foreign banks, and for all banks for all years.

The results suggest that the mean overall or technical efficiency has been 84.3 percent in 2000, increasing to 86 percent in 2001, decreasing to 77.5 percent in 2002, increasing again to 82.1 percent in 2003, remaining stable in 2004 to 2006, 81.8 percent, 81.3 percent and 81.5 percent respectively.

During the period of study, we found that overall or technical efficiency of domestic banks is 88.7 percent, slightly higher than the foreign banks overall or technical efficiency (73.3 percent). The results suggest that domestic banks pure technical efficiency is lower than the degree of scale efficiency implying that during the period of study domestic banks have been inefficient in controlling their costs rather than operating at the wrong scale. In contrast, foreign banks pure technical efficiency is higher than scale efficiency indicating that foreign banks were operating at the wrong scale of operations rather than producing below the production frontier.

Overall, for all the years (2000-2006), pure technical efficiency dominates the scale efficiency effects in determining the Malaysian commercial banks overall or technical efficiency. 79.6 percent of the banks experiencing decreasing returns to scale, 7.5 percent experiencing increasing returns to scale while 12.9 percent were operating at optimal scale.

Further research should take into consideration on the issue whether it is appropriate to have a separate frontier for domestic banks or to have a combined frontier for both.

Notes

1. In the TFA approach, data are averages within the very highest and lowest average cost quartile.
2. Lang and Welzel (1996) used a fixed effects model where a dummy variable is specified for each bank in a panel data set. Differences in the fixed effects estimated across banks represent bank inefficiencies. Berger (1993) finds that the fixed effects approaches (under Method 2) were confounded by large differences in scale.
3. In DEA, the entities responsible for converting inputs into outputs are known as Decision Making Units (DMUs)

References

- Aly, H. Y., R. Grabowski, C. Pasurka and N. Rangan, (1990), "Technical, Scale and Allocative Efficiencies in US Banking: An Empirical Investigation", *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, Vol. 72, 1990, pp. 211-218.
- Aigner, D. A., A.K. Lovell and P. Schmidt, (1977), "Formulation and Estimation of Stochastic Frontier Production Models", *Journal of Econometrics*, Vol. 6, 1977, pp. 21-37.
- Berger, A. N., (1993), "Distribution-Free" Estimates of Efficiency in the US Banking Industry and Tests of the Standard Distributional Assumptions", *The Journal of Productivity Analysis*, Vol. 4, 1993, pp. 261-92.
- Berger, A. N. and D.B. Humphrey, (1991), "The Dominance of Inefficiencies Over Scale and Product Mix Economies in Banking", *Journal of Monetary Economics*, Vol. 28, 1991, pp. 117-48.
- Berger, A. N. and D.B. Humphrey, (1992), "Mega mergers in Banking and the Use of Cost Efficiency as an Antitrust Defence", *The Antitrust Bulletin*, Vol. 38, No. 3, 1992, pp. 541-600.
- Berger, A. N. and D.B. Humphrey, (1997), "Efficiency of Financial Institutions: International survey and Directions for Future Research", *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol. 98, 1997, pp. 175-212.
- Berger, A. N., W.C. Hunter and S.G. Timme, (1993), "The Efficiency of Financial Institutions: A Review and Preview of Past, Present, and Future", *Journal of Banking and Finance*, Vol. 17, 1993, pp. 221-49.
- Charnes, A., W.W. Cooper and E. Rhoades, (1978), "Measuring the Efficiency of Decision Making Units", *European Journal of Operational Research*, Vol. 6, 1978, pp. 429-444.
- Coelli, T.J., (1996), "A Guide to FRONTIER Version 4.1: A Computer Programme for Stochastic Frontier Production and Cost Function Estimation", CEPA Working Papers No.7, 1996.
- Cornett, M. M. and H. Tehranian, (1992), "Changes in Corporate Performance Associated with Bank Acquisition", *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 31, 1992, pp. 211-234.
- Elyasiani, E. and S.M. Mehdiian, (1990), "A Nonparametric Approach to Measurement of Efficiency and Technological Change: The Case of Large U.S. Commercial Banks", *Journal of Financial Services Research*, Vol. 4, No. 2, July 1990, pp. 57-68.
- Evanoff, D.D. and D.L. Fortier, (1988), "Re-evaluation of the Structure-Conduct-Performance Paradigm in Banking", *Journal of Financial Services Research*, Vol. 1, 1988, pp. 277-94.
- Farell, M. J. (1957), "The Measurement of Productive Efficiency", *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society*, Vol. 120, No. 111, Series A, 1957, pp. 253-81.
- Ferrier, G. D. and C.K. Lovell, (1990), "Measuring Cost Efficiency in Banking: Econometrics and Linear Programming Evidence", *Journal of Econometrics*, Vol. 46, 1990, pp. 229-245.
- Humphrey, D. B., (1990), "Why Do Estimates of Bank Scale Economies Differ?", *Economic Review, Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond*, September-October 1990, pp. 38-50.

- Katib, M. Nasser and K. Mathews, (2000), "A Non-Parametric Approach to Efficiency Measurement in the Malaysian Banking Sector", *The Singapore Economic Review*, Vol. 44, 2000, pp. 89-114.
- Kolari, J. and A. Zardkoohi, (1987), "Bank Cost, Structure and Performance", Lexington, Mass: Lexington Books, 1987.
- Lang, G., and P. Welzel, (1996), "Efficiency and Technical Progress in Banking: Empirical Results for a Panel of German Cooperative Banks", *Journal of Banking and Finance*, Vol. 20, 1996, pp. 1003-23.
- Li, Z., (2006), "The Assessment Analysis of Efficiency of Commercial Banks based on DEA Model", *International Management Review*, Vol. 2, No. 3, 2006, pp. 60-66.
- Meesun, W. and J.V.D.Broeck, (1977), "Efficiency Estimation from Cobb-Douglas Production Functions with Composed Error", *International Economic Review*, Vol. 18, No. 2, June 1977, pp. 435-44.
- Okuda, H., H. Hashimoto and M. Murakami, (2003), "The Estimation of Stochastic Cost Functions of Malaysian Commercial Banks and its Policy Implications to Bank Restructuring", Centre for Economic Institutions Working Paper Series No. 2, 2003.
- Rhoades, S. A., (1986), "The Operating Performance of Acquired Firms in Banking Before and After Acquisition", Staff Study No. 149, Federal Reserve Board, 1986.
- Shepherd, W. G., (1997), "The Economics of Industrial Organization", 4th Edition, Prentice-Hall International, 1997, New Jersey.
- Smirlock, M., (1985), "Evidence on the (Non) Relationship Between Concentration and Profitability in Banking", *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 1985, Vol. 17, 1958, pp. 69-83.
- Srinivasan, A., and L.D.Wall, (1992), "Cost Savings Associated with Bank Mergers", Working Paper 92-2", *Federal Reserve Bank of Atlanta*, Vol. 32, 1992, pp. 1251-1266.
- Sufian, F., (2004), "The Efficiency Effects of Bank Mergers and Acquisitions in Developing Economy: Evidence from Malaysia", *International Journal of Applied Econometrics and Quantitative Studies*, Vol. 1, No. 4, 2004, pp. 53-74.
- Sufian, F., (2006), "The Efficiency of Non-Bank Financial Institutions: Empirical Evidence from Malaysia", *International Journal of Finance and Economics*. No. 6, 2006, retrieved from www.eurojournals.com/finance.htm.
- Sufian, F. and M.Z. Abdul Majid, (2007), "Singapore Banking Efficiency and its Relation to Stock Returns: A DEA Window Analysis Approach", *International Journal of Business Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 1, 2007, pp. 83-106.
- Yildirim, H. S. and G. C. Philippatos, (2007), "Efficiency of Banks: Recent Evidence from the Transition Economies of Europe, 1993-2000", *The European Journal of Finance*, Vol. 13, No. 2, 2007, pp. 123-143.
- Yue, P., (1992), Data Envelopment Analysis and Commercial Bank Performance: A Primer with Applications to Missouri banks", *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis*, January-February 1992, pp. 31-45.