

https://dspace.org/

COST AND PROFIT EFFICIENCY OF SOUTH

Siyaka, Nokuthula

2011-06-15
http://hdl.handle.net/10539/10120

Downloaded from a DSpace repository. https://dspace.org/

COST AND PROFIT EFFICIENCY OF SOUTH AFRICAN BANKS

Nokuthula Siyaka

A research report submitted to the Faculty of Commerce, Law and Management, University of the Witwatersrand, in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Business Administration.

Johannesburg

October 2006

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to analyse the cost and profit efficiency of banks in South Africa. The cost-to-income ratio has always been used in the South African banking sector in measuring efficiency. However this approach is very simplistic and does not provide enough insight on real profit efficiency.

This research uses a stochastic frontier model to determine both cost and profit efficiency of four large and four small, South African-based banks. The results of the study show that South African banks have significantly improved their cost efficiencies between 2000 and 2005. However efficiency gains on profitability, over the same time period, have not been significant. No bank was found to be superior to another in terms of achieving efficiency gains in cost reduction and profitability.

A weak positive correlation was found to exist between the cost and profit efficiencies, with the most cost efficient banks also being most profit efficient. With regard to bank size, cost efficiency declined with increasing bank size.

DECLARATION

I declare that this research report is my own unaided work. It is submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Business Administration in the University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg. It has not been submitted before for any degree or examination in any other university.

Nokuthula Siyaka

Date:

DEDICATION

This work is dedicated to my husband, Patrick Mabuza

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to record my thanks and sincere gratitude to those whose collective help and support made this study possible.

My sincere thanks to:

- Prof. Mthuli Ncube, my supervisor for his guidance, intellectual input and enthusiasm.
- Bankseta, for funding my MBA studies,
- First National Bank, for allowing time off from work to pursue my studies full-time.
- Staff from all the different banks used in the study for their assistance in data collection.
- My husband, Patrick Mabuza for his love, support and encouragement throughout my studies.
- My mother; Ivy Nombeko Siyaka, sisters; Nobantu, Nombulelo, Vuyiswa and brother Sandile, for their support and belief in me.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TITLE PAGE ..... **i**

ABSTRACT ii

DECLARATION iii

DEDICATION iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v

TABLE OF CONTENTS vi

1 INTRODUCTION 1

1.1 PURPOSE OF STUDY 1
1.2 CONTEXT OF STUDY 1
1.3 PROBLEM STATEMENT 2
1.4 SIGNIFICANCE OF STUDY 3
1.5 LIMITATIONS 3
1.6 DEFINITION OF TERMS 4
1.7 ASSUMPTIONS 5
1.8 STRUCTURE OF THE REPORT 5

2 LITERATURE REVIEW 6

2.1 EFFICIENCY IN BANKING 6
2.2 EFFICIENCY CONCEPTS IN BANKING 7
2.2.1 Cost efficiency 7
2.2.2 Standard Profit Efficiency (SP) 9
2.2.3 Alternative (Non-Standard) Profit Efficiency 10
2.2.4 Relationship between cost efficiency and profit efficiency 12
2.3 INPUTS AND OUTPUTS FOR EFFICIENCY CONCEPTS 12
2.4 EFFICIENCY MEASUREMENT METHODS 13
2.4.1 Accounting approach 13
2.4.2 Econometric Approach 14

2.5 FACTORS INFLUENCING BANK EFFICIENCY 16
2.5.1 Bank size 16
2.5.2 Management structure 17
2.5.3 Bank Ownership 17
2.6 THE SOUTH AFRICAN BANKING SECTOR LANDSCAPE 18
2.7 CONCLUSION ON LITERATURE REVIEW 19

3 HYPOTHESES 20

4 METHODOLOGY 21

4.1 POPULATION 21
4.2 SAMPLE 21
4.3 MODELLING 22
4.3.1 Cost Frontier 23
4.3.2 Profit Frontier 24
4.3.3 Software package 25
4.4 DATA COLLECTION 25
4.5 DATA ANALYSIS 26
4.5.1 Hypothesis testing 26
4.5.2 Correlation Analysis 27
4.6 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY 28
4.6.1 Internal validity 28
4.6.2 External validity 28
4.6.3 Reliability 29

5 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS 30

5.1 INPUT FINANCIAL DATA 30
5.2 EFFICIENCY ESTIMATES 30
5.3 COST INEFFICIENCY VALUES 32
5.4 PROFIT EFFICIENCY VALUES 33
5.5 RESULTS OF HYPOTHESIS TESTING 34
5.5. 1 Hypothesis tests 1 and 2 34
5.5. 2 Testing hypothesis 3 36
5.5. 2 Testing of Hypothesis 4 37

6 INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS 41

6.1 ANALYSIS OF EFFICIENCY ESTIMATES 41
6.2 COST EFFICIENCY 41
6.3 PROFIT EFFICIENCY. 43
6.4 CORRELATION BETWEEN COST AND PROFIT EFFICIENCY 44
6.5 CORRELATION BETWEEN COST EFFICIENCY AND BANK SIZE 45

7 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS 46

7.1 SUMMARY 46
7.2 SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH 46

8 REFERENCES 48

APPENDIX 52

LIST OF TABLES

Page

Table 1: Variables used in estimation of cost and profit functions…… 23

Table 2: Bank size based on loans, deposits and number of employees...30

Table 3: The cost and profit frontier parameter estimates…….. 31

Table 4: Cost efficiencies of South African banks……..32

Table 5: Profit efficiencies of South African Banks……3**3**

Table 6 (a) : ANOVA test results on the difference in cost efficiencies……..35

Table 6 (b) : Krusral-Wallis Multiple Comparison Z-Value Test…… 35

Table 7: ANOVA test results on the difference in profit efficiencies……. 36

Table 8: Correlation matrix between cost and profit efficiency……37

Table 9: Correlation between cost efficiency and bank size……38

Table 10: Summary statistics for the regression between cost efficiency and bank size……..39

Table 11: Summary statistics for cost efficiency…..……42

LIST OF FIGURES

Page

Figure 1: Summary explanation of coefficiemt of correlation……27

Figure 2: Mean cost inefficiency values for the 6 banks ……..33

Figure 3: Mean profit efficiency values for the 6 banks…….34

Figure 4: Plot of cost efficiency against bank size……..39

1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Purpose of study

The purpose of the research is to investigate the cost and profit efficiency of South African banks, over the period of 2000-2005.

1.2 Context of study

South African banks are being faced with increasing competition and rising operational costs as a result of regulation requirements, entry of large foreign banks in the retail banking environment and the Financial Services Charter, amongst other factors. This puts pressure on the banks to review efficiencies if they are to remain competitive locally and in a global sense.

A number of studies have been carried out globally, mainly focused on the cost efficiency of banks and the drivers of the differences. However looking only at cost efficiency does not give a complete picture so there has been an increasing move by researchers to investigate both cost and profit efficiency (Berger & Mester, 1997; Isik & Hassan, 2002).

In the literature, bank performance is still predominantly measured using accounting methods by comparing financial ratios related to costs and profitability. Whilst this is useful, using financial ratios as a sole measure of performance has been criticised by many researchers (Yen, 1996; Berger & Humphrey, 1997) to be limited in scope. There is therefore a need to use other approaches in measuring bank efficiencies, and the econometric approach is one option for use.

In South Africa there has been limited work done that investigates the efficiency of the banking sector using the econometric approach. Research done by Oberholzer & van der Westhuizen (2004) was narrow in scope in that it investigated the efficiencies of ten branches of one local bank. The other work done by Bedari (2004) in this field was focused on banks in Botswana and Namibia and the three South African banks covered in the study were only used for comparison purposes. Ikhide (2000) also conducted research on banks in Namibia, over the period of 1996 to 1998 and compared these

results to those for other countries in the sub-Saharan region, including South Africa.

Napier (2005) stated that South African banks operate as a complex monopoly, with perceived high barriers to entry. A report by Falkena *et al* (2004), indicate that South African banks have outperformed their peers in terms of their profitability, over a sustained period. Isik & Hassan (2002) in a study of Turkish banks that are also oligopolistic in nature, found that the Turkish banks were better at controlling costs than generating profit. This indicates that they have high cost efficiency even if they are profit inefficient. It would be useful to understand if the profitability being realised by South African banks is due to high efficiencies. It would also be meaningful to understand if there are differences in cost and profit efficiencies for different bank sizes.

1.3 Problem Statement

Main problem

The aim of the research is to determine if there has been an improvement in the cost and profit efficiency of South African banks over a period of time. The research will also establish if there is a relationship between cost efficiency and bank size.

Sub-problems

The first sub-problem is to determine if there has been a change in cost efficiency of South African banks over time.

The second sub-problem is to determine if there has been a change in profit efficiency of South African banks over time.

The third sub-problem is to determine if there is a relationship between cost efficiency and profit efficiency for South African banks.

The fourth sub-problem is to determine if cost efficiency is related to bank size for South African banks.

1.4 Significance of study

Invariably the South African banking sector, currently use accounting approaches to measure cost and profit performance. However these methods have limitations (Yen, 1996; Berger & Humprey, 1997). Based on the literature, the econometric approach for measuring cost and profit efficiency proposed for this research is considered superior to the accounting-based ratios. This research presents an alternative approach that can be used by researchers and management in the banking sector in determining and comparing cost and profit efficiency among South African banks.

Berger & Humphrey (1997: 175) indicated that, “evaluating the performance of financial institution can inform government policy by assessing the effects of deregulation, mergers and market structure on efficiency”. On a micro-level, it can help improve managerial performance by identifying best and worst practices associated with high and low measured efficiency.

This research evaluates the cost and profit efficiency of South African banks over time in order to explain any changes based on prevailing economic conditions. This is useful to bank managers in understanding how cost and profit efficiencies have been affected by a number of economic, regulatory and competition factors. It will also help inform their strategies, should they be faced with similar issues in the future. It will also enable bank managers to compare their efficiencies with other local banks.

1.5 Limitations

- The study does not cover the whole spectrum of banks operating in South Africa between 2000 and 2005 due to difficulty in getting financial statements of all the banks, especially those that are not listed on the Johannesburg Stock Exchange (JSE).

- The annual reports used are for the Banking Group, which for some banks includes non-South African operations, and that of investments banks which are part of the group. It was difficult to extract consistent information solely for the South African banking operations or retail banking only.

- The data for small banks is only over four years and not the entire period (2000-2006), leading to unbalanced panel data.

- A small sample size (8 banks) was used, and therefore non-parametric techniques which are not always reliable were used for the hypotheses tests.

- A number of accounting and economic approaches are available for determining cost and profit efficiency of banks. For the purposes of this study only one approach, the Stochastic Frontier Approach (SFA) was used for both cost and profit efficiency. No attempt was made to try and compare results using other methods.

1.6 Definition of terms

Cost efficiency is a measure of how close a bank's cost is to what a best practice bank's costs would be for producing the same output bundle under the same conditions.

Cost-to-income ratio is operating expenses as a percentage of total income

Standard Profit Efficiency is a measure of how close a bank is to producing the maximum possible profit given a particular level of input and output prices.

Alternative Profit Efficiency is a measure of how close a bank comes to earning maximum profit given its output levels rather than its output prices.

X-inefficiency is a measure of the loss of allocative and technical efficiency (allocative and technical efficiency are defined in the literature review section 2.1)

1.7 Assumptions

- The data used is from reliable sources.
- The financial statements from which data has been extracted for this research have no qualified opinion by the auditors.
- The strategic objective of the banking group is consistent with the overall objective of the group that the bank belongs to, hence annual reports of the group can be used for this study.

1.8 Structure of the Report

The report presents an overview on efficiency in banking and the different models that are used to represent efficiency as well as measurement methods. This section, Section 2 also highlights the benefits of using econometric models over accounting approaches to measure efficiency as well as the factors that influences efficiency in banking.

Section 3 presents the hypothesis to be tested in the study, with the methodology used to measure efficiency and test the hypotheses in Section 4.

The results are presented in Section 5, and then analysed and discussed in Section 6. The conclusions are drawn and recommendations on possible areas for future research made in Section 7.

2 LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this research is to determine the cost and profit efficiency of South African banks. This literature review provides a definition of efficiency, the efficiency concepts that are applicable to banking and the different methods used to measure efficiency. It also outlines some of the factors influencing efficiency of banks and provides a broad overview of the South African banking sector.

2.1 Efficiency in banking

The presence of inefficiencies is considered an inherent feature of banking. According to Turati (2003:2), “banks are regarded as firms that emerge as a result of some sort of market imperfections, hence they bring about a certain degree of inefficiency with respect to perfect competitive outcomes”. A study conducted by the European commission in 2001 supported the above thinking when it revealed that European banks were particularly inefficient (Turati, 2003). Banking efficiency is important at both macro and micro levels and in order to allocate resources effectively, banks should be sound and efficient Hussein (2000).

Efficiency in banking can be distinguished between allocative and technical efficiency. Allocative efficiency is the extent to which resources are being allocated to the use with the highest expected value. A firm is technically efficient if it produces a given set of outputs using the smallest possible amount of inputs (Falkena *et al*, 2004). Outputs could be loans or total balance of deposits, while inputs include labour, capital and other operating costs. A firm is also said to be cost efficient if it is both allocatively and technically efficient (Mester, 1997). Studies on X-inefficiency, which is a measure of the loss of allocative and technical efficiency, has been carried out particularly internationally. The results showed that X-inefficiency is between 20-30 % of total banking costs in the US (Berger & Mester, 1997). According to Falkena *et al* (2004:38), “the notion of X-inefficiency suggests that comfortable incumbents may not produce in the most efficient method. If a few players dominate the market, they may be sheltered from competitive forces and may use rule-of-thumb rather than best practice methods”.

Commercial banks have been operating in an increasingly competitive environment (Isik & Hassan 2002; Mester 1997; Yeh, 1996). The long term viability of commercial banks operating in this environment depends in part on how efficiently they are being run (Mester, 1997). The efficient and effective use of resources is a key objective of every banker. Whilst this issue has always been relevant, global trends such as increasing competition for financial services, deregulation, technological innovations and banking consolidation has brought more attention on controlling costs and providing products and services more efficiently (Spong, Sullivan & De Young, 1995).

According to Yeh (1996), the competitive banking environment has heightened the need to evaluate risks and returns involved in banking. There is also a need to explore other methods besides financial ratios for assessing economic performance and management quality of banks.

2.2 Efficiency Concepts in Banking

When measuring efficiency of financial institutions, a fundamental decision to be made is which efficiency concept to use. There are three most important economic efficiency concepts currently being used namely cost, profit and alternative profit efficiency. These are well documented by Berger & Mester (1997). The choice on the appropriate concept to use is informed by the problem being addressed.

2.2.1 Cost efficiency

According to Maudos, Pastor, Perez & Quesada (2002:38), “cost efficiency corresponds to one of two most important economic objectives; cost minimization”. It is derived from a cost function in which variable costs depend on the input prices, quantities of variable outputs and any fixed inputs or outputs, environmental factors, random error and efficiency (Berger & Mester, 1997). According to Aigner, Lovell & Schmidt (1977), the cost function can be written as

$$C = C(w, y, z, v, u_c, \varepsilon_c) \quad (1)$$

and $Uc = Z_{it}\delta + \psi_{it}$ (2)

where *C* measures variable costs, *w* is a vector of prices of variable inputs, *y* is the vector of quantities of any fixed netputs (inputs/outputs), *v* is a set of environmental or market variables that may affect performance and u_c is an inefficiency factor that may raise costs above the best-practice level and ε_c is a random error term

The inefficiency and random terms are assumed to be multiplicatively separable from the rest of the cost function and both sides of (1) are represented in natural logs.

$$\ln C = f(w, y, z, v,) + \ln u_c + \ln \varepsilon_c \quad (3)$$

f denotes some functional form. The cost efficiency of bank *b* is estimated as the cost needed to produce *b*'s output vector if the bank was as efficient as the best-practice bank in the sample facing the same exogenous variables (*w,y,z,v*) divided by the actual cost of bank *b* , adjusted for random error i.e.,

$$CostEFF^b = \frac{C^{\min}}{C^b} = \frac{\exp\left[f(w^b, y^b, z^b, v^b)\right] \times \exp\left[\ln u_C^{\min}\right]}{\exp\left[f(w^b, y^b, z^b, v^b\right] \times \exp\left[\ln_C^b\right]} \quad (4)$$

where $u_C^{\min}$ is the minimum u_C^b across all banks in the sample.

According to Berger & Mester (1997), the cost efficiency ratio may be thought of as proportion of costs or resources that are used efficiently.

A translog functional form is the most frequently used for cost efficiency in literature. A generic translog cost function proposed by English, Grosskopf, Hayes & Yaisawarng (1993) is

$$\ln C(x, y) = \alpha_o + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \beta_n \ln x_n + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m \ln y_m + 0.5 \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{n'=1}^{N} \beta_{nn'} \ln x_n \ln x_{n'} + 0.5 \sum_{m=1}^{M} \sum_{m'=1}^{M} \alpha_{mm'} \ln y_m \ln y_{m'} + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \sum_{m=1}^{M} \gamma_{nm} \ln x_n \ln y_m \quad (5)$$

The equation is based on the fact that the bank's total operational costs (C) are a function of *x* and *y* and a composite error term. The variable *x*, is a vector of quantities of the bank's variable outputs and *y* a vector of the prices for the variable input. Cost efficiency ranges between zero and one and equals one for the best-practice bank in the sample.

The Fourier-flexible functional form has been used as an alternative to the translog, especially in studies of US banks. While this form is more flexible, it is very sensitive to the number of observations and may not be suitable for small samples (Ikhide, 2000), such as that of 8 banks in our research.

2.2.2 Standard Profit Efficiency (SP)

In contrast to cost efficiency, standard profit efficiency indicates performance based on the ability to generate revenues by varying outputs as well as inputs The profit function from which profit efficiencies are obtained does not hold all output quantities statistically fixed at their observed, possibly inefficient levels (Isik & Hassan, 2002).

The standard profit function in log form is

$$\ln(\pi + \theta) = f(w, p, z, v,) + \ln u_{\pi} + \ln \varepsilon_{\pi} \qquad (6)$$

where π is the variable profits of the firm, which includes all the interest and fee income earned on the variable outputs minus variable costs *C* used in the cost function; θ is a constant added to every firm's profit so that the natural log taken is of a positive number; *p* is a vector of prices of the variable outputs, ln ε_{π} represents random error and ln u_{π} represents inefficiency that reduces the profits.

$$Std\pi EFF^{b} = \frac{\pi^{b}}{\pi^{\max}} = \frac{\exp\left[f(w^{b}, p^{b}, z^{b}, v^{b})\right] \times \exp\left[\ln u_{\pi}^{b}\right] - \theta}{\exp\left[f(w^{b}, p^{b}, z^{b}, v^{b}\right] \times \exp\left[\ln u_{\pi}^{\max}\right] - \theta} \qquad (7)$$

where $u_{\pi}^{\max}$ is the maximum value of u_{π}^{b} in the sample

Standard profit efficiency is the proportion of maximum profits that are earned.

Berger & Mester (1997) consider the profit efficiency concept to be superior to the cost efficiency concept for evaluating the overall performance of a firm. First, profit efficiency is based on a profit maximization, which requires that the same amount of focus is placed on maximizing marginal revenue as to reducing marginal costs. Second, the profit function deals with both input and outputs inefficiencies whilst the cost function accounts for only inefficiencies in inputs (Vivas, 1997). Finally a bank can be inefficient if it produces too few, or a non-optimal mix of outputs given the inputs it uses and the prices it faces. As highlighted by Isik & Hassan (2002:264), "cost efficiency models ignore this possibility and thus can misrepresent the nature and extent of efficiency of banks".

2.2.3 Alternative (Non-Standard) Profit Efficiency

Unlike in the standard efficiency concept, the alternative profit efficiency measures how close a bank is to generating maximum profits given its output levels instead of output prices (Isik & Hassan, 2002). It employs the same dependent variables as the standard profit function and the same exogenous variables as the cost function. Output prices are free to vary and affect profits (Berger & Mester, 1997). The alternative profit function can be represented in translog form as follows

$$\ln(\pi+\theta) = f(w,y,z,v,) + \ln u_{a\pi} + \ln \varepsilon_{a\pi} \tag{8}$$

Alternative profit efficiency is the ratio of predicted actual profits to the predicted maximum profits for a best-practice bank.

$$Alt\pi EFF^{b} = \frac{a\pi^{b}}{a\pi_{\max}} = \frac{\exp\left[f(w^{b},y^{b},z^{b},v^{b})\right]\times\exp\left[\ln u_{a\pi}^{b}\right]-\theta}{\exp\left[f(w^{b},y^{b},z^{b},v^{b}\right]\times\exp\left[\ln_{a\pi}^{\max}\right]-\theta} \tag{9}$$

where $u^{b}_{\max}$ is the maximum value of u^{b}_{π} in the sample

The alternative profit function employs the same independent variables as the cost function, as shown below (Isik & Hasan, 2002)

$$\ln(\pi+\theta) = \alpha_o + \sum_{n=1}^{N} \beta_n \ln x_n + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \alpha_m \ln y_m + 0.5\sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{n'=1}^{N} \beta_{nn'} \ln x_n \ln x_{n'} + 0.5\sum_{m=1}^{M}\sum_{m'=1}^{M} \alpha_{mm'} \ln y_m \ln y_{m'} + \sum_{n=1}^{N}\sum_{m=1}^{M} \gamma_{nm} \ln x_n \ln y_m \quad (10)$$

Berger & Mester (1997), De Young & Hasan (1998) provide conditions where the alternative profit efficiency concept is superior to both the cost and standard efficiency methods. The conditions are stated below:

a) if there is substantial unmeasured differences in the quality of banking products and services offered across banks.

b) if outputs are not completely variable, so that the bank cannot achieve every output scale and product mix.

c) if banks are not sole price-takers, so that they have some market power over the prices they charge.

d) if output prices are not accurately measured so that inaccurate measurement may result in poor estimation of opportunities for banks to earn revenues and profits in the standard profit function.

e) in relation to (d) if the availability of data impedes one to come up with an accurate market or accounting price for some of the bank outputs.

In some studies on efficiency (Kraft, Hofler & Payne, 2002; Berger & De Young, 1997; Berger & Mester, 1997), the translog function is replaced with a Fourier-flexible functional form that combines a standard translog function with the non-parametric Fourier form. This is a theoretical improvement to the translog. Since it includes trigonometric transformations, it can globally approximate the underlying cost function over an entire range of data. The

translog function may perform poorly for observations far from the sample means (Berger & De Young, 1997).

2.2.4 Relationship between cost efficiency and profit efficiency

Berger, Hunter & Timme (1993: 221) asserts that "companies that are more efficient can be expected to have improved profitability". Studies have been carried out on both cost and profit efficiency and some correlations drawn between the two. Maundos *et al* (2002) in a study on European banks found that profit efficiency levels were lower than those of cost efficiency. Results from a study by Berger & Mester (1997) on US banks showed negative correlation between the two. Isik & Hassan (2002) also found similar results for Turkish banks. The Turkish banks were found to be relatively better at controlling costs that generating profits. These findings suggest that cost inefficient banks can continue to prosper, especially in a concentrated market like Turkey.

2.3 Inputs and Outputs for Efficiency Concepts

For any of the three efficiency concepts selected, one of the key elements is that appropriate inputs and outputs of the financial institution are defined. There are two main approaches used to determine the input and output variables (Zaim, 1995; Kaparakis, Miller & Noulas, 1994) and these are the

a) production approach and

b) intermediation approach

Under the production approach, a bank is viewed as a producer of deposits and loans using labour, capital and materials. The advocates of this approach use the number of accounts and loans outstanding as the bank's output (Zaim, 1995). Total costs include all operating costs incurred in the production of outputs.

Under the intermediation approach, banks are treated as collectors of funds, which are then intermediated to loans and other assets. The total balance of deposits and loans is used as a measure for outputs, while operating and interest costs are used to measure total costs. According to Kaparakis *et al*

(1994), this approach seems more appropriate when the sample contains large banks, who fund a larger share of their assets from non-deposit sources. Berger & Humphrey (1997) suggest that the intermediation approach is best suited for analyzing firm level efficiency, while production approach is suited for measuring branch level efficiency, as at this level employees have little influence over funding and investment decisions.

There is no consensus amongst researchers on the actual variables to use in efficiency models. Instead the researchers choose variables depending on what they want to test (Sealey & Lindley, 1977; Kaparakis *et al*, 1994; Zaim, 1995). The two commonly used inputs are labour and capital while Fukuyama (1993) suggest that anything from total assets, total deposits, loans, gross operating income or a combination can be used as a bank's output.

2.4 Efficiency Measurement Methods

There are two broad approaches used to measure cost and profit efficiency, and are the accounting approach, which makes use of financial ratios and econometric approaches.

2.4.1 Accounting approach

Within the banking industry, cost efficiency is often measured by using a cost to income ratio (Isik & Hassan, 2000). The current international benchmark for this ratio is 0.6 (Falkena *et al*, 2004), indicating that banks with a higher value are inefficient. For profitability, the measurements that are used include return on assets (ROA), return on equity (ROE) and capital asset ratio, liquidity ratios and ratios measuring credit risk (Yeh, 1996; Maudos *et al*, 2002). Whilst these ratios are widely used to measure efficiency they have certain limitations. As highlighted by Falkena *et al* (2004:36) "whilst the cost to income ratio may provide a rule of thumb by which to measure efficiency, it does not allow for analysis of market dominance and the ability of a dominant firm to grow its income as expenses climb".

Yeh (1996) highlighted the disadvantages of financial ratios as being that they are only meaningful when used with a suitable benchmark, which may be difficult to establish. Secondly, each performance measure is calculated using

only a subset of data available to a firm. The problem with partial measures is that a bank may perform well using one measure but badly when using another (van der Westhuizen, 2004). There is therefore a need for a more flexible way of expressing a bank's financial position (Yeh,1996). This would be a measure that incorporates all the bank's input and output data available on the firm and the econometric approach attempts to do this.

2.4.2 Econometric Approach

Under this approach, the measure of efficiency is the actual level of cost relative to an efficient production frontier (Fuentes & Vegara, 2003). This is a way of benchmarking the relative performance of production units by assigning numerical efficiency values and identifying areas of input overuse and/or output underproduction (Berger & Humphrey, 1997). Two econometric techniques have been applied in the literature to calculate cost efficiency and estimate frontier functions (Bauer & Hancock, 1993) namely:

a) Parametric techniques

b) Non-parametric i.e. linear mathematical programming techniques

2.4.2.1 Parametric techniques

This category includes three techniques as given below

a) Stochastic Frontier Approach (SFA)

The Stochastic Frontier Approach proposes that the observed bank costs may deviate from the cost frontier either because of inefficiency or random fluctuations (Maudos *et al*, 2002). The inefficiency and random error terms are separated by making explicit assumptions about their distributions. The inefficiency term ln u is assumed to be half-normally distributed, whilst the error term ln ε is assumed to be normally distributed. (Berger & Mester,1997). The parameters of the two distributions are estimated and can be used to obtain estimates of bank-specific inefficiency.

b) Distribution-free approach

This method assumes that there is core inefficiency for each firm over time. The core inefficiency is distinguished from random error by assuming that core inefficiency is persistent over time, while random errors tend to cancel each other out in the course of time. This approach is often used when panel data is available.

c) The thick frontier approach

In the thick frontier approach, a relatively large subset of firms is used to define the frontier. It therefore provides a firmer basis for establishing the realizable efficiency of an industry (Vivas, 1997). The differences in predicted costs within the quartile of banks with lowest average costs for a given size are attributed to random error. On the other hand, differences in predicted costs between the quartile with lowest and highest costs are ascribed to inefficiency.

2.4.2.2 Non- parametric techniques

There are two linear mathematical programming techniques that have been used in efficiency studies namely:

a) Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA)

Like any deterministic technique, Data Envelope Analysis assumes that all deviations between observed costs and the minimum costs are due to inefficient behaviour (Maudos *et al,* 2002).

b) Free Disposable Hull Analysis

Both the parametric and non-parametric techniques have been used to the same extent in efficiency studies. However, the parametric techniques are often preferred as they generally correspond well with cost and profit efficiency concepts studies (Berger & Humprey, 1997). The non-parametric methods have two major drawbacks. Firstly they generally assume there is no statistical measurement error and luck as factors affecting outcomes (Kaparakis *et al*, 1994; Vennet, 2002). Studies on US banks that use non-

parametric techniques reported lower efficiency means than those using parametric techniques with much greater variation.

Secondly non-parametric techniques generally ignore prices and therefore can only account for technical inefficiency and not allocative inefficiency (Berger & Mester, 1997). Non-parametric methods typically focus on t*echnological* rather than *economic* optimization. They are therefore not suitable for comparing firms specializing in different inputs or outputs (Ikhide, 2000).

However it must be acknowledged that even econometric models are less than perfect as they do not incorporate every item or all dimensions of a bank's output in the model (Spong *et al*, 1995). The choice of econometric technique affects the results in measured efficiency and it has been found that the ranking of banks do not correspond well across methods (Ferrier & Lovell, 1990).

An extensive number of studies on the efficiency of financial institutions using the econometric approach have been carried out globally and the research findings are well been documented by Berger & Humprey (1997). However, very few of similar studies have been conducted in South Africa. Oberholzer & van der Westhuizen (2004) used the non-parametric DEA approach to analyze the relative efficiency of 10 branches of a small South African bank. Work done by Bedari (2004) in this field was focused on banks in Botswana and Namibia, and three South African banks were used only for comparison.

2.5 Factors influencing bank efficiency

A number of studies have been carried out to determine some of the factors impacting on efficiency of financial institutions, which includes bank size, management structure and ownership.

2.5.1 Bank size

According to Isik & Hassan (2002), the size of the bank can be an important driver of the variation of efficiency across banks. In order to operate optimally by obtaining scope and scale, banks must possess a certain degree of size. A

number of studies have been carried out to determine relationship between bank size and efficiency but the results are ambiguous. Isik & Hassan (2002) and Kaparakis *et al* (1994) showed that average cost and profit efficiency decrease with increasing bank size. One plausible reason for this is that overhead costs for small bank are relatively low because they often operate few branches, so may possess operational advantage, which contributes to higher efficiency (Isik & Hassan, 2002). Secondly, larger banks often extend loans to a larger number of people, and in small amounts. The servicing and monitoring costs might be higher for large banks than small banks.

In contrast to these findings, Berger & Mester (1997) and Berger, Hancock & Humphrey (1993) noted a slight increase in cost efficiency with bank size for US banks, which may be induced by competitive pressures. Small banks on the other hand showed the highest level of profit efficiency in the study by Berger & Mester (1997). This could be related to profitability ratios, which are typically high for small banks. The conclusions drawn by Berger & Mester (1997: 936), was that "as banks grow larger, they are equally able to control costs but it becomes harder to create revenues efficiently". Research by Kraft *et al* (2002) found that cost efficiency does not vary much across bank size categories.

2.5.2 Management structure

Pi & Timme (2003) conducted one of the first studies linking efficiency with the agency cost theory. They investigated whether the concentration of decision management and control in one hand brings about any deterioration of efficiency. They found that the efficiency of banks whose CEO and chairman of the board is the same person is significantly lower than those possessed by banks without similar governance structure. These findings were supported by Isik & Hassan (2002) indicating a strong link between management structure and efficiency.

2.5.3 Bank Ownership

Ownership of a bank can be considered as two-fold. It can either be whether a bank is state or privately owned. Another aspect of ownership is whether a bank is a domestic bank or foreign-controlled. Berger & Mester (1997) found

that publicly traded US banks were more cost and profit efficient than state banks. Isik & Hassan (2002) also recorded similar results for Turkish banks.

This may indicate that public scrutiny is able to exert enough discipline on banks to be efficient in the countries where study was carried. However findings by Isik & Hassan (2002) on profit efficiency did not support the notion that private banks are more efficient in Turkey. Kraft *et al* (2002) found foreign banks to be more efficient than domestic banks in Croatia.

2.6 The South African banking sector landscape

The South African banking industry is oligopolistic in nature, being dominated by five large commercial banks accounting for 86 % of deposits (Falkena *et al*, 2004). As of October 2005, there were 14 locally-controlled registered banks, 6 foreign controlled banks, 2 mutual banks, 15 foreign banks with registered branches and a further 30 with representative offices (South African Reserve Bank, 2005). Although there has been a sizeable presence of foreign banks, they have had minimal impact on retail banking as many of them have focused on corporate and merchant banking, treasury and capital markets dealings (Napier, 2005).

Barclays Bank, a giant UK retail bank was been granted approval in 2005, to acquire shareholding in ABSA, a local bank. This deal signifies the entrance of big players in the South African arena, which is likely to increase competition. The financial services sector signed the 2003 Financial Services Charter, in which it commits to increasing access to financial services, developing human capital and increasing provision of financing to small and medium enterprises. This is likely to put pressure on operating costs and efficiency, making research aimed at understanding efficiency in the South African banking sector relevant.

2.7 Conclusion on literature review

The literature presents three concepts on efficiency and the methods that can be used to measure it. Combining both cost and profit efficiency gives a more clearer and integrated picture of a bank's performance than measuring cost efficiency only. Despite the changing competition landscape and increasing pressure on operational costs, very few studies have been conducted to measure efficiency of South African banks using the more representative econometric approach.

3 HYPOTHESES

A number of hypotheses are derived from the literature review. These hypotheses were tested for South African banks and are listed below.

Hypothesis 1

H_0 : There has been no change in the cost efficiency of the selected South African banks over the period of 2000-2005

H_A : There has been a change in the cost efficiency of the selected South African banks over the period 2000-2005.

Hypothesis 2

H_0 : There has been no change in profit efficiency of the selected South African banks over the period of 2000-2005

H_A : There has been a change in the profit efficiency of the selected South African banks over the period 2000-2005

Hypothesis 3

H_0 : There is a negative correlation between a banks' cost efficiency and its profit efficiency.

H_A : There is a positive correlation between a banks' cost efficiency and its profit efficiency.

Hypothesis 4

H_0 : For South African banks, there is no correlation between a bank's cost efficiency and its size

H_A : For South African banks, there is a correlation between a bank's cost efficiency and its size.

4 METHODOLOGY

The methodology section initially identifies the population and then describes the sample used in the study. A description of the model and software package used is given in Section 4.3. Sections 4.4 and 4.5 outlines how the data was collected and analyzed including the statistical testing conducted. A brief description of how the reliability and integrity of the data was ensured is given in Section 4.6.

4.1 Population

The research population was all registered banks operating in South Africa between 2000 and 2005. In October 2005, the South African Reserve Bank recorded 14 locally-controlled registered banks, 6 foreign-controlled banks, 2 mutual banks, 15 foreign banks with registered branches and 30 foreign banks with representative offices.

4.2 Sample

The sample consisted of eight (8) South African commercial banks. The sample is split between large banks and small banks, classified according to the number of employees. For the purposes of this research, the number of employees was used instead of market capitalization as an indicator of bank size. The sample was made up of the following banks in each size category.

Large banks (Number of employees more than 10 000)

- ABSA
- FirstRand Bank
- Nedbank /Nedcor
- Standard Bank

Small banks (Number of employees less than 10 000)

- African Bank (ABIL)
- Capitec Bank
- Investec Bank
- Teba Bank

4.3 Modelling

This study is quantitative in nature and involves mathematical modelling in order to determine the cost and profit efficiency frontiers for the selected South African banks. The econometric approach that was used is the Stochastic Frontier Analysis (SFA) for both cost and profit frontiers. For modelling purposes the banks are classified as multi-product, 3-inputs and 2-outputs firms. The dependent variables are total costs (TC) and pre-tax profits (PP), and the independent variables are outputs and input prices.

The inputs are assumed to be labour, capital and funds, with the outputs as advances and deposits. This assumption on outputs is consistent with other studies conducted by Fuentes & Vegara (2003), Kraft, *et al* (2002) and Vivas (1997). Other studies such as those conducted by Berger & Mester (1997), Isik & Hassan (2002), included other assets such as investment and trading securities, as outputs. Other assets as a third output, was excluded in this study as at least two of the banks did not have any values recorded for these assets. Since the model variables are in logarithms, this would have introduced an error in the inputs, hence the exclusion.

Table 1 below outlines the data extracted from the banks' annual reports that was used in the estimation of cost and profit efficiency frontiers.

Table 1: Variables used in the estimation of the cost and profit functions

Variable	**Variable name**	**Definition**
TC	Total costs	Interest expenses and operating expenses
PP	Pre-tax Profit	Income before taxation
Outputs		
Q_1	Advances	Loans issued
Q_2	Deposits	Deposits and current accounts)
Inputs		
P_1	Labour	Number of full-time employees
P_2	Capital	Fixed Assets (Property and Equipment)
P_3	Funds	Deposits and current accounts
Input Prices		
P_L	Labour	Total staff costs/Number of employees
P_K	Capital	Expenses on fixed assets/Book value of fixed assets
P_D	Deposits	Interest expense/Deposits

4.3.1 Cost Frontier

The model for costs is derived from equations (1), (2), (3) and (5) in the literature review and can be represented by a translog function

$$\ln C(y,P) = \alpha_o + \sum_{n=1}^{2} \beta_n \ln y_n + \sum_{m=1}^{3} \alpha_m \ln P_m + 0.5\sum_{n=1}^{2}\sum_{n'=1}^{2} \beta_{nn'} \ln y_n \ln y_{n'} + 0.5\sum_{m=1}^{3}\sum_{m'=1}^{3} \alpha_{mm'} \ln P_m \ln P_{m'} + \sum_{n=1}^{2}\sum_{m=1}^{3} \gamma_{nm} \ln y_n \ln P_m + U_c + V_{it} \quad (11)$$

and

$$Uc = Z_{it}\delta + \psi_{it} \quad (2)$$

where:

y is a vector of outputs and *P* a vector of input prices, *i* and *t* represent cross-sectional, *t* the time values of the firm, ψ and V_{it} are random errors.

For the 3- input, 2-output model used in the study, the expanded equation is represented as follows

$$\ln TC = \beta_0 + \alpha_1 \ln Q_1 + 0.5\alpha_{11}(\ln Q_1)^2 + \alpha_2 Q_2 + 0.5\alpha_{22}(\ln Q_2)^2 + \beta_1 \ln P_L + \beta_2 \ln P_K + \beta_3 \ln P_D + 0.5\beta_{11}(\ln P_L)^2 + 0.5\beta_{22}(\ln P_K)^2 + 0.5\beta_{33}(\ln P_D)^2 + \beta_{12} \ln P_L \ln P_K + \beta_{13} \ln P_L \ln P_D + \beta_{23} \ln P_K \ln P_D + \gamma_{Q11} \ln Q_1 \ln P_L + \gamma_{Q12} \ln Q_1 \ln P_K + \gamma_{Q1_3} \ln Q_1 \ln P_D + \varepsilon_{Q21} \ln Q_2 \ln P_L + + \varepsilon_{Q22} \ln Q_2 \ln P_K + \varepsilon_{Q_{23}} \ln Q_2 \ln P_D + \varepsilon_{Q1Q2} \ln Q_1 \ln Q_2 + U_c + V \quad (12)$$

Where, $U_c \geq 0$, and zero for the most cost efficient firm (best practice firm) and increasing values imply more inefficient.

For natural log, the most cost efficient firm will have a value of 1, the farther the value from 1, the most cost inefficient the firm is.

4.3.2 Profit Frontier

The *alternative profit function* specified by Berger & Mester (1997) was used for the profit frontier, instead of the standard profit function. Some of the conditions under which the alternative profit function is preferable to the standard function, hold for the South African case. One such condition is that South African banks have influence over the prices they charge for services.

This alternative profit function is represented by

$$\ln PP = \beta_0 + \alpha_1 \ln Q_1 + 0.5\alpha_{11}(\ln Q_1)^2 + \alpha_2 Q_2 + 0.5\alpha_{22}(\ln Q_2)^2 + \beta_1 \ln P_L + \beta_2 \ln P_K + \beta_3 \ln P_D + 0.5\beta_{11}(\ln P_L)^2 + 0.5\beta_{22}(\ln P_K)^2 + 0.5\beta_{33}(\ln P_D)^2 + \beta_{12} \ln P_L \ln P_K + \beta_{13} \ln P_L \ln P_D + \beta_{23} \ln P_K \ln P_D + \gamma_{Q11} \ln Q_1 \ln P_L + \gamma_{Q12} \ln Q_1 \ln P_K + \gamma_{Q1_3} \ln Q_1 \ln P_D + \varepsilon_{Q21} \ln Q_2 \ln P_L + + \varepsilon_{Q22} \ln Q_2 \ln P_K + \varepsilon_{Q_{23}} \ln Q_2 \ln P_D + \varepsilon_{Q1Q2} \ln Q_1 \ln Q_2 - U_c + V \quad (13)$$

$$Uc = Z_{it}\delta + \psi_{it} \quad (2)$$

Where U_c is the value of efficiency, and is determined is determined by a set of variables Z, ψ_{it} is noise error.

For the profit function, Uc $\leq$ 0; (0 for highest profit). In logarithm, the values are bound between 0 and 1, 1 for firm with highest profit.

PP is pretax profit of each bank.

Where a bank recorded zero profits or a loss, a constant (θ) was added to make the profit a positive number, so that the natural log of a positive number could be used. The same constant was added to all the other bank's profits in that year.

4.3.3 Software package

The two models, equations (12) and (2) for cost, and equations (13) and (2) for the profit functions were simultaneously estimated using the maximum likelihood criterion. This methodology was advanced by Battese & Coelli (1995). A software package Frontier 4.1 developed by Coelli (1996) was used to estimate the cost and profit efficiency levels for each bank in every year under consideration (2000-2005). The twenty regressor variables were first converted to logarithm values before being used in the model, and the truncated normal distribution was selected for the error term. The number of observations, banks (8) and time periods (6) were also defined.

4.4 Data collection

The data used was documentary in nature. As the data can be classified as interval data, there was no need to have it rescaled.

Data on the selected variables was collected from published annual reports of the selected banks. Two of the small banks, Capitec and Teba Bank were only granted banking licences after 2001, and therefore did not have data covering the entire period. For these two and the other small banks, only the data for 2002 to 2005 was used in the research.

The following financial information was obtained from the annual reports for each of the banks.

- Operating expenditure
- Interest expenses
- Income before tax (Pre-tax profit)
- Advances (loans issued)
- Deposits (including current accounts)
- Number of full-time employees
- Staff costs (including employee benefits)
- Fixed Assets (defined as Property and Equipment)
- Depreciation and Impairment losses and

A database with data for each bank was created in Excel in order to form panel data. The datasets were checked for completeness and accuracy. As far as possible, where a bank was part of a holding company, the results of the banking group and not the holding company were used. The data was then used in the Frontier 4.1 software package to determine the efficiency measures for each bank achieved in each year.

4.5 Data Analysis

4.5.1 Hypothesis testing

Results from the modelling are cost and profit efficiency values. The Number Crunching Statistical Software (NCSS 2001) was used to conduct the hypothesis testing and correlation analysis.

Sub-problem one involves determining if there has been a change in cost efficiency over the period from 2002 to 2005. Sub-problem two involves determining if there has been a change in profit efficiency over the same period. The one way Anova tests were conducted to determine if the efficiency


levels were significantly different at a significance level of 5%. Since the data sample was small, this model was deemed appropriate as the assumption of normality was not necessary. A similar test was done to establish if there were any differences in efficiency levels of the different banks.

4.5.2 Correlation Analysis

A correlation analysis measures the strength of an association or relationship between two variables, the independent variable and the dependent variable (Lind, Mason & Marchal, 2001).

The correlation test used in this study is the correlation coefficient denoted *r*, which "describes the strength of the relationship between two sets of interval-scaled or ratio-scaled variables" (Lind *et al,* 2001:361). Results of *r* can range from -1.00 to 1.00, both representing perfect correlation. The former denotes a perfect negative correlation and the latter a perfect positive linear relationship. Zero denotes the absence of any relationship.

Figure 1: Summary explanation of coefficient of correlation



Source: Lind *et al*, 2001:363

4.5.2.1 Applying correlation analysis to sub-problem three

The third sub-problem was to determine whether a relationship exists between cost efficiency and profit efficiency for South African banks, and the nature of that relationship. NCSS was used to determine the correlation coefficient

between cost efficiency and profit efficiency. All the cost efficiency values were plotted against profit efficiency values.
Each independent variable (X-axis) was plotted against the dependent variable (Y-axis). These scatter plots were inspected visually to establish linearity. Non-linear relationships would have needed an appropriate transformation technique to be applied.

4.5.2.2 Applying correlation analysis to sub-problem four

The fourth sub-problem was to determine whether a relationship exists between cost efficiency levels and the size of the bank. The hypothesis was tested by determining the coefficient of correlation. The size of the bank is the independent variable and cost efficiency the dependent variable. Size was represented by the number of employees in the bank using natural logarithm for the number of employees.

4.6 Validity and Reliability

As defined by Leedy & Ormrod (2001:103) the validity of the research refers to the “accuracy, meaningfulness and credibility” of the study as a whole.

4.6.1 Internal validity

According to Leedy & Ormrod (2001:103), “internal validity is the extent, to which a researcher is able to draw accurate conclusions about cause-and-effect and other relationships within the data”. This involves reducing the possibility that the research results came about due to reasons other than those concluded in the study. To ensure that results of this study are valid, the defined variables for inputs and outputs will be kept the same for all the commercial banks used.

4.6.2 External validity

External validity is the extent to which results of a specific study can be generalised to other contexts (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). External validity may be a concern for this research as the cost and profit efficiency results only related to the specific banks studied. Results relating to the relationship

between efficiency and bank size *may* be valid to other locally controlled banks provided they offer loans and accept deposits from customers. However results may not necessarily apply to mutual banks or foreign banks operating in South Africa or having representative offices. This may be due to a different operating model being employed by foreign banks. As an example, foreign banks often operate a single office instead of multiple branches, which may have a significant effect on efficiency levels.

One method of improving external validity is through replication of the research in another context (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). The results of this research were compared to a study conducted by Bedari (2003), which included some South Africa banks. This was done to validate results of this research by checking for consistency in the trends for cost and profit efficiency.

4.6.3 Reliability

Reliability is defined as the extent to which similar research conducted in future will result in similar outcomes (Leedy & Ormrod, 2001). The modelling software package that was be used (Frontier 4.1) is widely available and has been applied by other researchers in similar efficiency studies internationally. If exactly the same variables are used in another study following the same methodology as adopted in this research then the results should be replicated.

5 PRESENTATION OF RESULTS

5.1 Input financial data

The financial data used in the modelling of each of the banks is tabulated in Appendix 1. Table 2 is a summary of the size of banks based on the loans, deposits and number of employee in 2005.

Table 2: Bank size based on loans, deposits and number of employees (2005)

Bank	Loans (Rm)	Deposits (Rm)	Employees
Absa	268,240	278,583	32,515
FirstRand	226,552	247,084	39,385
Nedbank	248,408	261,311	22,188
Standard Bank	250,939	314,703	36,682
African Bank	5,282	644	2,845
Capitec	208	222	1,708
Investec	42,690	74,492	4,096
Teba Bank	206	1,464	739

5.2 Efficiency estimates

The stochastic translog cost and profit efficiency frontier parameter estimates from the maximum likelihood model are given in Table 3.

Table 3: The maximum likelihood cost and profit frontier parameter estimates for South African Banks (2000-2005)

Parameter	Variable	**Cost Function**		**Profit Function**	
		Estimate	T statistic	Estimate	T statistic
β_0	Constant	19.41	23.9*	10.02	9.3*
α_1	Q_1	-3.3	-14.4*	-17.17	-19.6*
α_{11}	Q_1^2	0.070	3.0*	5.55	13.1*
β_1	P_L	1.57	3.0*	39.2	-26.1*
β_2	P_K	2.41	6.1*	25.9	16.3*
β_3	P_D	4.75	18.3*	7.82	5.4*
β_{11}	P_L^2	-0.0019	-0.12	-2.63	-1.7***
β_{22}	P_K^2	0.13	22.3*	2.98	3.0*
β_{33}	P_D^2	1.19	10.3*	7.28	4.0*
β_{12}	P_L x P_K	0.389	4.7*	2.24	-2.2**
β_{13}	P_L x P_D	0.517	26.4*	15.15	-6.3*
β_{23}	P_D x P_K	-0.251	1.8**	11.91	16.5*
γ_{Q11}	Q_1 x P_L	-0.697	5.5*	4.87	5.6*
γ_{Q12}	Q_1 x P_K	0.174	3.2*	4.46	10.2*
γ_{Q13}	Q_1 x P_D	-0.529	11.4*	7.53	-9.2*
α_2	Q_2	2.21	28.5*	14.22	18.6*
α_{22}	Q_2^2	0.010	0.27	5.74	13.8*
ε_{Q21}	Q_1 x P_L	0.712	5.7*	5.70	-5.0*
ε_{Q22}	Q_1 x P_K	-0.357	6.94*	4.93	11.2*
ε_{Q23}	Q_1 x P_D	0.49	16.6*	7.44	7.9*
ε_{Q1Q2}	Q_1 x Q_2	0.041	1.66 ***	5.52	-13.7*

* Significant at 1% level, ** Significant at 5%, *** Significant at 10% level

5.3 Cost inefficiency values

Table 4 presents the cost inefficiency values for the South African banks. The model output is included in Appendix 2.


Table 4: Cost inefficiencies of South African banks

Bank	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Absa	1.075	1.184	1.114	1.078	1.086	1.004
FirstRand	1.227	1.172	1.010	1.053	1.024	1.037
Nedbank	1.069	1.003	1.011	1.013	1.094	1.005
Standard Bank	1.239	1.130	1.178	1.053	1.123	1.002
African Bank			1.023	1.156	1.008	1.030
Capitec			1.059	1.033	1.007	1.028
Investec			1.048	1.013	1.006	1.005
Teba Bank			1.132	1.013	1.031	1.006
Mean	***1.153***	***1.123***	***1.072***	***1.052***	***1.047***	***1.015***

Table 4 shows that for all the banks, the values are greater than 1 indicating a level of cost inefficiency amongst the banks. For all the banks, there is an overall decline in the values recorded indicating an improvement in the cost efficiency over the six year period.

Figure 2 shows the mean cost inefficiency values for the different banks. The graph shows that Investec is the most cost efficient and Standard Bank the least.

Figure 2: Mean cost inefficiency values for the 6 banks



5.4 Profit efficiency values

The profit efficiencies for the eight South African banks over the six year period between 2000 and 2005 are shown in Table 5 below. This table also includes the averages for each bank over the years.

Table 5: Profit Efficiencies of South African Banks

Bank	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**
Absa	0.116	0.129	0.128	0.382	0.954	0.571
FirstRand	0.337	0.694	0.647	0.999	0.403	0.383
Nedbank	0.553	0.130	0.036	0.002	0.423	0.464
Standard Bank	0.610	0.742	0.566	0.999	0.251	0.873
African Bank			0.212	0.915	0.367	0.999
Capitec			0.999	0.634	0.698	0.531
Investec			0.449	0.509	0.925	0.518
Teba Bank			0.896	0.575	0.166	0.953
Mean	***0.404***	***0.565***	***0.491***	***0.627***	***0.523***	***0.662***

Figure 3 below shows the mean profit efficiency values for the different banks.

Figure 3: Mean profit efficiency values for the 6 banks




Figure 3 shows that Capitec is the most profit efficient and Nedbank the least.

5.5 Results of hypothesis testing

5.5. 1 Hypothesis tests 1 and 2

Hypothesis 1, H_o: There has been no change in the cost efficiency of the selected South African banks over the period of 2000-2005

Hypothesis 2, H_o: There has been no change in profit efficiency of the selected South African banks over the period of 2000-2005

The Krusral–Wallis one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test in NCSS was used to determine if the cost efficiency levels have changed significantly over time at a significance level of 5%. The results of the tests for the cost efficiency are summarised in Tables 6.

Table 6 (a) : ANOVA test results on the difference in cost efficiencies between 2000 and 2005

Year	Sample size	Mean	Test	Null hypothesis	Decision	P-Value
2000	4	1.153	Kruskal Wallis	All medians are equal	Reject H_0	0.00356
2001	4	1.123				
2002	8	1.072				
2003	8	1.051				
2004	8	1.048				
2005	8	1.015				

The Krusral-Wallis test shows that there are at least two medians that are different. This indicates that there has been a significant change in cost efficiency between 2000 and 2005, hence the null hypothesis for test 1 is rejected. The Krusral-Wallis Multiple Comparison Z-Value test results in Table 6 (b), highlights where the differences in the medians are.

Table 6 (b): Krusral-Wallis Multiple Comparison Z-Value Test

Year	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
2000	0.0000	0.6958	1.3799	1.6593	1.9999	**3.2924**
2001	0.6958	0.0000	0.5764	0.8559	1.1965	2.4890
2002	1.3799	0.5764	0.0000	0.3423	0.7594	2.3424
2003	1.6593	0.8559	0.3423	0.0000	0.4171	2.0002
2004	1.9999	1.1965	0.7594	0.4171	0.0000	1.5830
2005	**3.2924**	2.4890	2.3424	2.0002	1.5830	0.0000

* Medians significantly different if z-values > 2.952

Similar results were obtained when the test was conducted at an alpha level of 10 %. Results in Table 6(b) show that the change in cost efficiency of the banks is significant between 2000 and 2005.

An ANOVA test was conducted to test hypothesis 2 on profit efficiency at an alpha of 5 % and 10%. The results are presented in Table 7 for alpha of 5 %.

Table 7: ANOVA test results on the difference in profit efficiencies between 2000 and 2005

Year	Sample size	Mean	Test	Null hypothesis	Decision	P-Value
2000	4	0.404				
2001	4	0.565				
2002	8	0.491	Kruskal Wallis	All medians are equal	Accept H_0	0.7223
2003	8	0.627				
2004	8	0.523				
2005	8	0.662				

The ANOVA tests results above indicate that the null hypothesis that there has been no improvement in banks' profit efficiency between 2000 and 2005 is accepted.

5.5. 2 Testing hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 states that there is a negative correlation between a banks' cost efficiency and its profit efficiency.

The values given in Table 4 indicate how inefficient each bank is, and these values were converted to reflect the efficiency levels between 0 and 100 %, with 100 % representing perfect efficiency (i.e. no inefficiencies, relative to other banks on the sample).

Using the modified values for cost efficiency, Hypothesis 3 was tested in NCSS using Pearson's and Spearman's correlations, and the correlation matrices for the two tests are shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Correlation matrix between cost and profit efficiency

Pearson Correlations

	Profit Efficiency	*Cost Efficiency*
Profit Efficiency	1.0000	0.0452
Cost Efficiency	0.0452	1.0000

Cronbachs Alpha = 0.038299

Standardized Cronbachs Alpha = 0.086483

Spearman Correlations

	Profit Efficiency	*Cost Efficiency*
Profit Efficiency	1.0000	0.0703
Cost Efficiency	0.0703	1.0000

Both the Pearson's and Spearman's correlation indicate a very weak positive correlation. The null hypothesis on a negative correlation between cost and profit efficiency is therefore rejected in favour of the alternative.

5.5. 2 Testing of Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 H_0 : For South African banks, there is no correlation between a bank's cost efficiency and its size

The following method was used to test the hypothesis on NCSS

H_0 : $\rho = 0$

H_A : $\rho \neq 0$

where ρ is a correlation coefficient between the cost efficiency and bank size, In this study, the number of employees is used as a proxy for bank size. The resulting correlation matrix is given in Table 9.

Table 9: Correlation between cost efficiency and bank size

Pearson Correlations


	Cost Efficiency	*Number of Employees*
Cost Efficiency	1.0000	-0.3791
Number of Employees	-0.3791	1.0000

Cronbachs Alpha = - 0.000007
Standardized Cronbachs Alpha =- 1.2214

The null hypothesis that there is no correlation between a bank's cost efficiency and its size is rejected. Table 9 shows a negative correlation between cost efficiency and bank size. At a 5 % significance level, the correlation is significant as represented by the Cronbach alpha of less than 0.05.

The cost efficiency was also regressed against bank size, based on the natural logarithm for number of employees and the linear plot is shown in Figure 4.

Figure 4: Plot of cost efficiency against ln (Number of employees)



The statistics for the regression in Figure 4 is summarised in Table 10

Table 10: Summary statistics for the regression between cost efficiency and bank size.

Parameter	**Value**
Dependent Variable	Cost Efficiency
Independent Variable	ln (Number of Employees)
Intercept	1.0677
Slope	-0.0144
R-Squared	0.1011
Mean Square Error	0.0004156
Prob Level (T Test) – Slope	0.0455
Reject H_0 (Alpha = 0.0500)	Yes

Figure 4 shows a negative correlation between cost efficiency and bank size. A significance test that the slope is zero resulted in a t-value of -2.0677. The significance level of this t-test is 0.0455. Since 0.0455 is less than 0.0500, the hypothesis that the slope is zero is rejected.

The R^2 is very low at 0.1011, indicating that whilst the relationship between cost efficiency and bank size is significant, only 10 % of it is explained by the data.

6 INTERPRETATION OF RESULTS

6.1 Analysis of efficiency estimates

Table 3 showed the stochastic translog cost and profit frontier parameters from the maximum likelihood model used in the Frontier 4.1 package. Based on the t- statistic, all the variables used in model are significant at either 1%, 5% or 10 % levels except for P_L^2 and Q_2^2. It must be noted that the frontier estimates are not perfect as there are few observations relative to the number of parameters to be predicted, and this is mainly as a result of limited data.

The values in the table suggest that of the two outputs used in the model, advances seem to be the most cost incentive output. The production costs per rand for loans are quite high, possibly due to the inflationary pressure experienced in recent years.

6.2 Cost Efficiency

The results show that overall the banks are over 85 % efficient, with Investec being the most efficient and Standard Bank the least. The average inefficiency score for Standard Bank is 1.121, implying that its inefficiency is 12.1 % higher than it should be. These results are consistent with those reported by Bedari (2003), whose work compared efficiency of Botswana and Namibian banks to three South African Banks (Absa, Standard Bank and Nedbank). Nedbank was found to be the most efficient and Standard Bank the least amongst the South African banks.

The high level of efficiency for Investec may be explained by the nature of its business relative to other banks in the sample. Investec is mainly involved in corporate and investment banking, servicing a relatively fewer high net- worth clients. Hence its servicing costs are lower relative to banks such as Absa, FirstRand and Standard Bank, who disburse loans to many individuals.

Table 11 summarises the stochastic cost inefficiency scores for the six years.

Table 11: Summary statistics for cost efficiency

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	All
Mean	1.153	1.123	1.072	1.052	1.047	1.015	1.077
σ	0.093	0.083	0.062	0.048	0.046	0.015	0.058
Minimum	1.070	1.003	1.010	1.013	1.006	1.002	1.002
Maximum	1.240	1.184	1.178	1.156	1.123	1.038	1.240
# of banks	4	4	8	8	8	8	
Delta	*0.170*	*0.181*	*0.168*	*0.143*	*0.117*	*0.036*	

Overall there has been an improvement in the cost efficiency over the 6 years as marked by the declining mean values in Table 11. The average cost efficiency over the six year period is about 92 % implying that the banks only required 92 % of the resources used to produce the services that they generated.

The Krusral-Wallis ANOVA test results present evidence to reject the null hypothesis that there has been no change in cost efficiency over the last six years. The improvement in cost efficiency of South African banks over the period is significant at a 5% level, with the significant differences between 2000 and 2005. The mean efficiency was only about 85 % in 2002, but had improved to about 98 % in 2005.The Tukey-Kramer multiple comparison test (included in Appendix 3) , which provides all pairwise differences between the means revealed that there has been a significant improvement in the last two years (2004 and 2005) from the first two (2000 and 2001).

The values in Table 4 and Figure 2 seem to suggest that small banks are more cost efficient than big banks as evidenced by the smaller inefficiency values. However ANOVA tests indicate that this difference amongst the banks is insignificant.

The inter-temporal comparison of the scores suggest that although cost efficiencies were stable in 2000 and 2001, there was significant improvement from 2002, possibly due to increased competition amongst banks to collect

scarce deposits and regulatory pressures to make banking services more accessible to a broader base of individuals.

The variation in cost efficiency seems to have narrowed over time, as represented by the delta values in Table 11. The difference in cost efficiency between the best practice and worst practise banks was 17 % in 2000, but this had declined to less than 4 % in 2005. This may be a result of more emphasis being placed on cost efficiency and the effective deployment of technology such as ATMs in place of the more expensive brick and mortar structures.

6.3 Profit Efficiency.

On average during the period, the profit efficiency of banks in the sample was 55 %. This is much lower than the cost efficiency levels recorded for the same banks. This is consistent with what has been observed in literature that profit efficiency levels are lower than cost efficiencies.

In 2005, the banks on average only earned 66 % of their potential profits. The most profit efficient banks are Capitec and Standard Bank, with the least being Nedbank and Absa. The observations are similar to those reported by Bedari (2003). The profit efficiencies for Nedbank were particularly low in 2002 and 2003, a period when the bank was under financial difficulties and recorded losses. Since restructuring the business, the profit efficiency improved up to 46 % in 2005.

Results of the Krusral Wallis one- way ANOVA test indicate that the changes in the profit efficiency over the years were insignificant, hence the null hypothesis was accepted. The profit efficiency levels indicate that the small banks are relatively more profit efficient than the big banks. However on analysis using ANOVA test, it could be proven that these differences in the banks' efficiency level are insignificant at σ of both 5 and 10 %. Berger & Mester (1997) noted that small banks showed the greatest levels of profit efficiency as they often recorded higher profitability ratios. They also

concluded that as banks grow larger, whilst they are equally able to control costs, it becomes harder for them to create revenue efficiently.

The average profit efficiency level of 55 % for the South African banks is similar to those obtained in other studies. Research by Berger & Mester (1997) recorded profit efficiency levels of about 50 % for U.S banks between 1990 and 1996, whilst 52 % was noted for European banks (Maudos *et al*, 2000).

It seems that South African banks are relatively better at controlling costs than generating profits as marked by the lower profit efficiency levels. A similar trend was observed by Isik & Hassan (2002), for banks operating in Turkey which has a very similar nature of banking environment to South Africa.

6.4 Correlation between cost and profit efficiency

The correlation coefficient between cost and profit efficiency of South African banks is very low at 0.045, but statistically significant. This implies that the most cost efficient banks are also the most profit efficient even though the correlation is very low, as is the case with Capitec. The weak positive correlation is consistent with observation by Isik & Hassan (2002) for Turkish banks and Maudos *et al* (2000) for European banks.

An interesting case in the South African sample is Standard Bank, which was found to be relatively cost inefficient but recorded high profit efficiency levels. This may have been driven by increased demand for banking services from individuals, large corporations and government, which has enabled cost inefficient banks to prosper.

High cost inefficiencies can also be compensated through achieving higher revenues than competitors by using a different composition of the vectors of production, or benefiting from market powers in pricing. The case of Standard Bank highlights the benefits of adopting a holistic approach in assessing efficiency instead of only focusing on the cost side, which the cost-to-income ratios does.

6.5 Correlation between cost efficiency and bank size

Table 9 shows a significant negative correlation between cost efficiency and bank size. The cost efficiency falls systematically as the bank size is increased. The South African results are similar to those by Isik & Hassan (2002) and Kaparakis *et al* (1994). However some studies have indicated a positive relationship (Miller & Noulas, 1996 and Berger *et al* , 1993).

There are a number of plausible reasons for the decline in cost efficiency as the bank size increases. Small banks may have low overhead costs as they operate few branches (less than 300), whilst the bigger banks have in excess of 500 brick-and-mortar branches country wide. Secondly the small banks such as African Bank, Capitec and Teba offer fewer basic services such as short-term loans and deposits, and employ fewer people to manage the operations. Whilst big banks can benefit from scale, small banks have also made significant investments in technology and are able to compete effectively with the big banks.

The small banks such as Investec also offer larger amounts of loans to corporations or fewer individuals and specialised services, hence incur relatively lower costs for originating, servicing and monitoring the loans.

7 CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Summary

The research used the stochastic frontier approach to determine cost and profit efficiency levels of South African banks over a six year period. The intermediary approach was adopted in which a bank's outputs were considered to be advances and deposits.

Cost efficiency was found to have significantly improved over time, whilst the change in profit efficiency levels was not significant. The small banks recorded higher average profit efficiency levels than the big banks, but these differences were found to be statistically insignificant.

A correlation analysis was done to establish the relationship between cost and profit efficiency. A very weak positive correlation was found to exist for the South African banks. The cost efficiency was also regressed against bank size, of which a negative correlation was observed with cost efficiency declining with increasing bank size.

7.2 Suggestions for future research

A number of issues were identified during the course of this research which could be researched further in the future, and these are highlighted below.

- The sample size could be increased to cover the entire universe of banks operating in South Africa, including foreign banks and banks with representative offices.
- Identifying the influence of management structure and foreign ownership on the cost and profit efficiencies.
- Comparing the efficiencies of South African banks with that of other banks in the African region or in similar developing markets.

This report has fulfilled its purpose of using econometric methods to try and quantify efficiency of South African banks and to establish whether it has improved over the six year period between 2000 and 2005.

8 REFERENCES

Aigner, D, Lovell C.A.K & Schimdt P (1977): Formulation and estimation of stochastic frontier production models, *Journal of Econometrics*, 6, 21-37

Battese G. & Coelli T (1995): A model for technical inefficiency effects in a stochastic frontier production function for panel data, *Empirical Economics*, 20, 325-332

Bauer, P.W & Hancock D. (1993): The efficiency of the Federal Reserve in providing check processing services, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 17 (1-3) 287-311

Bedari, D. (2004): *Cost and Profit Efficiency of some banks in Botswana, Namibia and South Africa*, Presentation

Berger A.N & Humphrey, D.B. (1997): Efficiency of financial institutions: International survey and directions for future research, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 98, 175-212

Berger A.N & Mester, L.B. (1997): Inside the black box: What explains differences in the efficiencies of financial institutions?, *Journal of Banking and Finance,* 21, 895-947.

Berger A.N., Hunter, W. C. & Timme S.G. (1993): The efficiency of financial institutions: A review and preview of research past, present, and future, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 17 (1-3) 221-249

Berger A.N.& De Young, R. (1997): Problem loans and cost efficiency in commercial banks: What explains differences in the efficiencies of financial institutions?, *Journal of Banking and Finance,* 21, 849-870.

Coelli T (1996): A computer program for stochastic frontier production and cost function estimation, Working Paper 96/07, Centre for Efficiency and Productivity Analysis (CEPA)

De Young R. & Hassan I. (1998): The performance of de novo commercial banks: A profit efficiency approach, *Journal of Banking and Finance,* 22, 565-587.

English M, Grosskopf S, Hayes K & Yaisawarng S (1993): Output allocative and technical efficiency of banks, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 17 (1-3) 349-366

Falkena H, Davel G, Hawkins P, Llewellyn D, Luus C, Masilela E, Parr G, Pienaar, J & Shaw H, (2004): *Competition in South African Banking,* Task Group Report for The National Treasury & the South African Reserve Bank, April 2004

Ferrier G.D & Lovell C.A.K. (1990): Measuring Cost Efficiency in Banking; Econometric and Linear Programming Evidence, *Journal of Econometrics*, 46, 229-245

Fuentes R & Vergara M (2003): Explaining Bank Efficiency: Bank Size or Ownership Structure? last accessed on 20 October 2005 from http:// cemla. org/ pdf/redviii/chile_fuentes_vergara.pdf

Fukuyama T (1993): Technical and scale efficiency of Japanese commercial banks: a non-parametric approach, *Applied Economics*, 28 (5-8) 1101-1112

Hussein K.A (2000): *Efficiency in Islamic Banking*, Unpublished presentation, last accessed on 20 October 2005 on http://www.sbp.org.pk/dept/ibd/Banking Efficiency.ppt

Ikhide S (2000): Efficiency of Commerical Banks in Namibia, Bank of Namibia (BON) Occasional Paper No.4, July 2000

Isik, I & Hassan, M.K (2002): Cost and Profit Efficiency of the Turkish Banking Industry: An Empirical Investigation, *The Financial Review,* 37,257-280.

Leedy P.D & Ormrod J.E (2001): *Practical Research- Planning and Design*, 7th Edition, New Jersey, Prentice Hall

Lind, D.A., Mason, R. D. & Marchal, W.G. (2000): *Basic Statistics for Business and Economics*, 3rd Edition, Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill

Kaparakis, E. Miller S & Noulas P (1994): Short-run Cost Inefficiency of Commercial Banks: A Flexible Stochastic Frontier Approach, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 26, 875-893

Kraft E, Hofler R & Payne J (2002): *Privatization, Foreign Bank Entry and Bank Efficiency in Croatia: A Fourier-Flexible Function Stochastic Cost Frontier Analysis*, Working Paper, Croatian National Bank

Maudos, J, Pastor J.M, Perez F & Quesada J (2002): Cost and profit efficiency in European banks, *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 12, 33-58

Mester, L.J (1993): Efficiency in the savings and loan industry, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 17 (1-3) 267-286

Mester, L.J (1997): Measuring efficiency of U.S. Banks: Accounting for heterogeneity is important, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 98 230-242

Napier M (2005): *Provision of Financial Services of South Africa- Country Case Study,* Services Expert Meeting, 3-4 February 2005 last accessed 10 November 2005

Obeholzer M & Van der Westhuizen (2004): An empirical study on measuring efficiency and profitability of bank regions, *Meditari Accountancy Research* Vol 12, 1,165-178

Pi, L. & Timme S.G (1993): Corporate control and bank efficiency, *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 17 (1-3) 515-530

Sealey C & Lindley J (1977): Inputs, outputs, and a theory of production and cost at depository financial institutions, *Journal of Finance 32, 1251-1266*

South African Reserve Bank (2005), *Registered Banks*, Bank Supervision, last accessed on 10 November 2005 from http:/www2. resbank.co.za /Bank Sup/BankSup.nsf

Spong, K, Sullivan R.J & De Young R (1995): *What makes a bank efficient? - A look at financial characteristics and bank management and ownership structure*, Financial Industry Perspectives, Dec, 1-19 last accessed 15 Sept 2005 from http://ideas.repec.org/a/fip/fedkfi/y1995idecp1-19.html

Turati, G (2003): Cost Efficiency and Profitability in European Commercial Banks: Implications for Antitrust Analysis, last accessed 15 September, 2005 from http:/www.web.econ.unito.it/prato/papers/qr69.pdf

Vivas, A.L (1997): Profit efficiency for Spanish savings banks: Accounting for heterogeneity is important, *European Journal of Operational Research*, 98 381-394

Vennet, R.D (2002): Cost and profit efficiency of financial conglomerates and universal banks in Europe, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, Feb, 1-31

Yeh Q-J (1996): The Application of Data Envelopment Analysis in Conjunction with Financial Ratios for Bank Performance Evaluation, *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 47, 980-988

Zaim, O (1995): The effect of financial liberalization on the efficiency of Turkish commercial banks, *Applied Financial Economics,* 5, 257-264

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1: FINANCIAL DATA FOR BANKS

ABSA

Variable name	Source	Definition	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Total costs	IS			**R Millions**				
		Operating expenses	7,739	8,900	9,700	10,780	11,679	12,761
		Interest expenses	15,843	14,708	16,133	21,467	19,183	16,568
Pretax Profit	IS	Income before tax	2,172	3,260	1,643	5,189	6,223	7,633
Outputs								
Advances	BS	Loans issued	144,824	156,396	183,860	199,297	222,395	268,240
Other earning assets	BS	Investment and trading securities	18,917	21,044	29,005	28,525	25,447	28,876
		Other Assets	2,484	2,671	3,399	3,506	5,792	14,384
Inputs								
Labour	Notes on FS	Number of full-time employees	34,313	36,700	35,283	32,356	31,658	32,515
Capital	BS	Fixed Assets (Property & Equip)	2,916	2,562	2,552	2,613	2,597	2,683
Deposits	BS	Deposits (incl current acc)	153,541	167,736	213,766	222,056	234,380	278,582
Total Staff costs	Notes on FS		3,880	4,491	4,872	5,338	5,708	6,340
Expenses on fixed assets	Notes on FS		582	703	685	748	766	698
Interest Expense	IS	Interest expenses	15,843	14,708	16,133	21,467	19,183	16,568
Other data								
Cost to income ratio			63.5	62.3	60.3	60.0	57.0	56.8
ROE			17.1	19.1	12.9	21.4	24.6	25.5

- **IS**: Income Statement, **BS**: Balance Sheet , **FS**: Financial Statements

AFRICAN INVESTMENT BANK LIMITED (ABIL)

Variable name	Source	Definition	2002	2003	2004	2005
Total costs	IS			**R Millions**		
		Operating expenses	938	1,036	946	968
		Interest expenses	212	202	112	102
Pretax Profit	IS	Income before tax	774	1,690	1,311	1,592
Outputs						
Advances	BS	Loans issued	4,900	4,400	4,472	5,282
Other earning assets	BS	Investment and trading securities Other Assets	422	479	490	517
Inputs						
Labour	Notes on FS	Number of full-time employees	3,029	2,911	2,672	2,845
Capital	BS	Fixed Assets (Property & Equip)	189	194	140	112
Deposits	BS	Deposits (incl current acc)	690	884	544	644
Total Staff costs	Notes on FS		327	401	373	328
Expenses on fixed assets	Notes on FS		62	78	85	61
Interest Expense	IS	Interest expenses	212	202	112	102
Other data						
Cost to income ratio			37	36	30.8	28.6
ROE			23.6	25.9	31.3	37.4
Year End		September				

- **IS**: Income Statement, **BS**: Balance Sheet , **FS**: Financial Statements

CAPITEC BANK

Variable name	Source	Definition	2002	2003	2004	2005
				R Millions		
Total costs	IS					
		Operating expenses	178	243	301	386
		Interest expenses	6	3	4	17
Pretax Profit	IS	Income before tax	67	671	65	100
Outputs						
Advances	BS	Loans issued	92	116	135	208
Other earning assets	BS	Investment and trading securities	0	0	0	17
		Other Assets	0	0	0	0
Inputs						
Labour	Notes on FS	Number of full-time employees	1,267	1,180	1,402	1,708
Capital	BS	Fixed Assets (Property & Equip)	127	136	146	176
Deposits	BS	Deposits (incl current acc)	60	26	49	222
Total Staff costs	Notes on FS		67	95	117	162
Expenses on fixed assets	Notes on FS		11	23	33	54
Interest Expense	IS	Interest expenses	6	3	4	17
Other data						
Cost to income ratio	%			75	76	73
ROE			15.3	8.00	12.0	16.0
Year End		February				

- **IS**: Income Statement, **BS**: Balance Sheet , **FS**: Financial Statements

FIRSTRAND (BANKING GROUP)

Variable name	Source	Definition	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
					R millions			
Total costs	IS							
		Operating expenses	6,348	7,091	8,378	9,537	10,503	12,389
		Interest expenses	9,701	9,770	12,305	17,189	13,505	13,920
Pretax Profit	IS	Income before tax	2,869	3,680	5,021	6,330	7,126	9,626
Outputs								
Advances	BS	Loans issued	102,652	119,659	175,145	189,611	210,414	226,552
Other earning assets	BS	Investment and trading securities	12,244	29,111	37,939	36,655	36,007	43,522
		Other Assets	16,914	6,114	3,286	0		
Inputs								
Labour	Notes on FS	Number of full-time employees (SA)	32,995	33,308	34,046	35,344	35,837	39,385
Capital	BS	Fixed Assets (Property & Equip)	3,330	2,911	3,412	3,455	3,839	3,633
Deposits	BS	Deposits (incl current acc)	117,592	137,584	201,404	186,031	225,886	247,084
Total Staff costs	Notes on FS		3,521	3,928	4,412	4,910	5,756	6,408
Expenses on fixed assets	Notes on FS		671	536	721	728	702	681
Interest Expense	IS	Interest expenses	9,701	9,770	12,305	17,189	13,505	13,920
Other data								
Cost to income ratio			60.2	59.5	57.6			56.0
ROE			24.1	25.1	26.0			28.8

- **IS**: Income Statement, **BS**: Balance Sheet , **FS**: Financial Statements

INVESTEC

Variable name	Source	Definition	2002	2003	2004	2005
				R millions		
Total costs	IS					
		Operating expenses	936	1,247	1,076	1,296
		Interest expenses	4,599	5,966	5,242	5,050
Pretax Profit	IS	Profit before tax	1,125	1,072	1,022	1,404
Outputs						
Advances	BS	Loans issued	28,955	28,158	35,726	42,690
Other earning assets	BS	Investment and trading securities	11,228	9,531	16,710	14,929
		Other Assets (Short-term securities)	7,354	8,199	6,336	7,982
Inputs						
Labour	Notes on FS	Number of full-time employees	5,529	4,874	4,170	4,096
Capital	BS	Fixed Assets (Property & Equip)	860	816	686	121
Deposits	BS	Deposits (incl current acc)	58,884	60,398	67,866	74,492
Total Staff costs	Notes on FS		619	701	665	850
Expenses on fixed assets	Notes on FS		80	101	51	35
Interest Expense	IS	Interest expenses	4,599	5,966	5,242	5,050

- **IS**: Income Statement, **BS**: Balance Sheet , **FS**: Financial Statements

NEDBANK

Variable name	Source	Definition	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
					R millions			
Total costs	IS							
		Operating expenses	4,516	5,409	7,334	9,950	11,736	11,157
		Interest expenses	10,504	11,918	17,522	21,333	16,258	14,705
Pretax Profit	IS	Income before tax	6,875	946	1,682	1	1,877	5,437
Outputs								
Advances	BS	Loans issued	120,085	151,329	201,539	210,096	221,128	248,408
Other earning assets	BS	Investment and trading securities	13,947	16,547	20,076	25,121	29,680	29,533
		Other Assets (Short term securities)	6,873	11,372	14,987	10,610	16,310	17,014
Inputs								
Labour	Notes on FS	Number of full-time employees	18,664	19,178	25,240	24,273	21,103	22,188
Capital	BS	Fixed Assets (Property & Equip)	1,793	1,793	2,854	2,684	2,740	3,095
Deposits	BS	Deposits (incl current acc)	140,689	177,160	235,449	250,329	254,299	261,311
Total Staff costs	Notes on FS		2,330	2,928	3,853	4,949	5,350	5,290
Expenses on fixed assets	Notes on FS		537	550	1,340	826	800	961
Interest Expense	IS	Interest expenses	10,504	11,918	17,522	21,333	16,258	14,705
Other data								
Cost to income ratio		%	50.0	49.3	55.4	70.1	74.5	62.8
ROE			24.0	25.1	17.2	0.3	9.2	15.5

- **IS**: Income Statement, **BS**: Balance Sheet , **FS**: Financial Statements

STANDARD BANK (BANKING OPERATIONS)

Variable name	Source	Definition	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005
Total costs	IS				**R millions**			
		Operating expenses	8,462	9,744	12,587	13,608	10,718	12,061
		Interest expenses	13,465	16,159	20,697	25,359	21,130	22,684
Pretax Profit	IS	Income before tax	4,501	5,655	7,371	9,468	7,145	7,547
Outputs								
Advances	BS	Loans issued	127,057	157,841	170,377	220,375	201,225	250,939
Other earning assets	BS	Investment and trading securities	16,488	45,730	43,580	51,298	136,319	113,700
		Other Assets	31,323	55,194	40,766	124,334	6,828	4,376
Inputs								
Labour	Notes on FS	Number of full-time employees	30,315	33,086	34,509	35,034	35,820	36,682
Capital	BS	Fixed Assets (Property & Equip)	2,906	3,376	2,911	3,040	2,069	2,421
Deposits	BS	Deposits (incl current acc)	168,845	236,553	239,715	272,677	366,710	314,703
Total Staff costs	Notes on FS		4,477	5,242	6,934	7,581	5,850	6,933
Expenses on fixed assets	Notes on FS		640	640	1,008	1,134	779	686
Interest Expense	IS	Interest expenses	13,465	16,159	20,697	25,359	21,130	22,684
Other data								
Cost to income ratio			58.8	57.4	57.3	56.2	56.5	56.6
ROE			22.1	19.9	21.2	24.0	31.9	30.9
Year End		December						

- **IS**: Income Statement, **BS**: Balance Sheet , **FS**: Financial Statements

TEBA BANK

Variable name	Source	Definition	2002	2003	2004	2005
				R millions		
Total costs	IS					
		Operating expenses	175	214	274	295
		Interest expenses	35	41	43	41
Pretax Profit	IS	Income before tax	60	700	75	77
Outputs						
Advances	BS	Loans issued	263	188	207	206
Other earning assets	BS	Investment and trading securities	12	11	0	0
Inputs						
Labour	Notes on FS	Number of full-time employees	535	612	692	739
Capital	BS	Fixed Assets (Property & Equip)	48	47	52	49
Deposits	BS	Deposits (incl current acc)	971	1,031	1,243	1,464
Total Staff costs	Notes on FS		58	69	96	115
Expenses on fixed assets	Notes on FS		10	17	23	26
Interest Expense	IS	Interest expenses	35	41	43	41
Other data						
Cost to income ratio			66.8	63.3		
ROE			11.2	13.4		
Year End		February				

- **IS**: Income Statement, **BS**: Balance Sheet , **FS**: Financial Statements

APPENDIX 2: OUTPUT OF FRONTIER PACKAGE FOR COST EFFICIENCY and PROFIT EFFICIENCY

Appendix 2.1 : Cost efficiency

```
Tech. Eff. Effects Frontier (see B&C 1993)
 The model is a cost function
 The dependent variable is logged

the ols estimates are :
                 coefficient     standard-error    t-ratio

  beta 0         0.18706561E+02  0.65652663E+01  0.28493226E+01
  beta 1        -0.20200008E+01  0.13304716E+01 -0.15182592E+01
  beta 2        -0.97423343E-01  0.16010109E+00 -0.60851143E+00
  beta 3         0.32870443E+01  0.29147136E+01  0.11277418E+01
  beta 4         0.22478098E+01  0.11094216E+01  0.20261096E+01
  beta 5         0.34037912E+01  0.17487071E+01  0.19464616E+01
  beta 6         0.71876874E+00  0.80089264E+00  0.89745954E+00
  beta 7        -0.29532233E-02  0.14035315E+00 -0.21041376E-01
  beta 8         0.70071688E+00  0.41816876E+00  0.16756796E+01
  beta 9         0.31869719E+00  0.20899485E+00  0.15249045E+01
  beta10         0.59990209E+00  0.52661077E+00  0.11391755E+01
  beta11        -0.18964036E+00  0.35466399E+00 -0.53470431E+00
  beta12        -0.58806492E+00  0.30173129E+00 -0.19489689E+01
  beta13         0.12792327E+00  0.15326423E+00  0.83465834E+00
  beta14        -0.21084962E+00  0.25347620E+00 -0.83183201E+00
  beta15         0.10107857E+01  0.98002325E+00  0.10313895E+01
  beta16        -0.82887829E-01  0.13789741E+00 -0.60108331E+00
  beta17         0.57499390E+00  0.25419482E+00  0.22620205E+01
  beta18        -0.31263258E+00  0.15446828E+00 -0.20239273E+01
  beta19         0.20991184E+00  0.24129310E+00  0.86994547E+00
  beta20         0.16858987E+00  0.14168075E+00  0.11899278E+01
  sigma-squared  0.41070603E-02

log likelihood function =   0.68032224E+02

the final mle estimates are :

                 coefficient     standard-error    t-ratio

  beta 0         0.19409974E+02  0.81196240E+00  0.23905016E+02
  beta 1        -0.33297947E+01  0.23266890E+00 -0.14311301E+02
  beta 2         0.70250394E-01  0.23494247E-01  0.29901104E+01
  beta 3         0.15736798E+01  0.51509677E+00  0.30551149E+01
  beta 4         0.24141878E+01  0.39609671E+00  0.60949453E+01
  beta 5         0.47533716E+01  0.25920610E+00  0.18338194E+02
  beta 6        -0.19388159E-02  0.15359211E+00 -0.12623148E-01
  beta 7         0.12871199E+00  0.57784417E-01  0.22274515E+01
  beta 8         0.11931309E+01  0.11628801E+00  0.10260137E+02
  beta 9         0.38913078E+00  0.82890895E-01  0.46944937E+01
  beta10         0.51775901E+00  0.19616427E+00  0.26394155E+01
  beta11        -0.25095263E+00  0.13873216E+00 -0.18089002E+01
  beta12        -0.69738924E+00  0.12558874E+00 -0.55529600E+01
  beta13         0.17434174E+00  0.54526614E-01  0.31973696E+01
  beta14        -0.52926405E+00  0.46397207E-01 -0.11407239E+02
  beta15         0.22120862E+01  0.77466681E-01  0.28555325E+02
  beta16         0.10662255E-01  0.38757608E-01  0.27510094E+00
  beta17         0.71214711E+00  0.12452942E+00  0.57187058E+01
  beta18        -0.35687069E+00  0.51410417E-01 -0.69416027E+01
  beta19         0.49059036E+00  0.29403664E-01  0.16684667E+02
  beta20         0.41217153E-01  0.24786082E-01  0.16629152E+01
  delta 0        0.18613108E+00  0.37160877E-01  0.50087915E+01
  delta 1       -0.56392110E-01  0.84846118E-02 -0.66463983E+01
  sigma-squared  0.50029526E-02  0.76934045E-03  0.65029112E+01
  gamma          0.99705874E+00  0.70300046E-02  0.14182903E+03
```

```
log likelihood function =   0.77067340E+02

LR test of the one-sided error =   0.18070231E+02
number of iterations =     32
(maximum number of iterations set at :   100)
number of cross-sections =      8
number of time periods =      6
total number of observations =     40
thus there are:      8  obsns not in the panel
```

cost efficiency estimates :

firm	year	eff.-est.
1	1	0.10749789E+01
2	1	0.12268117E+01
3	1	0.10695114E+01
4	1	0.12397868E+01
1	2	0.11840543E+01
2	2	0.11725979E+01
3	2	0.10031335E+01
4	2	0.11305301E+01
1	3	0.11135410E+01
2	3	0.10101973E+01
3	3	0.10106666E+01
4	3	0.11779371E+01
5	3	0.10230606E+01
6	3	0.10592837E+01
7	3	0.10477224E+01
8	3	0.11318256E+01
1	4	0.10775836E+01
2	4	0.10525100E+01
3	4	0.10132787E+01
4	4	0.10534617E+01
5	4	0.11561878E+01
6	4	0.10329333E+01
7	4	0.10131460E+01
8	4	0.10134034E+01
1	5	0.10857819E+01
2	5	0.10236375E+01
3	5	0.10936378E+01
4	5	0.11229350E+01
5	5	0.10083259E+01
6	5	0.10073410E+01
7	5	0.10062293E+01
8	5	0.10316955E+01
1	6	0.10040700E+01
2	6	0.10379617E+01
3	6	0.10054475E+01
4	6	0.10018853E+01
5	6	0.10302650E+01
6	6	0.10285880E+01
7	6	0.10053781E+01
8	6	0.10064971E+01

```
 mean efficiency =   0.10646955E+01
```

Appendix 2.2: Profit Efficiency

```
Tech. Eff. Effects Frontier (see B&C 1993)
 The model is a production function
 The dependent variable is logged

the ols estimates are :

                 coefficient     standard-error    t-ratio
  beta 0         0.76122381E+01  0.19292816E+03  0.39456334E-01
  beta 1        -0.16344040E+02  0.39097491E+02 -0.41803296E+00
  beta 2         0.52497487E+01  0.47047611E+01  0.11158375E+01
  beta 3        -0.36887614E+02  0.85652330E+02 -0.43066679E+00
  beta 4         0.27437330E+02  0.32601674E+02  0.84159268E+00
  beta 5         0.94458992E+01  0.51387839E+02  0.18381585E+00
  beta 6        -0.49772191E+01  0.23535184E+02 -0.21147993E+00
  beta 7         0.16827718E+01  0.41244443E+01  0.40799966E+00
  beta 8         0.56262566E+01  0.12288387E+02  0.45785152E+00
  beta 9        -0.16711514E+00  0.61415626E+01 -0.27210525E-01
  beta10        -0.12087827E+02  0.15475084E+02 -0.78111543E+00
  beta11         0.10810928E+02  0.10422223E+02  0.10372958E+01
  beta12         0.38700155E+01  0.88667333E+01  0.43646464E+00
  beta13        -0.43028619E+01  0.45038518E+01 -0.95537379E+00
  beta14        -0.68581420E+01  0.74487000E+01 -0.92071664E+00
  beta15         0.14679622E+02  0.28799150E+02  0.50972416E+00
  beta16         0.53039782E+01  0.40522795E+01  0.13088876E+01
  beta17        -0.43088158E+01  0.74698175E+01 -0.57683013E+00
  beta18         0.44751706E+01  0.45392344E+01  0.98588665E+00
  beta19         0.64770984E+01  0.70906850E+01  0.91346582E+00
  beta20        -0.52552070E+01  0.41634575E+01 -0.12622219E+01
  sigma-squared  0.35466445E+01

log likelihood function =  -0.67188770E+02

the estimates after the grid search were :

  beta 0         0.91758794E+01
  beta 1        -0.16344040E+02
  beta 2         0.52497487E+01
  beta 3        -0.36887614E+02
  beta 4         0.27437330E+02
  beta 5         0.94458992E+01
  beta 6        -0.49772191E+01
  beta 7         0.16827718E+01
  beta 8         0.56262566E+01
  beta 9        -0.16711514E+00
  beta10        -0.12087827E+02
  beta11         0.10810928E+02
  beta12         0.38700155E+01
  beta13        -0.43028619E+01
  beta14        -0.68581420E+01
  beta15         0.14679622E+02
  beta16         0.53039782E+01
  beta17        -0.43088158E+01
  beta18         0.44751706E+01
  beta19         0.64770984E+01
  beta20        -0.52552070E+01
  delta 0        0.00000000E+00
  delta 1        0.00000000E+00
  sigma-squared  0.41296302E+01
  gamma          0.93000000E+00
```

```
the final mle estimates are :

                 coefficient     standard-error    t-ratio

  beta 0         0.10035107E+02  0.10680314E+01  0.93958915E+01
  beta 1        -0.17169497E+02  0.87612941E+00 -0.19596988E+02
  beta 2         0.55524067E+01  0.42475871E+00  0.13071908E+02
  beta 3        -0.39201998E+02  0.15007116E+01 -0.26122273E+02
  beta 4         0.25973869E+02  0.15799748E+01  0.16439419E+02
  beta 5         0.78183728E+01  0.14387220E+01  0.54342486E+01
  beta 6        -0.26323414E+01  0.15013224E+01 -0.17533485E+01
  beta 7         0.29833910E+01  0.97905630E+00  0.30472108E+01
  beta 8         0.72791411E+01  0.18235397E+01  0.39917644E+01
  beta 9        -0.22392110E+01  0.10124247E+01 -0.22117310E+01
  beta10        -0.15159357E+02  0.23818077E+01 -0.63646434E+01
  beta11         0.11913263E+02  0.72000432E+00  0.16546100E+02
  beta12         0.48668389E+01  0.86722439E+00  0.56119720E+01
  beta13        -0.44572887E+01  0.43580919E+00 -0.10227615E+02
  beta14        -0.75329784E+01  0.82119675E+00 -0.91731712E+01
  beta15         0.14222011E+02  0.76163909E+00  0.18672900E+02
  beta16         0.57397498E+01  0.41592027E+00  0.13800121E+02
  beta17        -0.56992936E+01  0.11264345E+01 -0.50595874E+01
  beta18         0.49294490E+01  0.44674242E+00  0.11034208E+02
  beta19         0.74399615E+01  0.94094553E+00  0.79068993E+01
  beta20        -0.55283885E+01  0.40389899E+00 -0.13687552E+02
  delta 0        0.15043588E+01  0.15712333E+01  0.95743826E+00
  delta 1       -0.49166014E+00  0.40903420E+00 -0.12020025E+01
  sigma-squared  0.33694999E+01  0.63364983E+00  0.53176055E+01
  gamma          0.99999999E+00  0.78637933E-07  0.12716509E+08

log likelihood function =  -0.48288861E+02

LR test of the one-sided error =   0.37799818E+02
with number of restrictions = 3
 [note that this statistic has a mixed chi-square distribution]

number of iterations =     55

(maximum number of iterations set at :   100)

number of cross-sections =      8

number of time periods =      6

total number of observations =     40

thus there are:      8  obsns not in the panel
```

PROFIT efficiency estimates:

firm	year	eff.-est.
1	1	0.11557620E+00
2	1	0.33742107E+00
3	1	0.55358195E+00
4	1	0.60986047E+00
1	2	0.12946049E+00
2	2	0.69421962E+00
3	2	0.12995107E+00
4	2	0.74280002E+00
1	3	0.12797674E+00
2	3	0.64747779E+00
3	3	0.36026916E-01
4	3	0.56655704E+00
5	3	0.21247990E+00
6	3	0.99956053E+00
7	3	0.44885695E+00
8	3	0.89553331E+00
1	4	0.38256806E+00
2	4	0.99915437E+00
3	4	0.20391069E-03
4	4	0.99965892E+00
5	4	0.91516209E+00
6	4	0.63393634E+00
7	4	0.50895119E+00
8	4	0.57502800E+00
1	5	0.95419895E+00
2	5	0.40266698E+00
3	5	0.42262901E+00
4	5	0.25137452E+00
5	5	0.36660524E+00
6	5	0.69825003E+00
7	5	0.92542482E+00
8	5	0.16593553E+00
1	6	0.57117450E+00
2	6	0.38317120E+00
3	6	0.46367167E+00
4	6	0.87343725E+00
5	6	0.99974206E+00
6	6	0.53087424E+00
7	6	0.51857368E+00
8	6	0.95282747E+00

mean efficiency = 0.54356400E+00

APPENDIX 3: RESULTS OF ANOVA TESTS

Appendix 3.1: Cost efficiency over time (2000-2005)

Analysis of Variance Report

Tests of Assumptions Section

Assumption	Test Value	Prob Level	Decision (0.05)
Skewness Normality of Residuals	0.4841	0.628316	Accept
Kurtosis Normality of Residuals	-0.2048	0.837765	Accept
Omnibus Normality of Residuals	0.2763	0.870979	Accept
Modified-Levene Equal-Variance Test	2.6481	0.039847	Reject

Expected Mean Squares Section

Source Term	DF	Term Fixed?	Denominator Term	Expected Mean Square
A (...)	5	Yes	S(A)	S+sA
S(A)	34	No		S(A)

Note: Expected Mean Squares are for the balanced cell-frequency case.

Analysis of Variance Table

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Prob Level	Power (Alpha=0.05)
A (...)	5	6.869947E-02	0.0137399	4.37	0.003549*	0.935153
S(A)	34	0.1070105	3.147368E-03			
Total (Adjusted)	39	0.17571				
Total	40					

* Term significant at alpha = 0.05

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA on Ranks

Hypotheses

Ho: All medians are equal.
Ha: At least two medians are different.

Test Results

Method	DF	Chi-Square (H)	Prob Level	Decision(0.05)
Not Corrected for Ties	5	13.68887	0.017711	Reject Ho
Corrected for Ties	5	13.69787	0.017647	Reject Ho

Number Sets of Ties	4
Multiplicity Factor	42


Group Detail

Group	Count	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Z-Value	Median
Year_2000	4	132.00	33.00	2.2542	1.151
Year_2001	4	109.00	27.25	1.2173	1.152
Year_2002	8	185.00	23.13	0.7101	1.0535
Year_2003	8	169.00	21.13	0.1691	1.043
Year_2004	8	149.50	18.69	-0.4903	1.028
Year_2005	8	75.50	9.44	-2.9924	1.0055

Means and Effects Section

Term	Count	Mean	Error	Effect
All	40	1.064725		1.076917
A:				
Year_2000	4	1.153	0.0280507	7.608333E-02
Year_2001	4	1.12275	0.0280507	4.583333E-02
Year_2002	8	1.071875	1.983484E-02	-5.041667E-03
Year_2003	8	1.0515	1.983484E-02	-2.541667E-02
Year_2004	8	1.0475	1.983484E-02	-2.941667E-02
Year_2005	8	1.014875	1.983484E-02	-6.204167E-02

Plots of Means Section



Bonferroni (All-Pairwise) Multiple Comparison Test

Response: Year_2000,Year_2001,Year_2002,Year_2003,Year_2004,Year_2005
Term A:

Alpha=0.050 Error Term=S(A) DF=34 MSE=3.147368E-03 Critical Value=3.1570

Group	Count	Mean	Different From Groups
Year_2005	8	1.014875	Year_2000
Year_2004	8	1.0475	
Year_2003	8	1.0515	
Year_2002	8	1.071875	
Year_2001	4	1.12275	
Year_2000	4	1.153	Year_2005

Notes:
This section presents the results of all paired comparisons among the means. Since this procedure uses the Bonferroni inequality, it is not as accurate as the Tukey-Kramer's method.

Tukey-Kramer Multiple-Comparison Test

Response: Year_2000,Year_2001,Year_2002,Year_2003,Year_2004,Year_2005
Term A:

Alpha=0.050 Error Term=S(A) DF=34 MSE=3.147368E-03 Critical Value=4.2684

Group	Count	Mean	Different From Groups
Year_2005	8	1.014875	Year_2001, Year_2000
Year_2004	8	1.0475	Year_2000
Year_2003	8	1.0515	
Year_2002	8	1.071875	
Year_2001	4	1.12275	Year_2005
Year_2000	4	1.153	Year_2005, Year_2004

Notes:
This report provides multiple comparison tests for all pairwise differences between the means.

Kruskal-Wallis Multiple-Comparison Z-Value Test

Variable	Year_2000	Year_2001	Year_2002	Year_2003	Year_2004
Year_2000	0.0000	0.6958	1.3799	1.6593	1.9999
Year_2001	0.6958	0.0000	0.5764	0.8559	1.1965
Year_2002	1.3799	0.5764	0.0000	0.3423	0.7594
Year_2003	1.6593	0.8559	0.3423	0.0000	0.4171
Year_2004	1.9999	1.1965	0.7594	0.4171	0.0000
Year_2005	3.2924	2.4890	2.3424	2.0002	1.5830

Regular Test: Medians significantly different if z-value > 1.9600
Bonferroni Test: Medians significantly different if z-value > 2.9352

Kruskal-Wallis Multiple-Comparison Z-Value Test

Variable	Year_2005
Year_2000	3.2924
Year_2001	2.4890
Year_2002	2.3424
Year_2003	2.0002
Year_2004	1.5830
Year_2005	0.0000

Regular Test: Medians significantly different if z-value > 1.9600
Bonferroni Test: Medians significantly different if z-value > 2.9352

Appendix 3.2 : Cost efficiency for different banks

Analysis of Variance Report

Tests of Assumptions Section

Assumption	Test Value	Prob Level	Decision (0.05)
Skewness Normality of Residuals	1.6160	0.106090	Accept
Kurtosis Normality of Residuals	0.4978	0.618636	Accept
Omnibus Normality of Residuals	2.8593	0.239391	Accept
Modified-Levene Equal-Variance Test	0.7915	0.599755	Accept

Expected Mean Squares Section

Source Term	DF	Term Fixed?	Denominator Term	Expected Mean Square
A (...)	7	Yes	S(A)	S+sA
S(A)	32	No		S(A)

Note: Expected Mean Squares are for the balanced cell-frequency case.

Analysis of Variance Table

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Prob Level	Power (Alpha=0.05)
A (...)	7	4.717198E-02	6.738854E-03	1.68	0.150009	0.589419
S(A)	32	0.128538	4.016812E-03			
Total (Adjusted)	39	0.17571				
Total	40					

* Term significant at alpha = 0.05

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA on Ranks

Hypotheses

Ho: All medians are equal.
Ha: At least two medians are different.

Test Results


Method	DF	Chi-Square (H)	Prob Level	Decision(0.05)
Not Corrected for Ties	7	8.722713	0.273182	Accept Ho
Corrected for Ties	7	8.728445	0.272745	Accept Ho

Number Sets of Ties	4
Multiplicity Factor	42

Group Detail

Group	Count	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Z-Value	Median
ABIL	4	77.00	19.25	-0.2254	1.0265
Absa	6	156.00	26.00	1.2500	1.082
Capitec	4	70.00	17.50	-0.5410	1.031
FirstRand	6	145.50	24.25	0.8522	1.0455
Investec	4	46.00	11.50	-1.6230	1.0095
Nedbank	6	86.50	14.42	-1.3825	1.012
Standard	6	166.50	27.75	1.6477	1.127
Teba_Bank	4	72.50	18.13	-0.4283	1.0225

Plots of Means Section



Bonferroni (All-Pairwise) Multiple Comparison Test

Response: ABIL,Absa,Capitec,FirstRand,Investec,Nedbank,Standard,Teba_Bank
Term A:

Alpha=0.050 Error Term=S(A) DF=32 MSE=4.016812E-03 Critical Value=3.4077

Group	Count	Mean	Different From Groups
Investec	4	1.018	
Capitec	4	1.032	
Nedbank	6	1.032667	
Teba_Bank	4	1.04575	
ABIL	4	1.05425	
FirstRand	6	1.0875	
Absa	6	1.090167	
Standard	6	1.121167	

Notes:
This section presents the results of all paired comparisons among the means. Since this procedure uses the Bonferroni inequality, it is not as accurate as the Tukey-Kramer's method.

Appendix 3.3 : Profit efficiency over time (2000-2005)

Analysis of Variance Report

Tests of Assumptions Section

Assumption	Test Value	Prob Level	Decision (0.005)
Skewness Normality of Residuals	-0.2283	0.819421	Accept
Kurtosis Normality of Residuals	-1.4828	0.138127	Accept
Omnibus Normality of Residuals	2.2508	0.324519	Accept
Modified-Levene Equal-Variance Test	0.4141	0.835586	Accept

Expected Mean Squares Section

Source Term	DF	Term Fixed?	Denominator Term	Expected Mean Square
A (...)	5	Yes	S(A)	S+sA
S(A)	34	No		S(A)

Note: Expected Mean Squares are for the balanced cell-frequency case.

Analysis of Variance Table

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Prob Level	Power (Alpha=0.005)
A (...)	5	0.2634605	0.0526921	0.57	0.722315	0.035237
S(A)	34	3.142682	9.243182E-02			
Total (Adjusted)	39	3.406142				
Total	40					

* Term significant at alpha = 0.005

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA on Ranks

Hypotheses

Ho: All medians are equal.
Ha: At least two medians are different.

Test Results

Method	DF	Chi-Square (H)	Prob Level	Decision(0.005)
Not Corrected for Ties	5	3.069055	0.689340	Accept Ho
Corrected for Ties	5	3.069631	0.689252	Accept Ho

Number Sets of Ties	2
Multiplicity Factor	12

Group Detail


Group	Count	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Z-Value	Median
PY2000	4	56.00	14.00	-1.1722	0.4455
PY2001	4	90.00	22.50	0.3607	0.6942
PY2002	8	145.00	18.13	-0.6424	0.50775
PY2003	8	186.50	23.31	0.7608	0.60445
PY2004	8	150.00	18.75	-0.4734	0.41265
PY2005	8	192.50	24.06	0.9637	0.55105

Analysis of Variance Report

Means and Effects Section

Term	Count	Mean	Standard Error	Effect
All	40	0.55768		0.5455083
A:				
PY2000	4	0.404125	0.152013	-0.1413833
PY2001	4	0.565175	0.152013	1.966E-02
PY2002	8	0.491825	0.1074894	-5.368E-02
PY2003	8	0.62685	0.1074894	8.134E-02
PY2004	8	0.5233875	0.1074894	-2.212E-02
PY2005	8	0.6616875	0.1074894	0.1161792

Plots of Means Section



Bonferroni (All-Pairwise) Multiple Comparison Test

Response: PY2000,PY2001,PY2002,PY2003,PY2004,PY2005
Term A:

Alpha=0.005 Error Term=S(A) DF=34 MSE=9.243182E-02 Critical Value=3.9899

Group	Count	Mean	Different From Groups
PY2000	4	0.404125	
PY2002	8	0.491825	
PY2004	8	0.5233875	
PY2001	4	0.565175	
PY2003	8	0.62685	
PY2005	8	0.6616875	

Notes:
This section presents the results of all paired comparisons among the means. Since this procedure uses the Bonferroni inequality, it is not as accurate as the Tukey-Kramer's method.

Analysis of Variance Report

Tukey-Kramer Multiple-Comparison Test

Response: PY2000,PY2001,PY2002,PY2003,PY2004,PY2005
Term A:

Alpha=0.005 Error Term=S(A) DF=34 MSE=9.243182E-02 Critical Value=5.5469

Group	Count	Mean	Different From Groups
PY2000	4	0.404125	
PY2002	8	0.491825	
PY2004	8	0.5233875	
PY2001	4	0.565175	
PY2003	8	0.62685	
PY2005	8	0.6616875	

Notes:
This report provides multiple comparison tests for all pairwise differences between the means.

Kruskal-Wallis Multiple-Comparison Z-Value Test

Variable	PY2000	PY2001	PY2002	PY2003	PY2004
PY2000	0.0000	1.0284	0.5763	1.3009	0.6636
PY2001	1.0284	0.0000	0.6112	0.1135	0.5239
PY2002	0.5763	0.6112	0.0000	0.8876	0.1069
PY2003	1.3009	0.1135	0.8876	0.0000	0.7806
PY2004	0.6636	0.5239	0.1069	0.7806	0.0000
PY2005	1.4057	0.2183	1.0159	0.1283	0.9089

Regular Test: Medians significantly different if z-value > 2.8070
Bonferroni Test: Medians significantly different if z-value > 3.5879

Kruskal-Wallis Multiple-Comparison Z-Value Test

Variable	PY2005
PY2000	1.4057
PY2001	0.2183
PY2002	1.0159
PY2003	0.1283
PY2004	0.9089
PY2005	0.0000

Regular Test: Medians significantly different if z-value > 2.8070
Bonferroni Test: Medians significantly different if z-value > 3.5879

Appendix 3.4 : Profit efficiency for different banks

Analysis of Variance Report

Tests of Assumptions Section

Assumption	Test Value	Prob Level	Decision (0.005)
Skewness Normality of Residuals	0.3848	0.700383	Accept
Kurtosis Normality of Residuals	-1.6337	0.102328	Accept
Omnibus Normality of Residuals	2.8170	0.244514	Accept
Modified-Levene Equal-Variance Test	0.7056	0.667299	Accept

Expected Mean Squares Section

Source Term	DF	Term Fixed?	Denominator Term	Expected Mean Square
A (...)	7	Yes	S(A)	S+sA
S(A)	32	No		S(A)

Note: Expected Mean Squares are for the balanced cell-frequency case.

Analysis of Variance Table

Source Term	DF	Sum of Squares	Mean Square	F-Ratio	Prob Level	Power (Alpha=0.005)
A (...)	7	0.6595325	9.421892E-02	1.10	0.388110	0.113577
S(A)	32	2.74661	8.583156E-02			
Total (Adjusted)	39	3.406142				
Total	40					

* Term significant at alpha = 0.005

Kruskal-Wallis One-Way ANOVA on Ranks

Hypotheses

Ho: All medians are equal.
Ha: At least two medians are different.

Test Results


Method	DF	Chi-Square (H)	Prob Level	Decision(0.005)
Not Corrected for Ties	7	7.498323	0.378898	Accept Ho
Corrected for Ties	7	7.49973	0.378763	Accept Ho

Number Sets of Ties	2
Multiplicity Factor	12

Group Detail

Group	Count	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Z-Value	Median
ABIL_p	4	89.50	22.38	0.3381	0.6409
Absa_p	6	81.00	13.50	-1.5909	0.25605
Capitec_p	4	111.00	27.75	1.3074	0.6661
FirstRand_p	6	124.50	20.75	0.0568	0.5251
Investec_p	4	84.00	21.00	0.0902	0.5138
Nedbank_p	6	80.50	13.42	-1.6098	0.44315
Standard_p	6	153.50	25.58	1.1553	0.67635
Teba_Bank_p	4	96.00	24.00	0.6312	0.73525

Plots of Means Section



Bonferroni (All-Pairwise) Multiple Comparison Test

Response:
ABIL_p,Absa_p,Capitec_p,FirstRand_p,Investec_p,Nedbank_p,Standard_p,Teba_Bank_p
Term A:

Alpha=0.005 Error Term=S(A) DF=32 MSE=8.583156E-02 Critical Value=4.2382

Group	Count	Mean	Different From Groups
Nedbank_p	6	0.3617167	
Absa_p	6	0.3801833	
FirstRand_p	6	0.5773667	
Investec_p	4	0.600475	
ABIL_p	4	0.6235	
Teba_Bank_p	4	0.6473	
Standard_p	6	0.6739666	
Capitec_p	4	0.715675	

Notes:
This section presents the results of all paired comparisons among the means. Since this procedure uses the Bonferroni inequality, it is not as accurate as the Tukey-Kramer's method.