

**AN INVESTIGATION ON THE X-EFFICIENCY OF COMMERCIAL BANKS IN
KENYA**

BY

LYAGA SHEILLA SAKINA

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
RWEN KIBETE LIBRARY

**A MANAGEMENT RESEARCH PAPER SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL
FULFILLMENT OF THE DEGREE OF MASTERS IN BUSINESS
ADMINISTRATION (FINANCE OPTION), SCHOOL OF BUSINESS
ADMINISTRATION, UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI.**

NOVEMBER 2006



DECLARATION

I declare that this research is my original piece of work and it has not been submitted for a degree in any other university

Signed



Date

23/11/06

Iyaga Sheila Sakina

10617813/04

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as the university supervisor,

Signed:



Mt. Sifunjo Kisaka

Date

24/11/2006

Lecturer, Department of Accounting and Finance

School of Business

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

| | PAGE |
|--|----------|
| Declaration..... | ii |
| Table of Contents..... | iii |
| Acknowledgement..... | v |
| List of Tables..... | vi |
| List of Figures..... | vii |
| Abbreviations..... | viii |
| Dedication..... | ix |
| Abstract..... | x |
| | |
| CHAPTER ONE..... | 1 |
| 1.0 INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Background of the Study..... | 1 |
| 1.2 The Commercial Banking Industry in Kenya..... | 2 |
| 1.3 Statement of the Problem..... | 4 |
| 1.4 Objectives of the Study..... | 7 |
| 1.5 Significance of the Study..... | 7 |
| | |
| CHAPTER TWO..... | 8 |
| 2.0 LITERATURE REVIEW..... | 8 |
| 2.1 Introduction..... | 8 |
| 2.2 X-Efficiency of Commercial Banks..... | 10 |
| 2.3 X-Efficiency of Commercial Banks in Kenya..... | 13 |
| 2.4 Estimation Techniques of Efficiency..... | 17 |
| 2.4.1 Examiner Ratings..... | 17 |
| 2.4.2 Operating Ratios..... | 18 |
| 2.4.3 Data Envelopment Analysis..... | 18 |
| 2.4.4 Stochastic Efficient Cost Frontier Analysis..... | 18 |
| 2.5 Trends in the Study of Efficiency..... | 19 |

| | | |
|--|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| 2.6 | Summary..... | 20 |
| CHAPTER THREE..... | | 21 |
| 3.0 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY..... | | 21 |
| 3.1 | Introduction | 21 |
| 3.2 | The Population | 21 |
| 3.3 | Data Sample | 21 |
| 3.4 | Sample Design | 22 |
| 3.5 | Research Model | 22 |
| | 3.5.1 Conceptual Model | 22 |
| | 3.5.2 Analytical Model | 23 |
| CHAPTER FOUR..... | | 25 |
| 4.0 SUMMARY, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION..... | | 25 |
| 4.1 | Introduction | 25 |
| 4.2 | Data Summary | 25 |
| 4.3 | Discussion | 26 |
| 4.4 | Conclusion | 34 |
| 4.5 | Limitations of the Study | 34 |
| 4.6 | Recommendations | 35 |
| REFERENCES..... | | 36 |
| APPENDICES..... | | 40 |
| | Appendix I. Aggregated Data | 40 |
| | Appendix II. Y2 Data Components | 45 |
| | Appendix III. Total Assets..... | 50 |

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Mr. Situnjo Kisaka for his unequivocal support in the selection of research title, providing the relevant literature and for his guidance throughout this research.

I also wish to thank my family for the moral and financial support.

I appreciate all my friends and colleagues who endured my constant queries and consultations, and for encouraging me till the end of the study.

Lastly, I would like to thank all my lecturers who have tremendously changed my view of the world of business. However, I am wholly responsible for any error in this report.

God bless you all.

LIST OF TABLES.

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| Table 1 Data Summary for the Sample of Banks..... | 25 |
| Table 2 Time-Series Properties of X-efficiency Estimates..... | 27 |
| Table 3 Cross-Sectional Properties of X-efficiency Estimates..... | 28 |
| Table 4 Spearman Rank Correlation of X-efficiency..... | 33 |
| Table 5: Correlation between X-efficiency and bank size..... | 33 |

LIST OF FIGURES

| | Page |
|---|-------------|
| Figure 1 (a): Mean of X-efficiency for the Full Sample of Banks..... | 29 |
| Figure 1 (b) Median of X-efficiency Median for the Full Sample of Banks | 30 |
| Figure 1 (c) Standard Deviation of X-efficiency for the Full Sample of Banks..... | 30 |
| Figure 2 (a) Mean of X-efficiency for Large and Small Banks | 31 |
| Figure 2 (b) Median of X-efficiency for Large and Small Banks | 32 |
| Figure 2 (c). Standard Deviation of X-efficiency for Large and Small Banks..... | 32 |

ABBREVIATIONS.

| | | |
|------------------|---|--|
| C.B.K | : | Central Bank Kenya |
| K.C.B | : | Kenya Commercial Bank |
| C.B.A | : | Commercial Bank of Africa |
| A.B.C | : | African Banking Commercial |
| H.F.C.K | : | Housing Finance Company of Kenya |
| I & M | : | Investment and Mortgage |
| N.B.K | : | National Bank of Kenya |
| NBFIs | : | Non Bank Financial Institutions |
| NPLs | : | Non Performing Loans |
| CAMEL | : | Capital adequacy, Asset quality, Management quality, Earning ability and Liquidity |
| VSAT | : | Very Small Aperture Terminal |
| IPOs | : | Initial Public Offers |
| EABS | : | East Africa Building Society |

DEDICATION

This project is dedicated to my parents Adam and Hawa Lyaga, who mean a lot to me and without them I could not be what I am today

ABSTRACT

This paper seeks to determine the X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya and to establish whether the X-efficiency of these banks is affected by economies of scale. The data set consists of annual operation costs of banks including interest expense. Deposits and borrowed funds are the inputs, and the loans to customers and investment and other incomes are the outputs. The data was collected from 33 banks for the period 2000 to 2005. To measure the X-efficiency level of commercial banks in Kenya, we used the Stochastic Econometric Cost Frontier approach which involves the estimation of the cost function and the derivation of the X-efficiency estimate based on the deviation from the efficient cost frontier. The empirical results obtained showed that X-efficiency exists in the commercial banks in Kenya and that X-efficiency of the banks is affected by economies of scale. We found out that the level of X-efficiency in Kenya's commercial banks industry is 18%. After controlling for scale differences, the average small bank is found to be relatively less efficient than the average large bank. The persistency of X-efficiency in relation to bank size was measured to find out if inefficient banks tend to remain inefficient over time. We found out that the average large bank was more persistent than the average small bank at the level of 23%. We also found out that bank size affects X-efficiency for large banks. These findings were consistent with the results found in other related studies in US (Kwan and Eisenbeis, 1996), Hong Kong (Kwan, 2001) and Namibia (Ikhide, 2000).

CHAPTER ONE

1.0. INTRODUCTION.

1.1. Background

The pursuit of efficiency is a fundamental concern for all businesses including commercial banks and other financial institutions. Generally, the concept of efficiency can be regarded as the relationship between outputs of a system and the corresponding inputs used in their production. Within the financial efficiency literature, efficiency is treated as a relative measure, which reflects the deviations from the maximum attainable output for a given level of input (Kwan and Eisenbeis, 1996)

X-efficiency stems from technical efficiency. Nyhan (1998) defines *technical efficiency* as a way of using minimum inputs to produce a given level of output. If a financial institution is technically inefficient then it is using too many inputs to produce the given level of output. *X-efficiency* attempts to measure the degree of waste and friction in the production process. *Allocative efficiency* measures whether the right levels of various inputs have been used to produce a given level of output.

In this study we have used X-efficiency as a measure of cost efficiency i.e. the extent to which commercial banks usually incur minimum costs in their operations to produce a given level of output. The difference between the actual operating costs of commercial banks and the minimum costs they should use is the X-efficiency.

Scale efficiency in a banking context refers to the economies brought about by joint operations. That is, the cost of providing joint banking services is less than the sum of banks stand-alone operations (Kwan and Eisenbeis, 1996). *Scope efficiency* in a banking context refers to the number of different types of services offered by banks and their effect on cost of operation and ability to raise revenue (Berger et al, 2001)

The Banking Act (2004) defines a bank as a company, which carries on, or proposes to carry on, banking business in Kenya and includes the Co-operative Bank of Kenya but does not include the Central Bank of Kenya. Commercial banks in Kenya are either privately owned, government owned, foreign owned or a mixture of two or more of the above. Therefore commercial banks in Kenya as elsewhere need to be efficient as they are accountable to their stockowners, depositors, investors and to the government for the resources entrusted to them.

This study is divided into four chapters. These chapters have been presented as follows: first is chapter one which is the introduction chapter, followed by literature review in chapter two, then the research methodology in chapter three and lastly chapter four focuses on the summary, discussion and conclusion. This chapter presents the introduction of the research topic. In section 1.2, we do the overview of the commercial banking industry in Kenya. Sections 1.3 and 1.4 focus on the statement of the problem and objectives of the study respectively. In section 5 we discuss the significance of the study.

1.2. The Commercial Banking Industry in Kenya.

Since independence, the commercial banks in Kenya have grown both in number, branches and the variety of services they offer like loans, credit and debit card services, introduction of Automatic Teller Machines (ATMs), electronic banking and other services. These developments are meant to improve scale and scope efficiency of operations in the banking industry. As commercial banks grow, they introduce new technology which increases scale and scope efficiency.

Currently Kenya has 44 commercial banks, which includes both large and small-scale banks. The entrance of new banks both local and foreign into the Kenyan banking sector has increased competition in the industry. Whether and how a bank survives in this competitive environment depends in part on how efficient it operates both in terms of scale and scope.

Some commercial banks in Kenya like Equity, Kenya Commercial Bank (KCB) and Cooperative bank play a special role in funding of small businesses that often have very limited access to other sources of external finance. Banks also play a major role in ensuring a smoothly functioning payment system, which allows financial and real resources to flow freely to their highest-return uses.

Policy makers, economists, and monetary authorities recognize the ability of banks to achieve the desired results and continue to play their role in contributing to the development of the economy. This depends not only on the existence of an enabling (regulatory) environment and the number of operating banks but also more importantly on their performance from one financial year to another. A commercial bank ought to improve on its X-efficiency in order to improve its performance from one year to another.

A basic benefit of enhanced efficiency is a reduction in spreads between lending and deposit rates. This is likely to stimulate both greater loan demands for industrial investments (and thus contribute to higher economic growth) and greater mobilization of savings through the banking system. Banks in most developing countries operate with relatively wide interest rate spreads. Operating inefficiencies of banks has been pointed out as one of the reasons to be investigated (Ikhide, 2000).

In this study, we use the Stochastic Econometric Cost Frontier Analysis approach to study the X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya. The cost function gives the minimum level of cost at which it is possible to produce some level of output, given input prices (Dwivedi, 2002). The cost frontier means that the observed production cost must lie anywhere above the cost frontier curve but no points can lie below it (Kwan, 2001). Thus, the amount by which a firm lies above its cost frontier is regarded as a measure of inefficiency.

In this study, we purpose to measure the operating X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya and to highlight the status of operation performance so that managers and regulators

can improve their own efficiency scores. This is important to managers, stockowners, depositors and investors

1.3. Statement of the Problem

The efficiency of commercial banks has reemerged as a critical issue to the public and private investors, whose confidence in financial institutions has been shaken by recent failures of banks in the banking sector in Kenya. The first cycle of bank failures began in 1984-1986 with the collapse of Rural Urban Credit Finance, Continental and Union Bank groups. These banks were liquidated after they were unable to repay the deposits obtained from government parastatals (Brownbridge, 1998). This led to some of the commercial banks being closed e.g. Euro bank and Trade bank while Central Bank of Kenya placed others under statutory management e.g. Daima bank. Other banks experiencing liquidity problems such as The Home Savings and Mortgages Company Ltd and Nationwide Finance Company Ltd were merged to form part of the present Consolidated Bank (Njihia, 2005).

Bank failures damage the credibility of financial institutions raising the costs of deposits and forcing financial institutions to maintain high level of liquidity as a precaution against bank runs that could lead to insolvency. The need for efficiency in day-to-day operations of financial institutions is thus evident as this will reduce chances of a bank failing and also efficiency of intermediation translates into good performance in the whole economy (Musyoki, 2003).

An efficient and a smoothly operating payment system is a necessary precondition for business development in Kenya and other countries. Business development can be enhanced by efficient banking system through low cost of credit, which in turn affects the level and rate of economic growth.

Many countries in sub-Saharan Africa liberalized their financial sectors in the late 1980's or 1990's to encourage greater financial efficiency (Brownbridge, March 2002). Kenya liberalized her financial system in the 1990's with interest rate liberalization in 1991 and

conversion of Non Banking Financial Institutions (NBFIs) to banks in 1994. Some state-owned banks like Kenya Commercial Bank and National Bank of Kenya were also privatized and banking rules and regulations strengthened. These changes have had an impact on the cost structure of commercial banks in Kenya due to the reduction in their levels of non-performing loans and political influence. This thus necessitates the study of X-efficiency of Kenya's commercial banks.

The fragility within the financial system has exposed deficiencies in the banking sector more so in regulatory and supervisory framework. These deficiencies have an impact on costs incurred by banks to facilitate their operations. Despite other studies of efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya having been done, the literature in this area is still scarce.

The study of X-efficiency of commercial banks has been done elsewhere in some African countries like Namibia by Ikhide (2000), European countries like Germany, Italy, Netherlands, Switzerland and UK by Berger et al (2001), in United States (US) by Barr (1999), and Asian countries like Hong Kong by Kwan (2001).

Ikhide (2000) using the efficient cost frontier approach and performance ratios studied the efficiency of the five commercial banks in Namibia from 1996 to 1998. He found out that the commercial banks are not producing at minimum costs and that profitability measures are not highly correlated with operating cost (Ikhide, 2000). Kwan (2001) used the Stochastic Econometric Cost Frontier approach to study X-efficiency of commercial banks in Hong Kong from 1992 to 1999. He found out that the average large banks tend to be more efficient than the small banks and that efficient banks tend to grow faster than inefficient banks (Kwan, 2001). Barr (1999) used the ratio analysis and examiner ratings to evaluate efficiency and performance of US banks from 1984 to 1998. He found out that there exists a strong and consistent relationship between efficiency and inputs and outputs used and that a close relationship exists between efficiency and soundness of a banking system (Barr, 1999). Berger et al, (2001) studied efficiency barriers to the consolidation of European financial services industry. Using data of merger and acquisitions of large,

publicly traded financial institutions in Europe for the period 1985 to 1997, they found out that barriers offset most of the potential efficiency gains from cross-border consolidation

Mutau (2002) used a sample of eight quoted commercial banks in Kenya to compare efficiency scores of highly capitalized banks with those of low capitalized banks for the period 1999 to 2001. Using the efficient cost frontier approach she found out that the low capitalized banks were more efficient than the highly capitalized banks and that capital ratio cannot be used to discriminate efficient banks from inefficient banks (Mutau, 2002).

Musyoki (2003) used a sample of 46 commercial banks in Kenya for the period 1998 to 2002 to establish if there is any link between quality and bank profitability. Through the use of a questionnaire he monitored performance of banks using a set of indicators that included liquidity, leverage, profitability and efficiency on productivity. The findings showed that quality improvement has a short-term effect on financial performance (Musyoki, 2003). Njihia (2005) used a sample of 36 commercial banks in Kenya from 1998 to 2004 to find out the determinants of profitability of commercial banks in Kenya. Using multiple regression analysis to analyze secondary data of financial statements of commercial banks, Njihia (2005) found out that the critical variables affecting profitability of commercial banks in Kenya are non performing loans and advances, interest expense on customers' deposits, operating expenses, provision for doubtful debts and total assets.

Despite many studies on commercial banks having been done in Kenya on topics such as performance by Musyoki (2003), profitability by Njihia (2005) and efficiency by Mutau (2002), the study on X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya is important as the element of cost efficiency has not been studied yet. It is important for soundness of the banking systems. Also as an improvement of the study done by Mutau (2002) this study uses a larger sample of 33 commercial banks and will study the small and the large banks separately. To improve on the study done by Njihia (2005) and Musyoki (2003) this study uses Stochastic Econometric Cost Frontier Analysis, which is an improved technique to measure efficiency. Thus, this study has mainly focused on the study of X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya.

This leads us to the question are Kenya's commercial banks X-efficient or not, and do economies of scale exist in the banking industry in Kenya?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

1. To determine the level of X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya
2. To establish whether X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya is affected by economies of scale

1.5. Significance of the Study

1. To Policy Makers.

X-efficiency study will enable policy makers to make appropriate policies regarding establishment of more financial institutions and how the existing ones can be encouraged to expand. Commercial banks efficiency can promote growth, mobilize savings and efficiently allocate resources, diversify and pool risks, facilitate trade and improve the monetary transmission process. The findings will be important when making policies concerning licensing of more banks and expansion of the existing ones.

2. To The Bank Managers

Information on the X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya will assist the bank managers to make decisions on whether to expand and whether to introduce other products to the market. It is crucial for bank managers to understand the cost structure, operational efficiency and economies of scale of their banks. The study will make banks to improve their operating efficiency having known that maybe despite making profits, they can further reduce their costs to make more profits.

3. To The Government

The government is interested in the country's economic growth. The solvency of banks and soundness of the banking system is germane to the performance of the entire economy. Without a sound and efficiently functioning banking system, the economy cannot function. When banks fail, the whole of a nation's payments system is thrown into jeopardy.

CHAPTER TWO

2.0. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Introduction.

The study of efficiency dates back to the path-breaking work of Farrell (1957) in his study on productive efficiency. He proposed specific measures of technical and allocative efficiency. Based on the concept of technical and allocative efficiency, Leibenstein (1966) coined the term X-inefficiency and noted that, for a variety of reasons, people and organizations normally work neither as hard nor as effectively as they could. The choice of focusing on X-efficiency in this study is partly because banking research to date suggests that X-efficiency appears to be large and tends to dominate scale and scope efficiencies (Kwan, 2001).

Profit maximization is one of the objectives of operation of commercial firms, and hence they have to decide what level of output to produce (Dwivedi, 2002). This decision determines the firm's purchases of factor inputs and also influences the price at which output can be sold (Hardwick, Khan and Langmead, 1994). To maximize profit, firms can use the optimizing output technique specifically by minimizing average cost of production (Dwivedi, 2002).

Most firms operate in a competitive market and are often faced with a given market price. Their profit is dependent on their ability to reduce their unit cost of production. Given the technology and input prices, the prospect of reducing unit cost of production depends invariably on the size of a firm or output produced (Dwivedi, 2002). Faced with an increasingly competitive operating environment, high overhead costs, reduced interest rate margins and high levels of non-performing loans, banks have reacted by restructuring their operations. This involves rightsizing of establishment, greater focus on customer service through tailored products/service provisions and restructuring of non-performing loans with the aim of turning them to performing status (KCB Annual Report 2004).

Production involves transformation of resources into final goods or services. The relationship between inputs and outputs is a technological relationship, which economists summarize in a production function i.e. output is a function of various inputs used to produce that output (Nyhan, 1998). Technological efficiency is achieved for a given level of factor inputs if it is impossible to obtain a higher level of output given the existing technology.

Cost efficiency of commercial banks will be achieved if the products produced are the ones that will give the bank maximum revenue using the given inputs (Dwivedi, 2002). If this is achieved then profits made by the banks too will be maximized as well as shareholders' wealth.

It is quite plausible that some productively efficient firms are economically inefficient, and vice versa. Such efficiency mismatches depend on the relationship between managers' abilities to utilize the best technologies and their abilities to respond to market signals. Productive efficiency requires only input and output data, whereas economic efficiency also requires market price data. Allocative efficiency is about doing things right, and economic efficiency is about doing the right things right (Kwan and Eisenbeis, 1996). The study of X-efficiency therefore includes both allocative and economic efficiency.

Inputs of commercial banks used in this study include deposits from customers and borrowed funds (loans) (Kwan, 2001). Outputs on the other hand include loans and advances to customers and other incomes like income from investments in intangible and other assets like treasury bonds and bills, buildings, shares, service charges and commissions, and income on foreign exchange dealings (Kwan, 2001). The cost is composed of operating expenses such as administrative expenses, directors' emoluments, depreciation of property and equipment, amortization of intangible assets and leasehold land, and auditor's remuneration (Kwan, 2001).

2.2. X-Efficiency of Commercial Banks.

Kwan and Eisenbeis (1996) in their study of inefficiencies in banking, from 1986 to 1991 used Stochastic Efficient Frontier analysis. After controlling for scale differences, they found out that small banking firms on average are relatively less efficient than large banking firms. Moreover, small banking firms tend to exhibit larger variations in X-inefficiencies than large banking firms. Their findings suggest that the average large banking firm operates closer to its respective efficient frontier than the average small banking firm.

In the study of the productive efficiency and performance of US commercial banks, Barr (1999) used ratio analysis and examiner ratings techniques. Using the study period from 1984 to 1998, Barr (1999) found out that there is a strong and consistent relationship between efficiency and inputs used and outputs, as well as independent measures of bank performance. Further, the results found by Barr suggest that the impact of varying economic conditions is mediated to some extent by relative efficiencies of the banks that operate in these conditions. A close relationship exists between efficiency and soundness of the banking system as determined by bank examiner ratings (Barr 1999).

Productive efficiency examines levels of inputs relative to levels of outputs. To be productively efficient, a firm must either minimize its inputs given its output quantities, or maximize its outputs given inputs quantity (Barr, 1999). Economic efficiency is somewhat broader in that it involves optimally choosing the level and mixes of inputs and or outputs based on reactions to market prices. To be economically efficient, a firm seeks to optimize some economic goal, such as cost minimization or profit maximization. In this sense, economic efficiency requires both productive efficiency and allocative efficiency.

Ikhide (2000) used Econometric Cost Frontier approach and operating ratios to study Namibia's bank efficiency. Using the study period from 1996 to 1998, he found out that commercial banks are not producing at the point of minimum average costs and suggests that banks can further lower their operating costs as they expand output. Observations were

that profitability measures by gross margins, return on assets and return on equity ratios are not highly correlated with operating costs (Ikhude, 2000)

The study of X-efficiency of commercial banks in Hong Kong for the study period from 1992 to 1999 showed that cost inefficiency of Hong Kong was quite large averaging between 16 to 30 percent of the observed total costs (Kwan, 2001) In this study, Kwan (2001) further found out that the level of inefficiency in Hong Kong banks was declining over time, indicating that banks in Hong Kong are now operating closer to the cost efficient frontier than before which is consistent with existence of technological innovation in banking during the sampling period. Cross-sectional X-efficiency was found to skew to the left indicating that there are more banks that are relatively efficient than inefficient, (Kwan, 2001) As a whole, the average large bank in Hong Kong was found to be less efficient than the average small bank, but the gap seemed to be narrowing over time (Kwan, 2001).

Further, Kwan (2001) established that X-efficiency is related with certain bank characteristics. *Ceteris paribus*, X-efficiency was found to decline with bank size, deposit to asset ratio, loan to asset ratios, provision for loan loss, and loan growth, and it is found to increase with off-balance sheet activities (Kwan, 2001). After controlling for on and off-balance sheet ratios and growth, bigger banks tend to be more efficient than smaller banks. Banks that make more loans and banks that gather more deposits tend to be more efficient (Kwan, 2001) Banks with higher loan loss provisions were more cost efficient, perhaps at the expense of lower profits. Efficient banks tend to grow faster than inefficient banks (Kwan, 2001). More off-balance sheet activities are associated with higher level of inefficiencies, in part because off-balance sheet products were not included in the output definition and therefore biased the output measure downward (Kwan, 2001)

Iefula (2002) used both stochastic and distribution free approaches to study the implications of X-inefficiency of the banking industry in Africa. Using data from 1992 to 1999 he found out that in Africa, profit inefficiencies are higher than cost inefficiencies. This is not surprising since profit inefficiency is a composite of cost and revenue inefficiencies. However, when profit inefficiencies are decomposed, he found out that the

that profitability measures by gross margins, return on assets and return on equity ratios are not highly correlated with operating costs (Ikhide, 2000).

The study of X-efficiency of commercial banks in Hong Kong for the study period from 1992 to 1999 showed that cost inefficiency of Hong Kong was quite large averaging between 16 to 30 percent of the observed total costs (Kwan, 2001). In this study, Kwan (2001) further found out that the level of inefficiency in Hong Kong banks was declining over time, indicating that banks in Hong Kong are now operating closer to the cost efficient frontier than before which is consistent with existence of technological innovation in banking during the sampling period. Cross-sectional X-efficiency was found to skew to the left indicating that there are more banks that are relatively efficient than inefficient, (Kwan, 2001). As a whole, the average large bank in Hong Kong was found to be less efficient than the average small bank, but the gap seemed to be narrowing over time (Kwan, 2001).

Further, Kwan (2001) established that X-efficiency is related with certain bank characteristics. *Ceteris paribus*, X-efficiency was found to decline with bank size, deposit to asset ratio, loan to asset ratios, provision for loan loss, and loan growth; and it is found to increase with off-balance sheet activities (Kwan, 2001). After controlling for on and off-balance sheet ratios and growth, bigger banks tend to be more efficient than smaller banks. Banks that make more loans and banks that gather more deposits tend to be more efficient (Kwan, 2001). Banks with higher loan loss provisions were more cost efficient, perhaps at the expense of lower profits. Efficient banks tend to grow faster than inefficient banks (Kwan, 2001). More off-balance sheet activities are associated with higher level of inefficiencies, in part because off-balance sheet products were not included in the output definition and therefore biased the output measure downward (Kwan, 2001).

Tetula (2002) used both stochastic and distribution free approaches to study the implications of X-inefficiency of the banking industry in Africa. Using data from 1992 to 1999 he found out that in Africa, profit inefficiencies are higher than cost inefficiencies. This is not surprising since profit inefficiency is a composite of cost and revenue inefficiencies. However, when profit inefficiencies are decomposed, he found out that the

cost side was twice as large as the revenue side (Tefula, 2002). This suggested that more efficiency improvement would be achieved through better management and control of the cost side compared to the revenue side. Furthermore since managers have greater control of the costs than the revenues; the higher cost efficiency reflects their cost preference behavior. This tends to subjugate the shareholders' best interests, thus increasing agency costs (Tefula, 2002). This has necessitated the study of X-efficiency rather than efficiency in general.

There is unequivocal link between efficiency and financial performance, which means that efficient banks usually experience high financial performance. (Hughes, 2004). The evidence from the analysis of data collected in the study of efficiency of commercial banks in Gambia indicated that Gambia's banking system has not performed the functions as efficiently as it ought to (Agu, 2004). The causes of inefficiencies in the performance of the various functions include the heavy regulatory framework, the oligopolistic market structure and the small banking market (Agu, 2004).

A study of banking and process efficiency of Taiwan commercial banks by Taipei (1997), shows that banks in Taiwan usually act as a bridge to provide a major source of financial intermediation. They have tried to improve their efficiency by gaining strength assets management and providing new services to attract spare funds (Taipei, 1997). In the early 1990's, Taiwan embarked on bank deregulation to increase operating efficiency and to attract funds into the loanable fund supply market. The results from the study of process efficiency of Taiwan commercial banks using Data Envelopment Analysis showed that there is rather high level of overall efficiency. The study suggested that the inefficient banks could effectively promote efficient resource utilization by better handling their labor and capital operating efficiency and by enlarging bank investment function (Taipei, 1997).

Many countries in Sub-Sahara Africa liberalized their financial sectors in the late 1980's or 1990's to encourage greater financial efficiency (Brownbridge, 2002). Policy reforms included: removing interest rate controls, removing requirements on banks to lend to specific sectors, privatizing state owned banks and allowing easier entry by private sector

banks and Non Bank Financial Institutions (NBFIs) including foreign banks (Brownbridge, 2002). At the same time to promote sounder banking and help protect bank deposits reforms were introduced to strengthen the prudential regulation and supervision of banks by improving bank laws and expanding supervisory capacities (Brownbridge, 2002).

2.3 X-efficiency of Commercial Banks in Kenya.

Research by Ngugi (2001) indicates that Kenya experiences a widening spread in interest rates in post liberalization period i.e. after July 1991. Ngugi (2001) in her study found out that the interest rate spread increased because of the yet-to-be gained efficiency and high intermediation costs. Variations in interest rate spread are attributable to bank efforts to maintain threatened profit margins (Ngugi, 2001). Banks that faced increasing credit risk as the proportion of Non Performing Loans (NPLs) went up, responded by charging a high risk premium on the lending rate. Fiscal policy actions saw an increase in Treasury Bill rates and high inflationary pressure that called for tightening of the monetary policy. As a result, the banks increased their lending rates but they were reluctant to reduce the lending rate when the Treasury Bill rate came down because of the declining income from loans (Ngugi, 2001). The banks responded by reducing deposit rate, thus maintaining a wide margin as they left the lending rate at a higher level. Thus there was an asymmetric response of lending rates to Treasury Bill rates. High implicit costs were realized with the tight monetary policy, which was pursued with increased liquidity and cash ratio requirements. Consequently, banks kept a wide interest rate spread even when inflationary pressure came down (Ngugi, 2001).

The wide interest rate spread hampers stimulation of both greater loan demands for industrial investment (which would thus contribute to higher economic growth) and greater mobilization of savings through the banking system (Ngugi, 2001).

Interest rates in Kenya were liberalized in 1991 while state owned banks like Kenya Commercial Bank (KCB) and National Bank of Kenya (NBK) were privatized in the 1990's, (centralbank.go.ke). Private sector banks were allowed easier entry by allowing Non Bank Financial Institutions to convert into banks in 1992 (centralbank.go.ke).

Financial liberalization has changed the nature of the risks facing the banking system (Brownbridge, March 2002). Reforms have reduced the risk of bank distress caused by governments directing banks (government owned banks in particular) to lend to unviable and un-creditworthy borrowers (Brownbridge, March 2002). New challenges have emerged such as greater competition that is squeezing profits of weaker banks, the entry of new banks that lack the expertise to manage risks in liberalized markets, greater opportunities for fraud and abuse of depositors' funds by banks and NBFIs, and risks arising from foreign exchange (Brownbridge, March 2002).

Overall although banks complied with regulator's requirements on capital matters, the regulator's urgings for small poorly capitalized banks to merge, recapitalize or wind up altogether in order to boost capital levels were almost entirely ignored. A good case is the failed merger of Daima bank (now in receivership) and the collapsed Euro Bank, which were both seriously undercapitalized (Thuita, 2003). This implies that undercapitalization may lead to X-inefficiency

Low capitalized banks are more efficient than highly capitalized banks (Mutanu, 2002). The low capitalized banks by taking more risks increase their efficiency while the highly capitalized banks feel that taking more risks would be too much risk for their capital and this thus increases their inefficiency (Mutanu, 2002). Mutanu found out that in the Kenyan context, capital cannot be used to discriminate efficient banks from inefficient banks because the highly capitalized banks can increase their capital through reevaluation of the assets and not through the injection of fresh capital or retained earnings (Mutanu, 2002).

Further when Mutanu compared the size of banks and efficiency, the results showed that some of the largest banks were the most inefficient while the small banks maintained consistently moderate efficiency. This was evident in our local banks such as Kenya Commercial Bank and National Bank of Kenya which had the lowest efficiency clearly indicated in the market value (Mutanu, 2002). Small banks are more efficient than large banks, and therefore utilizing their resources efficiently unlike the large banks which do not want to take extra risk by injecting more capital. The large banks are not therefore

utilizing their resources well (Mutanu, 2002). However, the study used a limited sample (only quoted banks). Mutanu recommended another study to be done using a different technique and a larger sample allowing small and large banks to be studied separately.

Commercial banks in Kenya have been introducing new banking services like Short text Message Service (SMS) banking by KCB where bank customers use the mobile phone to send instructions to the bank; introduction of different types of loans like education loan, car loan, house loan; and being involved in Initial Public Offers (IPOs) floatation like for Kenya Electricity Generating company (Kengen) shares.

The KCB 2004 Annual Report and the Kenyan Banker (2004) have indicated that there is competition in the banking industry in Kenya. The Kenyan Banker (2004) stated that Kenya's banks are currently faced with increasingly competitive operating environment, high overhead costs, reduced interest rate margins and high levels of NPLs. The increased competition should leave little room for inefficiency; however it is unclear about the level of cost inefficiency of commercial banks in Kenya. High levels of non-performing loans and advances and reduced interest rate margins may contribute to the cost inefficiency of commercial banks as they may increase the costs incurred by banks. The increasingly competitive environment in the banking industry leads to an increase in overhead costs incurred by banks as a result of increased cost of advertising (Kenyan Banker, 2004).

The three banking systems i.e. Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, however, remain inefficient and perform only a limited intermediation role despite recent reform efforts and even with the presence of international banks (Cihak and Podpiera, 2005). This is due to the impediments to banking sector lending, competition and development in general (Cihak and Podpiera, 2005).

External environment is very turbulent due to both local and global competition, the increasingly demanding customer and changes in information technology. However, factor analysis reveal that the key factors that most impacted on the banks were increased competition and threat of substitute products (Gathoga, 2001). The banks are also

utilizing their resources well (Mutanu, 2002). However, the study used a limited sample (only quoted banks). Mutanu recommended another study to be done using a different technique and a larger sample allowing small and large banks to be studied separately.

Commercial banks in Kenya have been introducing new banking services like Short text Message Service (SMS) banking by KCB where bank customers use the mobile phone to send instructions to the bank; introduction of different types of loans like education loan, car loan, house loan; and being involved in Initial Public Offers (IPOs) floatation like for Kenya Electricity Generating company (Kengen) shares.

The KCB 2004 Annual Report and the Kenyan Banker (2004) have indicated that there is competition in the banking industry in Kenya. The Kenyan Banker (2004) stated that Kenya's banks are currently faced with increasingly competitive operating environment, high overhead costs, reduced interest rate margins and high levels of NPLs. The increased competition should leave little room for inefficiency; however it is unclear about the level of cost inefficiency of commercial banks in Kenya. High levels of non-performing loans and advances and reduced interest rate margins may contribute to the cost inefficiency of commercial banks as they may increase the costs incurred by banks. The increasingly competitive environment in the banking industry leads to an increase in overhead costs incurred by banks as a result of increased cost of advertising (Kenyan Banker, 2004).

The three banking systems i.e. Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, however, remain inefficient and perform only a limited intermediation role despite recent reform efforts and even with the presence of international banks (Cihak and Podpiera, 2005). This is due to the impediments to banking sector lending, competition and development in general (Cihak and Podpiera, 2005).

External environment is very turbulent due to both local and global competition, the increasingly demanding customer and changes in information technology. However, factor analysis reveal that the key factors that most impacted on the banks were increased competition and threat of substitute products (Gathoga, 2001). The banks are also

utilizing their resources well (Mutanu, 2002). However, the study used a limited sample (only quoted banks). Mutanu recommended another study to be done using a different technique and a larger sample allowing small and large banks to be studied separately.

Commercial banks in Kenya have been introducing new banking services like Short text Message Service (SMS) banking by KCB where bank customers use the mobile phone to send instructions to the bank; introduction of different types of loans like education loan, car loan, house loan; and being involved in Initial Public Offers (IPOs) floatation like for Kenya Electricity Generating company (KENGEN) shares.

The KCB 2004 Annual Report and the Kenyan Banker (2004) have indicated that there is competition in the banking industry in Kenya. The Kenyan Banker (2004) stated that Kenya's banks are currently faced with increasingly competitive operating environment, high overhead costs, reduced interest rate margins and high levels of NPLs. The increased competition should leave little room for inefficiency; however it is unclear about the level of cost inefficiency of commercial banks in Kenya. High levels of non-performing loans and advances and reduced interest rate margins may contribute to the cost inefficiency of commercial banks as they may increase the costs incurred by banks. The increasingly competitive environment in the banking industry leads to an increase in overhead costs incurred by banks as a result of increased cost of advertising (Kenyan Banker, 2004).

The three banking systems i.e. Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, however, remain inefficient and perform only a limited intermediation role despite recent reform efforts and even with the presence of international banks (Cihak and Podpiera, 2005). This is due to the impediments to banking sector lending, competition and development in general (Cihak and Podpiera, 2005).

External environment is very turbulent due to both local and global competition, the increasingly demanding customer and changes in information technology. However, factor analysis reveal that the key factors that most impacted on the banks were increased competition and threat of substitute products (Gathoga, 2001). The banks are also

differentiating their products/services given the homogeneous nature of products in the local market (Gathuga, 2001). Differentiating products may have an impact to increase cost, and for banks to be cost efficient the additional costs incurred on such output should also lead to a proportionate or more income from such services.

Competitor Analysis by Couperative Bank as at September 2005 shows that commercial banks in Kenya are experiencing a challenge in credit risk management as shown by the high levels of non-performing loans and advances. The industry average of non-performing loans and advances was at 23% in comparison to the total loans (Competitor Analysis as at September, 2005). This may have increased the operation costs of commercial banks thus increasing the cost inefficiency of commercial banks in Kenya.

Technological development in the banking industry in Kenya has enabled the banks to reduce their production costs and at the same time maximize their profits (KCB 2004 Annual Report). This may contribute to improved efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya. This study seeks to determine the X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya and whether economies of scale affect X-efficiency.

Njihia, 2005 in his study sought to find out the determinants of profitability of commercial banks in Kenya. Using multiple regression analysis technique, he studied 36 commercial banks from 1998 to 2004. Critical variables affecting profitability of commercial banks in Kenya are: non performing loans and advances, interest expense on customers' deposits, operating expenses, provision for doubtful debts and total assets (Njihia, 2005). Efficiency in expense management was one of the most significant determinants of commercial bank profitability (Shanmugan, 1999 as quoted in Njihia, 2005).

Musyoki (2003) compared quality improvement with financial performance in an attempt to establish if there is any link between quality and bank profitability. Using a sample of 46 commercial banks for the period 1998 to 2002, he found out that quality improvement has a short term effect on financial performance and that there are undoubtedly other benefits gained from improved quality, but they may be difficult to measure (Musyoki, 2003).

2.4. Estimation Techniques of Efficiency.

2.4.1. Examiner Ratings

In the early 1970s regulators of federal financial institutions, realized the advantages of a standardized framework for the examination process. They developed a rating system whereby the most critical components of a financial institution's overall safety and soundness could be identified, measured and quantified. In 1979, the uniform financial institution rating system was adopted commonly referred to by the acronym CAMEL. The evaluation factors that comprise the CAMEL ratings are: Capital adequacy, Asset quality, Management quality, Earning ability, and Liquidity. The outcome of an on-site examination of a financial institution has become a concise and indispensable tool for examiners and regulators (Barr, 1999).

Each of the factors is scored from 1 to 5 with 1 being the strongest rating. Additionally a single composite CAMELS rating is determined from these components, and represents the findings of the examination for the institution as a whole. The Commercial Bank Examination Manual produced by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System describes the five composite ratings as follows:

CAMELS = 1: An institution that is basically sound in every respect

CAMELS = 2: An institution that is fundamentally sound but has moderate weaknesses.

CAMELS = 3: An institution with financial, operational, or compliance weaknesses that give cause for supervisory concern.

CAMELS = 4: An institution with serious financial weaknesses that could impair future viability.

CAMELS = 5: An institution with critical financial weaknesses that render the probability of failure extremely high in the near term.

Research involving efficiency and CAMEL ratings is somewhat limited, due in large part to the restricted nature of the ratings (Barr, 1999). A firm's efficiency may fall in more than one of the five categories mentioned above or into none at all.

2.4.2. Operating Ratios

This method of measuring efficiency uses accounting data on bank margins, costs and profits as measures of bank efficiency (Ikhide, 2000). The three types of operating ratios used include: asset ratios like Return on Asset (ROA) ratio, operating income ratios like Return on Investments (ROI) and operating equity ratios like Return on Equity (ROE).

However, a setback in using this method as a measure of inefficiency is that differences in capital structure, business mix and accounting standards across banks may affect these ratios and render comparability inadequate (Ikhide, 2000). These differences are present in the Kenya's commercial banks industry, thus if used alone it may not be a good measure of commercial banks X-efficiency.

2.4.3. Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA).

This is a non-parametric approach to measure efficiency. It compares the amounts of inputs used to produce a given level of output so as to establish efficiency in the production process (Barr, 1999). However this technique generally does not take account of prices and can therefore account only for technical inefficiency i.e. using too many inputs or producing too few outputs (Weill, 2003). It does not also account for allocative inefficiency and is not suitable for comparing firms that specialize in different inputs and outputs since it does not take account of relative prices (Weill, 2003).

DEA uses linear programming technique to compute efficiency scores. Its weakness is that it does not allow for error in the data: thus includes exogenous events in the inefficiency term (Weill, 2003).

2.4.4. Stochastic Efficient Cost Frontier Approach (SECFA).

It was developed by Aigner, Lovell and Schmidt (1977). In this method a banking firm's observed total cost is modeled to deviate from the cost efficient frontier due to random noise and possibly X-inefficiency. A bank is labeled inefficient if its costs or profits are lower than the best practice bank after removing random errors. This technique assumes

that inefficiencies follow an asymmetric normal distribution, and that both are orthogonal to the cost function exogenous variables.

Its advantages are that it allows for separation of random error from the inefficiency term; thus avoid consideration of exogenous events as inefficiency and that it allows easier control of the influence of variables on the structure of the cost frontier than the DEA (Weill, 2003). Its disadvantage is that it imposes more structure on the shape of the frontier by specifying a functional form of cost function (Weill, 2003).

The advantages of SECFA outweigh its disadvantage, so it is a better approach to use in this study of Kenya's commercial banks X-efficiency.

2.5. Trends in the Study of Efficiency.

There has been significant development in studies of efficiency over time. In the 1950s the studies of efficiency just examined technical efficiency by comparing input to their corresponding output (Farrell, 1957). However, Lebeinstein (1966) introduced the study of X-inefficiency whereby the element of cost in the study of efficiency was introduced. Since then there have been improvements in the study of efficiency in the following studies: Ikhide (2000), Kwan (2001), and Kwan and Eisenbeis (1996) through the use of different methodologies like the econometric cost frontier analysis and performance ratios.

There has also been a shift from just using performance based techniques i.e. ratio analysis to DEA and SECFA as a measure of efficiency. This is due to the fact that financial performance alone cannot effectively measure efficiency (Ikhide 2000). The examiner ratings i.e. CAMEL may introduce bias in the measure of efficiency as a firm has to be fitted in either one of the five listed categories (Barr, 1999). The most commonly used methods are DEA and SECFA. However the DEA does not capture the cost element but only looks at the input in comparison to its corresponding output (Weill, 2003). This leaves the SECFA as the most preferred method to measure X-efficiency.

The focus of current research of X-efficiency is on determination of scale and scope efficiency and establishing whether economies of scale do exist (Ikhida, 2000). This study chooses to use Stochastic Econometric Cost Frontier approach, as it is the most appropriate because it incorporates the element of price, which is necessary in measuring cost efficiency.

2.6. Summary

The study of X-efficiency emphasizes more on economic efficiency as the element of price is involved. As an improvement to the study by Barr (1999), we use Stochastic Econometric Cost Frontier approach in this study on commercial banks in Kenya. In addition to establishing whether there is a relationship between inputs and outputs, this study has added the element of cost, which is a development in the studies of inefficiency. Also, for comparison of X-efficiency of commercial banks among different countries like Hong Kong, Namibia, United States of America (USA) and United Kingdom (UK); there is a need to study X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya.

Mutau (2002) used efficient cost frontier analysis in her study by comparing efficiency scores of highly capitalized banks to low capitalized banks. However, there was a limitation in her study as her sample size was small and thus she could not compare large and small banks. This study seeks to establish the cost efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya using the Stochastic Econometric Cost Frontier approach and using a larger sample so as to be able to examine the cost efficiency for the large and small banks separately. Musyoki (2003) in his study mentioned that there are undoubtedly other benefits gained from improved quality, but they may be very difficult to measure. Cost efficiency may be one of the benefits of improved quality and thus is the main objective of this study. Njihia (2005), in his study used the multiple regression technique to study the determinants of profitability of commercial banks in Kenya. This study emphasizes on establishing the X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya so as to fill the gap in studies on efficiency done in Kenya but concentrating on other aspects of efficiency studied as mentioned above.

CHAPTER THREE

3.0. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Introduction

In this study, we have used the Stochastic Econometric Cost Frontier approach to measure X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya. The aim was to establish the level of X-efficiency and whether economies of scale affect X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya. Apart from that, we have also established the persistency of X-efficiency and compared X-efficiency in relation to the characteristic of size. Using the Stochastic Econometric Cost Frontier model, we established the efficient cost frontier and hence the level of X-efficiency. The persistency of X-efficiency has been measured using the Spearman Rank correlation and the Pearson correlation coefficient has been used to compare the relationship between X-efficiency and the characteristic of bank size.

This chapter presents the research methodology. Section 3.2 and 3.3 describe the population and data sample respectively. Section 3.3 discusses the sample design and section 3.4 has focused on the research methodology.

3.2. The Population.

Currently, Kenya has 44 commercial banks in operation. All these banks constitute the population of the study.

3.3. Data Sample

The data set consists of secondary data of the audited financial statements of commercial banks included in the sample. Specific data used are: deposits; borrowed funds; operating expenses (administrative expenses, director's emoluments, depreciation of property and equipment, amortization of intangible assets and leasehold land and auditor's remuneration), loans and advances to customers; investments in intangible and other assets, service charges and fees, bank commissions, and income on foreign exchange dealings. We

obtained these audited financial statements from the Bank Supervision Department of Central Bank of Kenya (CBK).

3.4. Sample Design

The number of banks studied in this paper constitutes 75% of commercial banks currently operating in Kenya. This comprises of 33 banks that have been operating in Kenya in the period of study, which is from the year 2000 to 2005. This sample size excludes banks that have been closed down. These have been selected through random sampling. According to central limit theorem in statistical theory, any sample equal to or greater than 30 is representative enough irrespective of the population size. The sample is further divided into small and large banks subsamples by using total assets as a proxy for size.

3.5. Research Model.

3.5.1. Conceptual Model.

The stochastic cost frontier model has the following general (log) form:

$$\ln C_n = f(\ln y_{i,n}, \ln w_{j,n}) + e_n \quad (1)$$

Where C_n is the total cost for bank n ; $y_{i,n}$ measures the i th output of bank n ; and $w_{j,n}$ is the price of j th input of bank n . The error term e_n has two components:

$$e_n = \mu_n + v_n \quad (2)$$

The first component, μ_n captures the effect of the uncontrollable (random) factors while the second, v_n , represents controllable factors (Aigner et al, 1977). It is assumed that μ is distributed as asymmetric normal $N(0, \sigma_\mu^2)$ and that V is independently distributed as a half-normal, $[N(0, \sigma_v^2)]$. Where N is the number of banks studied, 0 implies the mean is zero. σ_μ^2 is variance of the uncontrollable random factors and σ_v^2 is the variance of the controllable random factors. Following Jondrow, Lovell, Materov and Schmidt (1982), as an estimate of the n^{th} bank's X-efficiency can be derived from the composite error term.

$$XE_n = E[v_n | c_n] = \frac{O_\lambda}{1 + \lambda^2} \left(\frac{\phi(C_n \lambda / O)}{\Phi(C_n \lambda / O)} - \frac{C_n \lambda}{O} \right) \quad (3)$$

Where XE_n is the X-efficiency of bank n , $E[v_n | c_n]$ is the expectation operator, O is the standard deviation, λ is the ratio of the standard deviation of v to the standard deviation of μ (i.e., O_λ / O_μ), $O^2 = O_v^2 + O_\mu^2$ and ϕ and Φ are the standard and cumulative normal density functions respectively. The X-efficiency estimate has the interpretation of the percentage of the total costs that could have been reduced were the bank to operate at the efficient cost frontier.

Assuming the cost function to be stationary over time, pooled time-series cross-section observations were used to estimate the efficient cost frontier. For robustness, in addition to estimating the efficient cost frontier using the full sample of banks, the efficient cost frontier is also estimated separately for the subsamples of large banks and small banks.

3.5.2. Analytical Model

To specify the functional form of the cost frontier in equation (1) above, the standard multi-product translog cost function is used:

$$\ln C = \alpha_0 + \sum_i \beta_i \ln y_i + \sum_j \beta_j \ln w_j + 1/2 \sum_i \sum_k \gamma_{ik} \ln y_i \ln y_k + 1/2 \sum_j \sum_l \zeta_{jl} \ln w_j \ln w_l + \sum_i \sum_j \omega_{ij} \ln y_i \ln w_j + \epsilon_n \quad (4)$$

The homogeneity restrictions,

$$\sum_i \beta_i = 1, \quad \sum_i \zeta_{ij} = 0, \quad \sum_k \omega_{ik} = 0$$

are imposed by normalizing total costs and input prices by one of the input prices. These restrictions are imposed so as to obtain a normal distribution of X-efficiency estimates. Therefore the difference between the mean and the median should be zero or almost zero for the mean X-efficiency to be distributed as asymmetric normal.

Where C is the operating cost (including interest expense), y_i and y_k are outputs i.e. loans and advances to customers and investments and other incomes respectively, w_j and w_l are

inputs i.e deposits and borrowed funds respectively. α_0 is a constant, β , γ , ζ , and ω are coefficients β_1 and β_2 are subscripts used to differentiate the first and second inputs while γ_1 and γ_2 are subscripts used to differentiate the first and second output.

Equation (4) was simplified as follows:

$$\ln C = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 \ln y_1 + \beta_2 \ln y_2 + \beta_1 \ln w_1 + \beta_2 \ln w_2 + 1/2 \gamma_{11} \ln y_1 \ln y_2 + 1/2 \zeta_{11} \ln w_1 \ln w_2 + \omega_{11} \ln y_1 \ln w_1 + \omega_{12} \ln y_1 \ln w_2 + \omega_{21} \ln y_2 \ln w_1 + \omega_{22} \ln y_2 \ln w_2 + \epsilon_a \quad (5)$$

We used equation (5) to estimate the efficient total cost (\hat{C}) that lies on the efficient cost frontier. Therefore, the X-efficiency level will be the difference between the estimated total cost and the actual total cost (\hat{C})

If C is greater than \hat{C} , then the commercial banks will be inefficient but if they are equal then the commercial banks will be efficient as they will be operating at the efficient cost frontier. C cannot be less than \hat{C} as it cannot be less than the efficient cost unless there is an error.

Further, we calculated the mean and standard deviation of the X-efficiency estimate which gave us the average level of X-efficiency and the variation of X-efficiency over time. The median is also calculated because if compared to the mean and they are almost equal it shows that the mean is distributed as asymmetric normal due to the restriction imposed by the model in equation (4). The Spearman Rank correlation of the X-efficiency estimate is also calculated so as to be able to determine the persistence of the inefficiency of the banks analyzed. The Pearson correlation coefficient has also been calculated to show relationship between the banks' X-efficiency estimates and size.

Our method assumes that all banks have the same access to the underlying production technology and hence face the same cost frontier.

CHAPTER FOUR

4.0. DATA ANALYSIS, DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION.

4.1. Introduction.

This chapter presents the results of the data analysis, discussion and conclusion. Section 4.2 is a statistical summary of the data. Section 4.3 provides the results of the data analysis and their discussion. Section 4.4 concludes the chapter. In section 4.5 and 4.6 we discuss the limitations of the study and recommendations for further research respectively.

4.2. Data Summary.

There were 33 banks in the sample. We divided these banks into two subsamples of small and large banks by using the median asset size of the sampled banks (Kwan, 2001). The aim of the division was to estimate X-efficiency separately for the large and small banks. The rationale is that the small and the large banks have different scales of operation and through these subsamples we sought to establish whether economies of scale affect X-efficiency. Banks that recorded an asset value above the median in the year 2005 are classified as large banks while those that recorded asset values below the median are classified as small banks. Of the 33 sampled banks 16 were classified as large and the remaining 17 were classified as small.

Table 1: Data Summary for the Sample of Banks.

(All figures are in Kshs. Billions)

| | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation | Min | Max |
|-------------------------------|--------|--------|--------------------|-------|---------|
| Loans and advances | 8.435 | 3.35 | 11.6 | 0.133 | 68.737 |
| Investments and other incomes | 5.057 | 1.787 | 7.6 | 0.118 | 47.526 |
| Deposits | 11.578 | 3.066 | 18.6 | 0.098 | 82.546 |
| Borrowed Funds | 3.929 | 0.818 | 8.6 | 0.026 | 52.549 |
| Operating Cost | 2.725 | 0.449 | 5.3 | 0.005 | 41.572 |
| Total Assets | 13.335 | 3.951 | 21.1 | 1.047 | 106.195 |

Source: Calculated from data collected from CBK.

Table 1 above shows the mean of output for the full sample is at Kshs.8.435 billion and Kshs.5.057 billion for loans and advances and investments and other incomes respectively.

while for the inputs are Kshs.11.578 billion and Kshs.3.929 billion for deposits and borrowed funds respectively. The mean of the operating cost is at Kshs.2.725 billion and kshs 13.335 billion for total assets. We also calculated the median, standard deviation, minimum and maximum amounts for each variable. The inputs of deposits and borrowed funds are used to produce the outputs of loans and advances to customers and investments and other incomes and the operation cost is the production cost.

4.3. Discussion.

To measure X-efficiency, we used pooled time-series cross-sectional analysis to estimate the efficient cost frontier. Then we calculated the X-efficiency estimates for each bank and each sampling period by subtracting the efficient cost from the actual cost. We obtained the time series measures of X-efficiency by aggregating data across banks. The distributions of X-efficiency for each sampling period in Table 2 provided information about cross-sectional distribution of X-efficiency among sample banks.

The results in Table 2 below shows the mean and median X-efficiency estimates for the years 2000 to 2005. For the full sample the mean X-efficiency was 18% in the year 2000 but by the year 2005 it had increased to 20%. For the large banks, X-efficiency increased from 17% in the year 2000 to 19% as at the end of the year 2005. For the small banks the mean X-efficiency estimate increased from 19% in the year 2000 to 21% by the end of the year 2005. The median calculated above if compared to the mean, the difference is almost zero and thus assumes that the mean of X-efficiency is distributed as a symmetric normal.

A number of observations can be made from Table 2. First the estimated mean X-efficiency was increasing over time, suggesting that commercial banks in Kenya are now operating further from the cost frontier than before. This is with the exception of the years 2001 and 2003 which showed a slight decline in the mean and median X-efficiency.

Secondly, when X-efficiency is estimated separately for the large and the small banks, we observed that the small banks are more inefficient than the large banks. Again, by pooling large and small banks together in the full sample we are imposing the restriction that large

banks and small banks employ the same technology in their production process. This common technology assumption may be too restrictive and separating the large banks from the small banks allows a tighter fit of data. This finding is consistent with the findings documented in the study by Kwan and Eisenbeis (1996).

Table 2: Time-Series Properties of X-efficiency estimates.

| Year | | All banks | Large banks | Small banks |
|------|--------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| 2000 | Mean | 0.1792 | 0.1718 | 0.1862 |
| | Median | 0.1875 | 0.1709 | 0.1898 |
| 2001 | Mean | 0.1743 | 0.1667 | 0.1814 |
| | Median | 0.1867 | 0.1816 | 0.1867 |
| 2002 | Mean | 0.1776 | 0.1736 | 0.1814 |
| | Median | 0.1901 | 0.196 | 0.1867 |
| 2003 | Mean | 0.1699 | 0.1574 | 0.1815 |
| | Median | 0.1744 | 0.1743 | 0.178 |
| 2004 | Mean | 0.1812 | 0.1697 | 0.1921 |
| | Median | 0.1867 | 0.1709 | 0.1875 |
| 2005 | Mean | 0.1966 | 0.1874 | 0.2053 |
| | Median | 0.1919 | 0.1835 | 0.2114 |

Source: Calculated from data collected from CBK

Finally, the range of the average X-efficiency estimate is between 18% and 20% and is almost similar to the range of X-efficiency estimates documented in the X-efficiency study of Hong Kong commercial banks by Kwan (2001).

Table 3 below reports the cross sectional distribution of X-efficiency as at the beginning and at the end of the sampling period. Panel A shows that mean and median X-efficiency for the period 2000 to 2005 for full sample of banks was 18% and 19% respectively and X-efficiency was 17% for the large banks and 19% for small banks. This implies that all the commercial banks could reduce their costs by an average of 18% if they were to use their inputs efficiently so as to operate at the efficient cost frontier. However, when analyzed separately the small and large banks could reduce their costs by 19% and 17% respectively in order to operate at the efficient cost frontier.

Table 3: Cross-Sectional Properties of X-Efficiency Estimates**Table 3 Panel A: Based on Averages from 2000 to 2005**

| Sample | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------------------|
| All banks | 0.1788 | 0.1867 | 0.0600 |
| Large banks | 0.1711 | 0.1743 | 0.0715 |
| Small banks | 0.1880 | 0.1880 | 0.0454 |

Source: Calculated from data collected from CBK

Table 3 Panel B: Based on Averages for 2000

| Sample | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------------------|
| All banks | 0.1792 | 0.1875 | 0.05922 |
| Large banks | 0.1718 | 0.1709 | 0.0666 |
| Small banks | 0.1862 | 0.1898 | 0.0524 |

Source: Calculated from data collected from CBK

Table 3 Panel C: Based on Averages for 2005

| Sample | Mean | Median | Standard Deviation |
|-------------|--------|--------|--------------------|
| All banks | 0.1968 | 0.1874 | 0.06234 |
| Large banks | 0.1874 | 0.1835 | 0.0766 |
| Small banks | 0.2053 | 0.2114 | 0.0458 |

Source: Calculated from data collected from CBK

The standard deviation shows variation of the X-efficiency estimates. The deviation during the study period was at 6% for the full sample of banks, 7% for the large banks and 5% for small banks. This implies that the inefficiency for the large banks varies more over time than the inefficiency for the small banks. This may be because of the effect of scale of operation whereby for large banks a small change in cost affects a large number of transactions whereas for small banks a small change in price affects few transactions as compared to large banks.

Panels B and C compare the banks' cross-sectional properties of X-efficiency estimate at the beginning and at the end of the sampling period. We observed that the mean, median and standard deviation X-efficiencies for the banks increased from 2000 to 2005. This

implies that the banks are operating further from the efficient cost frontier in 2005 than in 2000. This may be because of the investment costs incurred by banks to upgrade their technology of production and to train their staff too.

Figure 1: Time - Series Properties of X-efficiency for All Banks

Figure 1 (a): Mean of X-efficiency for the Full Sample of Banks




Figure 1 (a) above depicts the cross-sectional mean of X-efficiency for each year between 2000 and 2005 for the full sample of banks. In the year 2000, the bank industry experienced increased costs due to the power shortage in the country. Banks had to look for alternative sources of power e.g. generators which are more expensive. Also the effects of last minute investment in technology to curb the millennium bug pushed up the costs of operation. There was a slight decline in 2001 as the power shortage had been resolved. However, the increase in 2002 is because of the effects of political uncertainty in the country at that time which negatively affected the economy as a whole making it expensive to do business. The decline of cost inefficiency in the year 2003 was as a result of improvement of the economic performance in Kenya after the general elections. The interest rates were comparatively low hence reducing the costs of banks' operation. The increased cost inefficiency from 2004 to 2005 could be attributed to investments in technology and introduction of new ways of providing their services like SMS banking and electronic banking. These increased the costs incurred by the banks especially in terms of

training and recruitment of new specialized staff. The benefits of such investments will be felt in the future.

Figure 1 (b): Median of X-efficiency for the Full Sample of Banks




Figure 1 (b) above depicts similar pattern as figure 1 (a) based on the median as the measure of X-efficiency. The median declines and increases with the decline and increase of X-efficiency respectively. On average, the median X-efficiency lies between 17% and 19%.

Figure 1 (c): Standard Deviation of X-efficiency for the Full Sample of Banks




Figure 1 (c) depicts the standard deviation estimates of X-efficiency. The standard deviation measures the variation of X-efficiency over time. The standard deviation also

declined and increased with the decline and increase of the X-efficiency respectively. The range of the standard deviation was 5% to 7%.

Figure 2: Time – Series Properties of X-efficiency for large and small banks

Figure 2 (a): Mean of X-efficiency for large and Small Banks




Figure 2 (a) above depict the cross-sectional X-efficiency for the large banks and small banks. We made the observations below. First, the mean X-efficiency for the small banks is higher than the mean X-efficiency for the large banks which implies that the small banks are more inefficient than the large banks. The large banks have a lower inefficiency level as compared to the small banks because they enjoy reduced costs due to large scale production. This shows that economies of scale affect X-efficiency of commercial banks in Kenya by reducing their costs.

Secondly, after the year 2002, the X-efficiency gap between the two banks is increasing compared to the earlier time periods. This may be due to the fact that as the large banks continue to grow in size they enjoy reduced costs of operation as compared to the small banks. This could be because of scale efficiency enjoyed by the large banks.

Figure 2 (b): Median of X-efficiency for Large and Small Banks




Figure 2 (b) above depicts the same pattern as in figure 2 (a) above but using the median as a measure of X-efficiency. The median X-efficiency for the small banks generally was higher than the median X-efficiency for the large banks except for the year 2002. This implies that on average the small banks are more inefficient than the large banks.

Figure 2 (c): Standard Deviation of X-efficiency for Large and Small Banks




Figure 2 (c) above depicts the cross-sectional standard deviation for large and small banks. The standard deviation of the small banks is lower than the standard deviation of the large banks, which implies that the inefficiency for large banks varies more than the inefficiency for small banks.

The next property of X-efficiency to be measured was the persistency of X-efficiency in relation to size, which is measured by the Spearman Rank correlation. Table 4 below shows the correlation between size and X-efficiency among the commercial banks in Kenya.

Table 4: Spearman Rank Correlation of X-efficiency.

| Year | All banks | Large banks | Small banks |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| 2000-2005 | 0.112 | 0.232* | -0.13 |

* Correlation significant at 0.05 level (2 tailed)

Source: Calculated from data collected from CBK.

Spearman Rank correlation coefficients results show that the X-efficiency for all banks in general is persistent at 11% but not significant. Further, we observed that Spearman Rank correlation of X-efficiency is significant for large banks at 23% and at negative 13% for small banks. This implies that large banks will always tend to be less inefficient than small banks.

Finally we examined the relationship between X-efficiency and the characteristic of bank size by using Pearson correlation coefficients. Table 5 below shows the results of the relationship between the characteristic of bank size and X-efficiency.

Table 5: Correlations between X-efficiency and bank size.

| Year | All banks | Large banks | Small banks |
|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|
| 2000-2005 | 0.100 | 0.235* | -0.128 |

* correlation significant at 0.05 level (2 tailed)

Source: Calculated from data collected from CBK

The correlation between X-efficiency and the bank size is only significant for the large banks at 23.5% and at 5% level of significance. The results for the full sample of banks show a positive correlation at 10%. However, the small banks have a negative relationship

with bank size at 13%. This implies that for the large banks and the full sample of banks as the size of the bank increases the operation cost also increases. This implies that economies of scale affect X-efficiency.

4.4. Conclusion

This study examined the issue of X-efficiency among the commercial banks in Kenya by using the Stochastic Econometric Cost Frontier approach. The main reason for adopting this approach is because it enables us to make definitive statements about the level of X-efficiency and whether economies of scale affect X-efficiency.

We found out that the level of X-efficiency in the Kenya's commercial banks industry is 18%. This implies that the commercial banks in Kenya should reduce their costs by 18% in order to operate at the efficient cost frontier. This finding is important to the bank managers and policy makers since it will enable them to improve the cost efficiency of banks. The level of X-efficiency is increasing with time which means the banks are operating further from the efficient cost frontier than before. This is a worrying trend.

After controlling for scale differences, we established that large banks are less inefficient than the small banks, at 17% for the large banks and 19% for the small banks. This gap of X-efficiency for small banks and large banks is widening over time. This means that X-efficiency is affected by economies of scale. The persistency measure of X-efficiency showed that the large banks will always tend to be less inefficient than the small banks.

We also observed that it is only the X-efficiency for the large banks which was significant in relation to bank size. This shows that economies of scale affect X-efficiency.

4.5. Limitation of the Study.

The limitation of this study was that it only concentrated on measuring X-efficiency in relation to the characteristics of bank size, however there are other bank characteristics which affect X-efficiency but were excluded in this study due to time and financial constraints.

4.6. Recommendation for Further Studies.

This study concentrated on the X-efficiency of cost of operations by commercial banks in Kenya. I would recommend a study of X-efficiency based on revenue and profitability of commercial banks in Kenya. This is because despite the fact that large commercial banks usually report high profits, they are cost inefficient.

UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI
KISUMU RABETE LIBRARY

REFERENCES.

- Agu C. C., (2004). *"Efficiency of Commercial Banking in the Gambia (Abstract)."* African Review of Money Finance and Banking. (IgdA Publication, Italy).
- Aigner, D., Lovell, C. A. K. and Schmidt, P., (1977), *"Formulation and Estimation of Stochastic Frontier Production Function Models."* Journal of Econometrics 6, pages 21-37.
- Barr S. Richard. (1999). *"Evaluating the Productive Efficiency and Performance of U.S. Commercial Banks."* (Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, Research Department).
- Berger N. Allen, DeYoung Robert and Udell F. Gregory (2001), *"Efficiency Barriers to the Consolidation of the European Financial Services Industry"* European Financial Management, Vol. 7, No. 1, Pages 117-130.
- Brownbridge Martin, (1998). *"Financial Distress in Local Banks in Kenya, Nigeria, Uganda and Zambia: Causes and Implications for Regulatory Policy."* Development Policy Review, Vol.16, pages 173-188. (Blackwell Publishers).
- Brownbridge Martin, March (2002). *"Banking Reforms in Africa What has Been Learnt."* Insights Issue no. 40. (id21 insights).
- Brownbridge Martin, 2002. *"Policy Lessons for Prudential Regulation in Developing Countries."* Development Policy Review, 20(3): pages 305-316. (Blackwell Publishers).
- Centralbankofkenya.go.ke
- Čihák, M. and Podpiera, R., 2005. *"Bank Behavior in Developing Countries: Evidence from East Africa."* IMF Working Paper, WP/05/129, page 22. (International Monetary Fund).

“Competitor Analysis as at September 30, 2005”; Cooperative Bank of Kenya.

Dwivedi D. N. (2002). ***“Objectives of Business Firms”*** and ***“Optimization Technique”*** in Managerial Economics, Sixth Edition, Chapter 2 pages 19-41 and Chapter 4 pages 68-73. (Vikas Publishing House PVT Ltd).

Farrell, M. J., 1957, ***“The Measurement of Productive Efficiency.”*** Journal of Royal Statistical Society A 120, Part 3, pages 253-281.

Githoga Warucu. (2001). ***“Competitive Strategies Applied by Commercial Banks.”*** University of Nairobi, Unpublished MBS Thesis.

Hardwick Philip, Khan Bahadur, Langmead John, (1996). ***“Theory of a Firm I”*** in An Introduction To Modern Economics, Fourth Edition, Chapter 9, pages 144-153. (Longman Singapore).

Hughes, 2004. ***“Financial Performance and Process Efficiency of Australia Banks.”*** International Journal of Bank Marketing, (2004) ,Volume 22. No. 5. (Emerald Group Publishing Limited).

Ikhide Sylvanus. (2000). ***“Efficiency of Commercial Banks in Namibia.”*** BON Occasional Paper No. 4. (Bank of Namibia, Research Department).

Jondrow. M. J., (1957), ***“The Measurement of Productive Efficiency.”*** Journal of Econometrics 19, pages 233-238.

“Kenya Commercial Bank 2004 Annual Report”, (2004). Kenya Commercial Bank.

“The Kenyan Banker, 2004”, (2004). Kenya Bankers Association.

- Kwan H Simon, (2001), *"The X-efficiency of Commercial Banks in Hongkong."* FRSBF Working Paper 14. (Hong Kong Institute for Monetary Research).
- Kwan, S. H. and R. A. Eisenbeis, (1996), *"An Analysis of Inefficiencies in Banking: A Stochastic Cost Frontier Approach."* Economic Review, No. 2, pages 16-26. (Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco).
- Leibenstein, H., (1966), *"Allocative Efficiency "X-efficiency"."* American Economic Review 56, pages 392-415.
- Musyoki, D. (2003), *"An Investigation into the Relationship Between Quality Improvement and Financial Performance for Commercial Banks in Kenya."* University of Nairobi Unpublished MBA Thesis.
- Mutanu, Kyalo Joyce, (2002), *"Capital Allocation and Efficiency of Banking Institutions in Kenya."* University of Nairobi Unpublished MBA Thesis.
- Ngugi Rose, (2001), *"An Empirical Analysis of Interest Rate Spread in Kenya."* AERC Research Paper 106. (African Economic Research Consortium, Nairobi).
- Njihia J. Kamau (2005), *"Determinants of Banks Profitability: The Case of Commercial Banks in Kenya."* University of Nairobi Unpublished MBA Thesis.
- Nyhan C. Ronald (1998), *"An Easy to use Tool to Solve Complex Productivity Assessments of the Relative Efficiency of multiple Units."* (A Publication of Informs).
- Taipei, (1997), *"The Statistics of Financial Business in Taiwan"* International Journal of Service Industry Management, Volume 9 No. 5 pages 402-415. (MCB UP Ltd).

Tefulu Moses, (2002), "*The Implications of X-inefficiency on the Banking Sector in Africa*," Paper No. 55. (Institute of Development Policy and Management, University of Manchester).

Thuita, Maina Nicholas, (2003), "*Risk-Based Capital Standards and the Riskiness of Bank Portfolios in Kenya: An Empirical Investigation*," University of Nairobi. Unpublished MBA Thesis.

Weill Laurent, (2003), "*Banking Efficiency in Transition Economies: The Role of Foreign Ownership*," *Economics of Transition*, Volume 11 (3), pages 569-592. (Blackwell Publishing).

APPENDICES

Appendix I: Aggregated Data

DATA

| | | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | | | | |
|------|---------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| year | banks | y1 | y2 | w1 | w2 | C | phc | pf1 | propf1 | |
| 2000 | Standard Chartered | 23.90 | 12.10 | 53.80 | 1.79 | 3.80 | 18.96203 | 3.094839 | 0.163212 | |
| 2000 | Gro Bank | 3.76 | 0.75 | 0.22 | 0.19 | 0.43 | 15.78669 | 4.092964 | 0.259267 | |
| 2000 | Barclays Bank | 51.00 | 15.60 | 53.10 | 1.71 | 11.60 | 19.1835 | 3.95258 | 0.208126 | |
| 2000 | Victoria Bank | 4.62 | 2.28 | 0.93 | 0.61 | 0.45 | 16.73771 | 3.191751 | 0.190692 | |
| 2000 | CBA | 4.66 | 8.32 | 11.00 | 1.05 | 1.03 | 17.7607 | 2.906313 | 0.168705 | |
| 2000 | H&M Bank | 4.60 | 1.36 | 5.36 | 1.18 | 0.06 | 17.49421 | 0.368404 | 0.021059 | |
| 2000 | Habib Bank | 0.43 | 2.45 | 0.30 | 0.17 | 0.09 | 15.22490 | 3.077489 | 0.202121 | |
| 2000 | Guardian Bank | 2.85 | 0.92 | 3.45 | 0.18 | 0.25 | 16.57867 | 2.775892 | 0.167438 | |
| 2000 | Stanbic Bank | 3.99 | 2.54 | 6.14 | 11.00 | 0.35 | 18.24195 | 1.425694 | 0.078155 | |
| 2000 | Credit Bank | 0.20 | 0.78 | 2.36 | 0.38 | 0.21 | 15.87739 | 3.286349 | 0.206983 | |
| 2000 | NIC Bank | 5.15 | 2.50 | 4.70 | 0.37 | 0.54 | 17.13222 | 2.965057 | 0.173069 | |
| 2000 | HFCX | 6.26 | 1.78 | 0.12 | 0.16 | 0.50 | 15.71836 | 4.310358 | 0.274224 | |
| 2000 | EABS | 3.91 | 1.87 | 0.27 | 0.20 | 0.08 | 15.92359 | 2.737875 | 0.140539 | |
| 2000 | Prime Bank | 0.80 | 0.37 | 1.65 | 0.37 | 0.16 | 18.21981 | 2.680941 | 0.165286 | |
| 2000 | TransNational Bank | 1.23 | 0.24 | 0.78 | 0.12 | 0.31 | 16.36554 | 3.183109 | 0.194501 | |
| 2000 | National Bank | 21.40 | 2.18 | 15.80 | 1.70 | 4.37 | 18.44801 | 3.750683 | 0.203311 | |
| 2000 | K Reg Bank | 0.67 | 1.19 | 1.25 | 1.98 | 0.14 | 16.58457 | 2.129318 | 0.128314 | |
| 2000 | Oriental Bank | 1.02 | 6.25 | 38.30 | 2.28 | 3.65 | 18.26746 | 3.751682 | 0.205375 | |
| 2000 | Cooperative Bank | 18.80 | 4.93 | 17.60 | 2.90 | 5.85 | 18.61417 | 3.840065 | 0.206296 | |
| 2000 | Akiba Bank | 2.57 | 1.79 | 2.68 | 3.36 | 3.98 | 17.44157 | 4.662743 | 0.267335 | |
| 2000 | Imperial Bank | 2.85 | 1.79 | 4.35 | 2.54 | 1.16 | 17.53925 | 3.328495 | 0.189774 | |
| 2000 | ABC Bank | 1.96 | 0.91 | 2.38 | 0.32 | 0.28 | 16.52553 | 2.921236 | 0.176774 | |
| 2000 | Bank of India | 0.32 | 1.62 | 1.99 | 0.44 | 0.05 | 18.05018 | 1.625452 | 0.101273 | |
| 2000 | CITI Bank | 14.20 | 10.20 | 21.90 | 3.79 | 1.98 | 18.74937 | 2.645954 | 0.141122 | |
| 2000 | Dubai Bank | 0.96 | 0.32 | 0.71 | 0.13 | 0.23 | 15.58404 | 3.683482 | 0.236362 | |
| 2000 | Consolidated Bank | 0.91 | 0.52 | 1.02 | 0.06 | 0.58 | 15.45031 | 4.733411 | 0.300364 | |
| 2000 | First American Bank | 30.30 | 0.45 | 1.45 | 0.40 | 0.13 | 17.25791 | 1.389826 | 0.080521 | |
| 2000 | KCB | 2.94 | 5.57 | 34.00 | 2.03 | 3.58 | 18.18326 | 3.818042 | 0.209865 | |
| 2000 | Fina Bank | 3.24 | 1.54 | 4.06 | 0.49 | 0.26 | 17.0181 | 2.347151 | 0.137921 | |
| 2000 | Habib AG Zurich | 2.74 | 1.74 | 0.25 | 3.14 | 0.16 | 16.87311 | 2.237041 | 0.134171 | |
| 2000 | Paramount Bank | 1.02 | 1.06 | 1.16 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 15.60936 | 2.928728 | 0.187498 | |
| 2000 | Equity Bank | 18.80 | 1.03 | 1.09 | 1.17 | 0.57 | 17.39861 | 2.782535 | 0.158779 | |
| 2000 | CFC bank | 2.38 | 1.05 | 5.00 | 1.63 | 1.65 | 17.36248 | 3.97723 | 0.22907 | |
| 2001 | Consolidated Bank | 1.01 | 0.76 | 12.00 | 0.86 | 0.85 | 17.17031 | 3.390814 | 0.197481 | |
| 2001 | Credit Bank | 2.00 | 0.78 | 2.14 | 0.37 | 0.20 | 16.54251 | 2.550377 | 0.154171 | |
| 2001 | Prime Bank | 0.93 | 0.40 | 1.97 | 0.43 | 0.19 | 16.30191 | 2.739876 | 0.168052 | |
| 2001 | Equity Bank | 18.80 | 1.03 | 1.09 | 1.17 | 0.57 | 17.39861 | 2.782535 | 0.158779 | |
| 2001 | Habib AG Zurich | 2.84 | 1.79 | 0.27 | 3.35 | 0.19 | 16.73078 | 2.31365 | 0.138287 | |
| 2001 | First American Bank | 23.90 | 12.10 | 53.80 | 1.79 | 3.80 | 18.96203 | 3.094839 | 0.163212 | |
| 2001 | NIC Bank | 5.36 | 2.63 | 4.80 | 4.04 | 0.58 | 17.92889 | 2.219509 | 0.123795 | |
| 2001 | H&M Bank | 4.76 | 1.47 | 5.54 | 1.44 | 0.06 | 17.58146 | 0.382135 | 0.020598 | |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|----------|----------|----------|
| 2001 | Aliba Bank | 2 64 | 18 40 | 2 59 | 3 56 | 4 27 | 17 5510 | 4 822824 | 0 283392 |
| 2001 | Fina Bank | 3 56 | 1 86 | 4 27 | 0 54 | 0 20 | 17 0986 | 2 373757 | 0 138761 |
| 2001 | TransNational Bank | 14 60 | 2 56 | 8 04 | 0 15 | 0 36 | 17 3308 | 2 381190 | 0 135594 |
| 2001 | Paramount Bank | 1 26 | 1 13 | 1 47 | 0 07 | 0 14 | 15 7608 | 2 870801 | 0 18492 |
| 2001 | Habib Bank | 0 47 | 2 65 | 0 33 | 0 18 | 0 09 | 15 3182 | 2 802814 | 0 195362 |
| 2001 | Bank of India | 0 35 | 1 75 | 2 00 | 0 52 | 0 05 | 16 1303 | 1 64332 | 0 101877 |
| 2001 | CFC bank | 2 49 | 1 16 | 4 96 | 1 83 | 1 90 | 17 4163 | 3 946476 | 0 225596 |
| 2001 | Barclays Bank | 5 33 | 17 70 | 55 30 | 17 30 | 13 30 | 19 25993 | 4 047701 | 0 210167 |
| 2001 | CITI Bank | 15 60 | 12 00 | 21 00 | 39 60 | 1 58 | 19 5302 | 1 888573 | 0 384924 |
| 2001 | Dubai Bank | 0 64 | 0 12 | 0 11 | 0 19 | 0 17 | 14 9879 | 3 843356 | 0 24341 |
| 2001 | Guardian Bank | 3 35 | 0 98 | 3 83 | 0 20 | 0 21 | 16 69664 | 2 488028 | 0 149023 |
| 2001 | Oriental Bank | 29 90 | 9 78 | 48 20 | 5 14 | 13 50 | 19 31337 | 4 010178 | 0 207637 |
| 2001 | KCB | 28 60 | 9 88 | 48 60 | 5 04 | 15 70 | 19 31087 | 4 168937 | 0 21573 |
| 2001 | Cooperative Bank | 15 90 | 48 70 | 16 70 | 29 90 | 5 47 | 19 42521 | 2 996994 | 0 154284 |
| 2001 | Giro Bank | 3 68 | 0 74 | 0 20 | 0 21 | 0 45 | 15 77923 | 4 143313 | 0 26258 |
| 2001 | Standard Chartered | 26 30 | 16 90 | 57 40 | 19 20 | 3 96 | 19 79283 | 2 306753 | 0 116545 |
| 2001 | Victoria Bank | 4 58 | 2 03 | 0 92 | 0 60 | 0 44 | 16 71928 | 3 178452 | 0 190107 |
| 2001 | National Bank | 24 60 | 23 60 | 15 80 | 1 84 | 4 56 | 18 61114 | 3 830232 | 0 195057 |
| 2001 | CBA | 56 70 | 10 30 | 11 90 | 11 00 | 12 60 | 19 31752 | 3 937584 | 0 203835 |
| 2001 | ABC Bank | 1 86 | 0 94 | 2 52 | 0 34 | 0 30 | 16 55227 | 2 95997 | 0 118826 |
| 2001 | Stanbic Bank | 4 46 | 2 94 | 6 54 | 13 70 | 3 72 | 18 37249 | 3 664921 | 0 199479 |
| 2001 | EABS | 4 04 | 2 87 | 3 41 | 91 97 | 0 08 | 16 50844 | 1 743781 | 0 105628 |
| 2001 | Imperial Bank | 2 95 | 1 70 | 4 24 | 2 28 | 1 05 | 17 50064 | 3 266594 | 0 186656 |
| 2001 | HFCK | 6 44 | 1 70 | 1 02 | 0 16 | 0 74 | 16 42025 | 4 005772 | 0 243953 |
| 2001 | K-Rep Bank | 0 92 | 0 29 | 0 80 | 0 13 | 0 22 | 15 61033 | 3 580962 | 0 229397 |
| 2002 | Giro Bank | 3 68 | 0 74 | 0 20 | 0 21 | 0 45 | 15 77923 | 4 143313 | 0 26258 |
| 2002 | Imperial Bank | 2 95 | 1 70 | 4 24 | 2 28 | 1 05 | 17 50064 | 3 266594 | 0 186656 |
| 2002 | EABS | 4 04 | 2 87 | 3 41 | 0 09 | 0 08 | 16 50844 | 1 743761 | 0 105828 |
| 2002 | ABC Bank | 1 86 | 0 97 | 2 73 | 3 78 | 0 31 | 17 37754 | 2 182499 | 0 125593 |
| 2002 | Aliba Bank | 2 76 | 18 70 | 2 63 | 3 78 | 4 47 | 17 58654 | 4 634081 | 0 263502 |
| 2002 | CFC bank | 24 70 | 12 60 | 50 00 | 1 83 | 19 30 | 18 95483 | 4 770191 | 0 24934 |
| 2002 | Consolidated Bank | 1 23 | 0 78 | 13 60 | 0 90 | 0 88 | 17 27911 | 3 318998 | 0 192082 |
| 2002 | Victoria Bank | 4 58 | 2 03 | 0 92 | 0 60 | 0 44 | 16 71928 | 3 178452 | 0 190107 |
| 2002 | Fina Bank | 3 76 | 19 00 | 4 46 | 0 57 | 0 30 | 17 23891 | 2 294366 | 0 131352 |
| 2002 | Equity Bank | 18 80 | 1 03 | 1 09 | 1 17 | 0 57 | 17 39881 | 2 762535 | 0 158779 |
| 2002 | Cooperative Bank | 15 90 | 46 70 | 16 70 | 29 90 | 5 47 | 19 42521 | 2 996994 | 0 154284 |
| 2002 | Credit Bank | 2 00 | 0 78 | 2 14 | 0 37 | 0 20 | 16 54251 | 2 550377 | 0 154171 |
| 2002 | CBA | 53 70 | 11 50 | 12 40 | 12 60 | 13 40 | 19 36769 | 3 947958 | 0 203844 |
| 2002 | K-Rep Bank | 0 64 | 0 12 | 0 11 | 0 19 | 0 12 | 14 98798 | 3 843356 | 0 24341 |
| 2002 | KCB | 29 70 | 9 97 | 49 60 | 52 60 | 17 60 | 20 08805 | 3 500986 | 0 174282 |
| 2002 | Habib Bank | 0 49 | 0 28 | 0 36 | 0 20 | 0 09 | 15 38374 | 2 98089 | 0 192416 |
| 2002 | Standard Chartered | 28 70 | 18 90 | 59 80 | 20 70 | 41 60 | 19 88168 | 4 589018 | 0 231041 |
| 2002 | National Bank | 26 80 | 25 80 | 17 80 | 19 70 | 4 90 | 18 70287 | 3 608778 | 0 192951 |
| 2002 | Habib AG Zurich | 2 98 | 1 95 | 0 28 | 3 45 | 0 20 | 16 77602 | 2 320515 | 0 138323 |
| 2002 | Stanbic Bank | 4 59 | 3 25 | 6 76 | 159 00 | 4 02 | 16 44389 | 3 669806 | 0 198974 |
| 2002 | Oriental Bank | 2 94 | 5 57 | 34 00 | 2 03 | 3 58 | 18 18329 | 3 816042 | 0 209866 |
| 2002 | Paramount Bank | 1 35 | 1 59 | 1 76 | 0 07 | 0 17 | 15 86941 | 3 04918 | 0 182142 |
| 2002 | NIC Bank | 5 58 | 2 78 | 4 95 | 4 25 | 0 58 | 17 98932 | 2 206842 | 0 122812 |
| 2002 | Bank of India | 0 43 | 1 85 | 2 00 | 0 54 | 0 06 | 16 20428 | -0 69728 | -0 04301 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----------|
| 2002 | Prima Bank | 0.95 | 0.41 | 2.05 | 0.44 | 0.20 | 16.33057 | 2.767506 | 0.154928 |
| 2002 | CITI Bank | 16.20 | 12.70 | 23.00 | 39.00 | 17.50 | 19.5756 | 4.01107 | 0.204898 |
| 2002 | HFCX | 8.44 | 1.70 | 1.02 | 0.16 | 0.74 | 16.42026 | 4.006777 | 0.243993 |
| 2002 | BM BANK | 0.49 | 0.18 | 5.78 | 1.68 | 0.08 | 16.88382 | 1.123463 | 0.0068 |
| 2002 | Barclays Bank | 5.56 | 18.70 | 55.30 | 18.80 | 14.70 | 19.30008 | 4.110914 | 0.177 |
| 2002 | TransNational Bank | 0.18 | 2.77 | 82.80 | 0.16 | 0.38 | 16.74838 | 2.987028 | 0.177 |
| 2002 | Guardian Bank | 3.35 | 0.96 | 3.83 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 16.89554 | 2.488026 | 0.149028 |
| 2002 | First American Bank | 2.96 | 0.41 | 0.14 | 0.40 | 0.11 | 15.7952 | 2.754495 | 0.174 |
| 2002 | Dubai Bank | 0.92 | 0.29 | 0.80 | 0.13 | 0.22 | 15.81033 | 3.580967 | 0.229 |
| 2003 | Dubai Bank | 0.92 | 0.29 | 0.80 | 0.13 | 0.22 | 16.81033 | 3.580967 | 0.229 |
| 2003 | National Bank | 2.78 | 18.70 | 2.83 | 3.78 | 4.47 | 17.58864 | 4.634081 | 0.283 |
| 2003 | Aliba Bank | 2.95 | 0.41 | 0.14 | 0.40 | 0.11 | 15.7952 | 2.754495 | 0.174 |
| 2003 | Standard Chartered | 29.90 | 9.78 | 48.20 | 5.14 | 13.50 | 19.31337 | 4.010178 | 0.2078 |
| 2003 | Giro Bank | 3.68 | 0.74 | 0.20 | 0.71 | 0.45 | 15.77923 | 4.143313 | 0.25 |
| 2003 | BM BANK | 0.49 | 0.18 | 5.78 | 1.68 | 0.08 | 16.88382 | 1.123463 | 0.0888 |
| 2003 | Prima Bank | 0.94 | 0.43 | 2.24 | 0.45 | 0.22 | 16.36405 | 2.828026 | 0.1728 |
| 2003 | Habib Bank | 0.48 | 2.80 | 0.38 | 0.20 | 0.09 | 15.36374 | 2.96886 | 0.1924 |
| 2003 | Oriental Bank | 2.94 | 5.57 | 34.00 | 2.03 | 3.58 | 18.18329 | 3.816043 | 0.20 |
| 2003 | ABC Bank | 1.86 | 0.98 | 2.89 | 3.85 | 0.33 | 17.38423 | 2.237785 | 0.12887 |
| 2003 | Barclays Bank | 5.75 | 11.90 | 58.80 | 19.60 | 16.00 | 19.32888 | 4.168796 | 0.21688 |
| 2003 | Habib AG Zurich | 2.96 | 1.95 | 0.28 | 3.45 | 0.20 | 16.77807 | 2.320819 | 0.13832 |
| 2003 | Equity Bank | 18.80 | 1.03 | 1.09 | 1.17 | 0.67 | 17.39881 | 2.762836 | 0.15877 |
| 2003 | Cooperative Bank | 16.00 | 47.50 | 18.30 | 31.30 | 5.57 | 19.47088 | 2.898801 | 0.1525 |
| 2003 | Guardian Bank | 3.35 | 0.96 | 3.83 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 16.89554 | 2.488026 | 0.149028 |
| 2003 | HFCX | 8.44 | 1.70 | 1.02 | 0.16 | 0.74 | 16.42026 | 4.006772 | 0.243993 |
| 2003 | NIC Bank | 5.56 | 2.78 | 4.95 | 4.25 | 0.58 | 17.98932 | 2.208842 | 0.122812 |
| 2003 | KCB | 29.70 | 9.97 | 49.80 | 52.60 | 17.60 | 20.08806 | 3.500986 | 0.17428 |
| 2003 | CBA | 58.70 | 11.90 | 14.00 | 13.80 | 1.38 | 19.45294 | 1.589048 | 0.081883 |
| 2003 | K-Rep Bank | 0.84 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 14.98798 | 3.843356 | 0.2434 |
| 2003 | TransNational Bank | 0.18 | 2.83 | 82.80 | 0.16 | 0.38 | 16.78078 | 2.982826 | 0.177953 |
| 2003 | Bank of India | 0.45 | 20.20 | 22.60 | 0.56 | 0.01 | 17.10671 | -1.58381 | -0.09141 |
| 2003 | EABS | 4.04 | 2.87 | 3.41 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 16.90844 | 1.743781 | 0.10562 |
| 2003 | First American Bank | 2.95 | 0.41 | 0.14 | 0.40 | 0.11 | 15.7952 | 2.754495 | 0.174368 |
| 2003 | CFC Bank | 25.90 | 13.70 | 52.10 | 19.60 | 19.90 | 19.75488 | 3.96886 | 0.20028 |
| 2003 | Fina Bank | 3.78 | 19.00 | 4.46 | 0.57 | 0.30 | 17.23891 | 2.264388 | 0.131362 |
| 2003 | Paramount Bank | 1.59 | 1.85 | 1.83 | 0.73 | 0.18 | 16.63463 | 2.350383 | 0.141293 |
| 2003 | Imperial Bank | 2.95 | 1.70 | 4.24 | 2.26 | 1.05 | 17.50064 | 3.266594 | 0.188858 |
| 2003 | Stanbic Bank | 4.83 | 3.20 | 6.88 | 16.90 | 4.15 | 18.47073 | 3.678247 | 0.199031 |
| 2003 | Victoria Bank | 4.58 | 2.03 | 0.92 | 0.60 | 0.44 | 16.71928 | 3.178452 | 0.190107 |
| 2003 | Credit Bank | 2.00 | 0.78 | 2.14 | 0.37 | 0.20 | 16.54251 | 2.550377 | 0.154171 |
| 2003 | CITI Bank | 17.30 | 13.60 | 24.30 | 42.50 | 18.80 | 19.63878 | 4.008888 | 0.204152 |
| 2003 | Consolidated Bank | 0.13 | 0.79 | 14.10 | 0.89 | 0.93 | 16.60897 | 4.039997 | 0.243271 |
| 2004 | Imperial Bank | 2.95 | 1.70 | 4.24 | 2.26 | 1.05 | 17.50064 | 3.266594 | 0.188858 |
| 2004 | Aliba Bank | 2.57 | 1.79 | 2.68 | 3.38 | 3.98 | 17.44167 | 4.662743 | 0.267335 |
| 2004 | National Bank | 21.40 | 2.15 | 15.80 | 1.70 | 4.37 | 18.44801 | 3.750883 | 0.203311 |
| 2004 | Credit Bank | 2.00 | 0.78 | 2.14 | 0.37 | 0.20 | 16.54251 | 2.550377 | 0.154171 |
| 2004 | Habib AG Zurich | 2.74 | 1.74 | 0.25 | 3.14 | 0.16 | 16.87311 | 2.237041 | 0.134171 |
| 2004 | Paramount Bank | 1.02 | 1.08 | 1.18 | 0.07 | 0.11 | 15.80938 | 2.926728 | 0.187498 |
| 2004 | Fina Bank | 3.24 | 1.54 | 4.08 | 0.48 | 0.28 | 17.0181 | 2.347151 | 0.137921 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|----------|----------|----------|
| 2004 | First American Bank | 2.95 | 0.41 | 0.14 | 0.40 | 0.11 | 15.7852 | 2.754405 | 0.174388 |
| 2004 | Giro Bank | 3.68 | 0.74 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.45 | 15.77923 | 4.143313 | 0.282568 |
| 2004 | K-Rep Bank | 0.64 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 14.96798 | 3.643356 | 0.24341 |
| 2004 | Victoria Bank | 4.58 | 2.03 | 0.92 | 0.60 | 0.44 | 16.71928 | 3.178452 | 0.190107 |
| 2004 | Bank of India | 0.32 | 1.62 | 1.99 | 0.44 | 0.05 | 16.05018 | 1.625452 | 0.101273 |
| 2004 | CBA | 4.68 | 6.32 | 11.00 | 1.05 | 1.03 | 17.7607 | 2.996313 | 0.168705 |
| 2004 | Consolidated | 0.91 | 0.52 | 1.07 | 0.06 | 0.58 | 15.45031 | 4.733411 | 0.306364 |
| 2004 | Cooperative Bank | 16.80 | 4.93 | 17.60 | 2.90 | 5.65 | 18.61417 | 3.840065 | 0.206298 |
| 2004 | Oriental Bank | 2.94 | 5.57 | 34.00 | 2.03 | 3.56 | 18.18329 | 3.816042 | 0.208865 |
| 2004 | CFC Bank | 2.38 | 1.05 | 5.00 | 1.63 | 1.85 | 17.36248 | 3.97723 | 0.22907 |
| 2004 | Habb Bank | 0.43 | 2.46 | 0.30 | 0.17 | 0.09 | 15.22596 | 3.077469 | 0.202121 |
| 2004 | Prime Bank | 0.89 | 0.37 | 1.85 | 0.37 | 0.16 | 16.21981 | 2.680941 | 0.185288 |
| 2004 | Stanbic Bank | 3.99 | 2.54 | 6.14 | 11.00 | 0.35 | 18.24195 | 1.425694 | 0.078155 |
| 2004 | TransNational Bank | 12.30 | 0.24 | 0.79 | 0.12 | 0.31 | 16.36554 | 3.163109 | 0.194501 |
| 2004 | ABC Bank | 1.96 | 0.91 | 2.36 | 0.32 | 0.28 | 16.5253 | 2.921238 | 0.176774 |
| 2004 | EABS | 4.04 | 2.67 | 3.41 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 16.50844 | 1.743761 | 0.105628 |
| 2004 | Barclays | 51.00 | 15.60 | 53.10 | 1.71 | 11.60 | 19.1835 | 3.99258 | 0.208126 |
| 2004 | IBM Bank | 4.60 | 1.36 | 5.36 | 1.18 | 0.06 | 17.49421 | 0.368404 | 0.021059 |
| 2004 | Standard Chartered | 23.90 | 12.10 | 53.60 | 1.79 | 3.80 | 18.96203 | 3.094839 | 0.163212 |
| 2004 | Guardian Bank | 3.35 | 0.96 | 3.83 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 16.69554 | 2.486026 | 0.149023 |
| 2004 | HFCK | 6.44 | 1.70 | 1.02 | 0.16 | 0.74 | 16.42025 | 4.005772 | 0.243953 |
| 2004 | NIC Bank | 5.15 | 2.50 | 4.70 | 0.37 | 0.54 | 17.13222 | 2.965057 | 0.173069 |
| 2004 | Equity Bank | 18.80 | 1.03 | 1.09 | 1.17 | 0.57 | 17.39661 | 2.762535 | 0.158779 |
| 2004 | Dubai Bank | 0.92 | 0.29 | 0.80 | 0.13 | 0.22 | 15.61033 | 3.580962 | 0.228097 |
| 2004 | CITI Bank | 14.20 | 10.20 | 21.90 | 3.79 | 1.96 | 18.74937 | 2.645954 | 0.141122 |
| 2004 | KCB | 29.90 | 9.76 | 46.20 | 5.14 | 13.50 | 19.31337 | 4.010178 | 0.207637 |
| 2005 | IBM Bank | 3.83 | 3.41 | 3.91 | 3.68 | 24.10 | 17.7406 | 6.165079 | 0.347512 |
| 2005 | Guardian Bank | 3.35 | 0.96 | 3.83 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 16.69554 | 2.486026 | 0.149023 |
| 2005 | CFC Bank | 1.45 | 1.10 | 1.36 | 1.07 | 1.27 | 16.69916 | 4.29887 | 0.259044 |
| 2005 | Victoria Bank | 4.58 | 2.03 | 0.92 | 0.60 | 0.44 | 16.71928 | 3.178452 | 0.190107 |
| 2005 | Credit Bank | 2.00 | 0.78 | 2.14 | 0.37 | 0.20 | 16.54251 | 2.550377 | 0.154171 |
| 2005 | Bank of India | 0.22 | 14.90 | 80.90 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 16.46401 | 1.448961 | 0.088008 |
| 2005 | K-Rep Bank | 0.64 | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.19 | 0.12 | 14.96798 | 3.643356 | 0.24341 |
| 2005 | CITI Bank | 2.11 | 1.03 | 1.53 | 0.76 | 0.70 | 16.695 | 3.675295 | 0.220144 |
| 2005 | Albha Bank | 29.60 | 7.83 | 2.54 | 4.52 | 0.85 | 18.32729 | 1.968496 | 0.107408 |
| 2005 | EABS | 4.04 | 2.67 | 3.41 | 0.09 | 0.08 | 16.50844 | 1.743761 | 0.10562 |
| 2005 | Paramount | 0.20 | 0.14 | 0.13 | 0.12 | 0.08 | 14.51129 | 3.731282 | 0.25711 |
| 2005 | Habb Bank | 0.41 | 0.37 | 0.33 | 0.41 | 0.20 | 15.45886 | 3.65508 | 0.236431 |
| 2005 | Fina Bank | 4.18 | 2.21 | 2.64 | 0.45 | 0.51 | 16.94206 | 3.096819 | 0.182761 |
| 2005 | Oriental Bank | 2.94 | 5.57 | 34.00 | 2.03 | 3.56 | 18.18329 | 3.816042 | 0.209066 |
| 2005 | CBA | 1.76 | 1.27 | 5.03 | 0.43 | 0.46 | 16.85164 | 3.103157 | 0.164141 |
| 2005 | Habb AG Zurich | 4.02 | 0.38 | 1.07 | 2.66 | 1.74 | 17.1494 | 4.126944 | 0.24064 |
| 2005 | ABC Bank | 2.57 | 1.79 | 2.68 | 3.36 | 3.98 | 17.44167 | 4.662743 | 0.26733 |
| 2005 | KCB | 42.00 | 2.29 | 68.70 | 0.72 | 11.10 | 18.85321 | 4.273512 | 0.22867 |
| 2005 | Cooperative Bank | 33.30 | 16.10 | 45.90 | 3.42 | 6.33 | 19.2326 | 3.336539 | 0.17348 |
| 2005 | Equity Bank | 18.80 | 1.03 | 1.09 | 1.17 | 0.57 | 17.39661 | 2.762535 | 0.15877 |
| 2005 | Dubai Bank | 0.92 | 0.29 | 0.80 | 0.13 | 0.22 | 15.61033 | 3.580962 | 0.22939 |
| 2005 | First American Bank | 2.95 | 0.41 | 0.14 | 0.40 | 0.11 | 15.7952 | 2.754495 | 0.17438 |
| 2005 | Imperial Bank | 2.95 | 1.70 | 4.24 | 2.26 | 1.03 | 17.50064 | 3.266594 | 0.16665 |

| | | | | | | | | | |
|------|--------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|----------|----------|----------|
| 2006 | Standard Chartered | 28.60 | 27.80 | 0.83 | 4.58 | 0.24 | 18 11243 | 1 197525 | 0 006116 |
| 2006 | National Bank | 23.96 | 12.16 | 53.80 | 1.79 | 3.80 | 18 96203 | 3 094838 | 0 163212 |
| 2006 | NIC Bank | 16.60 | 11.00 | 12.50 | 8.41 | 2.58 | 18 87852 | 2 791092 | 0 147848 |
| 2006 | Prima Bank | 0.37 | 0.39 | 0.10 | 0.11 | 0.16 | 14 60048 | 4 284988 | 0 293482 |
| 2006 | TransNational Bank | 1.20 | 0.88 | 0.98 | 0.03 | 0.11 | 15 27887 | 3 230217 | 0 211417 |
| 2006 | Resona Bank | 2.76 | 2.07 | 1.90 | 1.65 | 0.16 | 17 12972 | 1 773388 | 0 103827 |
| 2006 | Geo Bank | 3.88 | 0.74 | 0.20 | 0.21 | 0.48 | 19 77823 | 4 143313 | 0 26268 |
| 2006 | HFCK | 6.44 | 1.70 | 1.02 | 0.16 | 0.74 | 16 42028 | 4 006772 | 0 243883 |
| 2006 | Consolidated Bank | 4.97 | 4.13 | 3.78 | 4.48 | 2.57 | 17 86621 | 3 812117 | 0 213488 |
| 2006 | Stanbic Bank | 24.10 | 18.90 | 7.41 | 12.60 | 8.84 | 18 97393 | 3 641768 | 0 191936 |

Source: Calculated from data Collected From CBK

Where

y1 is loans and advances to customers

y2 is investment and other incomes

w1 is deposits

w2 is borrowed funds

c is total operating cost

plnc is the estimated efficient cost

xf1 is the X-efficiency

propxf1 is the proportion of X-efficiency to estimated efficient cost

Appendix II: Y2 Data Components

2000

| Bank | service charge | commission income | investment income | foreign exchange income | aggregate Y2 |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion |
| Standard Chartered | 0.06 | 3.24 | 6.64 | 2.16 | 12.10 |
| Giro Bank | 0.30 | 0.05 | 0.39 | 0.01 | 0.75 |
| Barclays Bank | 0.03 | 3.42 | 11.35 | 0.80 | 15.60 |
| Victoria Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.26 | 0.00 | 2.26 |
| CBA | 0.01 | 0.22 | 7.91 | 0.18 | 8.32 |
| I&M Bank | 0.10 | 0.10 | 1.16 | 0.00 | 1.36 |
| Habib Bank | 0.06 | 0.01 | 2.38 | 0.00 | 2.45 |
| Guardian Bank | 0.02 | 0.01 | 0.89 | 0.00 | 0.92 |
| Stanbic Bank | 0.02 | 0.01 | 2.41 | 0.10 | 2.54 |
| Credit Bank | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.78 |
| NIC Bank | 0.04 | 0.05 | 2.39 | 0.02 | 2.50 |
| HFCK | 0.51 | 0.00 | 1.27 | 0.00 | 1.78 |
| EALS | 0.72 | 0.00 | 1.15 | 0.00 | 1.87 |
| Prime Bank | 0.10 | 0.10 | 0.15 | 0.02 | 0.37 |
| TransNational Bank | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.15 | 0.04 | 0.24 |
| National Bank | 0.12 | 0.58 | 1.23 | 0.25 | 2.18 |
| K-Rep Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.00 | 1.19 |
| Oriental Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 6.25 | 0.00 | 6.25 |
| Cooperative Bank | 0.07 | 0.82 | 3.96 | 0.08 | 4.93 |
| Aliba Bank | 0.00 | 0.03 | 1.74 | 0.02 | 1.79 |
| Imperial Bank | 0.60 | 0.10 | 0.79 | 0.30 | 1.79 |
| ABC Bank | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.83 | 0.02 | 0.91 |
| Bank of India | 0.20 | 0.00 | 1.42 | 0.00 | 1.62 |
| CITI Bank | 0.35 | 0.30 | 8.30 | 1.25 | 10.20 |
| Dubai Bank | 0.14 | 0.00 | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.32 |
| Consolidated Bank | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.42 | 0.02 | 0.52 |
| First American Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.44 | 0.00 | 0.45 |
| KCB | 0.52 | 2.30 | 2.48 | 0.27 | 5.57 |
| Fina Bank | 0.00 | 0.05 | 1.47 | 0.02 | 1.54 |
| Habib AG Zurich | 0.01 | 0.02 | 1.71 | 0.00 | 1.74 |
| Parnount Bank | 0.01 | 0.01 | 1.04 | 0.02 | 1.08 |
| Equity Bank | 0.12 | 0.11 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 1.03 |
| CFC Bank | 0.61 | 0.14 | 0.29 | 0.01 | 1.05 |

2001

| Bank | service charge | commission income | investment income | foreign exchange income | aggr y2 |
|--------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion |
| Standard Chartered | 0.02 | 0.40 | 0.14 | 0.20 | 0.76 |
| Giro Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.78 |
| Barclays Bank | 0.10 | 0.04 | 0.19 | 0.07 | 0.40 |
| Victoria Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.02 | 0.00 | 1.03 |
| CBA | 0.03 | 0.26 | 1.33 | 0.15 | 1.77 |
| I&M Bank | 0.40 | 0.20 | 11.50 | 0.00 | 12.10 |
| Habib Bank | 0.06 | 0.01 | 2.56 | 0.00 | 2.63 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Guardian Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.46 | 0.00 | 1.47 |
| Stanbic Bank | 0.40 | 0.30 | 17.58 | 0.12 | 18.40 |
| Credit Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.86 | 0.00 | 1.86 |
| NIC Bank | 0.04 | 0.05 | 2.45 | 0.02 | 2.56 |
| HFCB | 0.13 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.13 |
| EABS | 0.15 | 0.00 | 2.50 | 0.00 | 2.65 |
| Prime Bank | 0.01 | 0.06 | 1.66 | 0.02 | 1.75 |
| TransNational Bank | 0.03 | 0.03 | 1.08 | 0.02 | 1.16 |
| National Bank | 0.19 | 0.95 | 16.31 | 0.25 | 17.70 |
| K-Rep Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 12.00 | 0.00 | 12.00 |
| Oriental Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.12 |
| Cooperative Bank | 0.18 | 0.08 | 0.66 | 0.04 | 0.96 |
| Aliba Bank | 0.00 | 0.04 | 9.52 | 0.20 | 9.76 |
| Imperial Bank | 0.70 | 0.20 | 8.56 | 0.40 | 9.86 |
| ABC Bank | 0.01 | 0.08 | 46.59 | 0.02 | 46.70 |
| Bank of India | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.54 | 0.00 | 0.74 |
| CITI Bank | 0.38 | 0.45 | 13.97 | 2.10 | 16.90 |
| Dubai Bank | 0.03 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 2.03 |
| Consolidated Bank | 0.12 | 0.07 | 23.39 | 0.02 | 23.60 |
| First American Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 10.29 | 0.00 | 10.30 |
| KCB | 0.40 | 0.10 | 0.24 | 0.20 | 0.94 |
| Fina Bank | 0.00 | 0.04 | 2.89 | 0.01 | 2.94 |
| Habib AG Zurich | 0.03 | 0.03 | 2.61 | 0.00 | 2.67 |
| Painmont Bank | 0.00 | 0.01 | 1.69 | 0.00 | 1.70 |
| Equity Bank | 0.16 | 0.13 | 1.41 | 0.00 | 1.70 |
| CFC bank | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.22 | 0.01 | 0.29 |

2002

| Bank | Service charges | Commission income | Investment income | Foreign exchange income | 2001 Y2 |
|--------------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| | Kah. Billion | Kah. Billion | Kah. Billion | Kah. Billion | Kah. Billion |
| Standard Chartered | 0.01 | 0.91 | 0.21 | 0.20 | 0.74 |
| Giro Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.86 | 0.00 | 1.70 |
| Barclays Bank | 0.00 | 0.52 | 2.16 | 0.06 | 2.67 |
| Victoria Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.97 | 0.00 | 0.97 |
| CBA | 0.01 | 0.26 | 11.21 | 0.16 | 16.70 |
| IM Bank | 0.20 | 0.07 | 12.33 | 0.00 | 12.60 |
| Habib Bank | 0.06 | 0.10 | 0.82 | 0.00 | 0.78 |
| Guardian Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.03 | 0.00 | 2.03 |
| Stanbic Bank | 0.20 | 0.10 | 18.80 | 0.10 | 19.00 |
| Credit Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.02 | 0.00 | 1.03 |
| NIC Bank | 0.06 | 0.01 | 46.56 | 0.02 | 46.70 |
| HFCB | 0.14 | 0.01 | 0.83 | 0.00 | 0.78 |
| EABS | 0.17 | 0.01 | 11.33 | 0.00 | 11.50 |
| Prime Bank | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.02 | 0.00 | 0.12 |
| TransNational Bank | 0.01 | 0.05 | 9.67 | 0.04 | 9.90 |
| National Bank | 0.07 | 0.04 | 0.06 | 0.12 | 0.28 |
| K-Rep Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 16.80 | 0.00 | 16.80 |
| Oriental Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 25.79 | 0.00 | 26.80 |
| Cooperative Bank | 0.15 | 1.31 | 0.29 | 0.20 | 1.96 |
| Aliba Bank | 0.01 | 0.04 | 3.16 | 0.02 | 3.23 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Imperial Bank | 0.62 | 0.15 | 4.44 | 0.36 | 9.97 |
| ABC Bank | 0.06 | 0.08 | 1.11 | 0.31 | 1.99 |
| Bank of India | 0.21 | 0.00 | 2.69 | 0.00 | 2.70 |
| CITI Bank | 0.04 | 0.02 | 0.76 | 1.01 | 1.84 |
| Dubai Bank | 0.16 | 0.00 | 0.22 | 0.00 | 0.41 |
| Consolidated Bank | 0.25 | 0.12 | 12.22 | 0.01 | 12.70 |
| First American Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.99 | 0.00 | 1.70 |
| KCB | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.18 |
| Fina Bank | 0.03 | 0.08 | 18.81 | 0.02 | 18.70 |
| Habib AG Zurich | 0.02 | 0.03 | 2.77 | 0.00 | 2.77 |
| Paramount Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.00 | 0.96 |
| Equity Bank | 0.15 | 0.17 | 0.03 | 0.00 | 0.41 |
| CFC bank | 0.09 | 0.18 | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.25 |

2003

| Bank | service charge | commission income | investment income | foreign exchange income | aggr y2 |
|---------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Standard Chartered | Ksh. Billion 0.01 | Ksh. Billion 0.03 | Ksh. Billion 0.23 | Ksh. Billion 0.02 | Ksh. Billion 0.29 |
| Giro Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 18.69 | 0.00 | 18.70 |
| Barclays Bank | 0.01 | 0.05 | 0.34 | 0.01 | 0.41 |
| Victoria Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 9.75 | 0.00 | 9.76 |
| CBA | 0.01 | 0.30 | 0.18 | 0.25 | 0.74 |
| IBM Bank | 0.10 | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.00 | 0.18 |
| Habib Bank | 0.06 | 0.20 | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.43 |
| Guardian Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.80 | 0.00 | 2.80 |
| Slarabic Bank | 0.43 | 0.21 | 4.83 | 0.10 | 5.57 |
| Credit Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.96 | 0.00 | 0.99 |
| NIC Bank | 0.05 | 0.09 | 11.73 | 0.03 | 11.90 |
| HFCB | 0.12 | 0.00 | 1.83 | 0.00 | 1.95 |
| EABS | 0.17 | 0.00 | 0.86 | 0.00 | 1.03 |
| Prime Bank | 0.06 | 0.06 | 47.35 | 0.03 | 47.50 |
| TransNational Bank | 0.01 | 0.04 | 0.88 | 0.03 | 0.96 |
| National Bank | 0.32 | 0.88 | 0.41 | 0.09 | 1.70 |
| K-Rep Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 2.75 | 0.00 | 2.76 |
| Oriental Bank | 0.00 | 0.00 | 9.97 | 0.00 | 9.97 |
| Cooperative Bank | 0.11 | 1.88 | 8.41 | 1.50 | 11.90 |
| Akiba Bank | 0.01 | 0.07 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.12 |
| Imperial Bank | 0.63 | 0.16 | 1.44 | 0.40 | 2.63 |
| ABC Bank | 0.07 | 0.09 | 18.87 | 1.17 | 20.20 |
| Bank of India | 0.26 | 0.00 | 2.39 | 0.00 | 2.67 |
| CITI Bank | 0.05 | 0.04 | 0.12 | 0.20 | 0.41 |
| Dubai Bank | 0.70 | 0.00 | 13.00 | 0.00 | 13.70 |
| Consolidated Bank | 0.18 | 0.11 | 18.50 | 0.21 | 19.00 |
| First American Bank | 0.00 | 0.01 | 1.65 | 0.00 | 1.66 |
| KCB | 0.79 | 0.36 | 0.21 | 0.36 | 1.70 |
| Fina Bank | 0.01 | 0.07 | 3.20 | 0.01 | 3.29 |
| Habib AG Zurich | 0.04 | 0.03 | 1.96 | 0.00 | 2.03 |
| Paramount Bank | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.78 |
| Equity Bank | 0.32 | 0.31 | 12.97 | 0.00 | 13.60 |
| CFC bank | 0.20 | 0.04 | 0.47 | 0.09 | 0.79 |

2004

| Bank | service charge | commission income | investment income | foreign exchange income | aggr y2 |
|---------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion |
| Standard Chartered | 0.03 | 0.36 | 1.11 | 0.20 | 1.70 |
| Giro Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.78 | 0.00 | 1.78 |
| Barclays Bank | 0.00 | 0.50 | 1.58 | 0.10 | 2.18 |
| Victoria Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.77 | 0.00 | 0.78 |
| CBA | 0.01 | 0.33 | 1.14 | 0.28 | 1.74 |
| I&M Bank | 0.20 | 0.08 | 0.80 | 0.00 | 1.08 |
| Habb Bank | 0.06 | 0.10 | 1.38 | 0.00 | 1.54 |
| Guardian Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.40 | 0.00 | 0.41 |
| Stanbic Bank | 0.23 | 0.15 | 0.21 | 0.14 | 0.74 |
| Credit Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.12 |
| NIC Bank | 0.07 | 0.17 | 1.74 | 0.08 | 2.03 |
| HFCK | 0.16 | 0.00 | 1.46 | 0.00 | 1.62 |
| EABS | 0.18 | 0.00 | 8.14 | 0.00 | 8.32 |
| Prima Bank | 0.03 | 0.08 | 0.37 | 0.04 | 0.52 |
| TransNational Bank | 0.01 | 0.05 | 4.83 | 0.04 | 4.93 |
| National Bank | 0.41 | 0.84 | 4.04 | 0.28 | 5.57 |
| K-Rep Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 1.04 | 0.00 | 1.06 |
| Oriental Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 2.44 | 0.00 | 2.45 |
| Cooperative Bank | 0.01 | 0.02 | 0.33 | 0.01 | 0.37 |
| Akiba Bank | 0.01 | 0.09 | 2.41 | 0.03 | 2.54 |
| Imperial Bank | 0.01 | 0.15 | 0.04 | 0.03 | 0.24 |
| ABC Bank | 0.01 | 0.10 | 0.78 | 0.02 | 0.91 |
| Bank of India | 0.23 | 0.00 | 2.44 | 0.00 | 2.67 |
| CITI Bank | 0.60 | 0.45 | 13.85 | 0.80 | 15.60 |
| Duba Bank | 0.90 | 0.00 | 0.48 | 0.00 | 1.38 |
| Consolidated Bank | 0.41 | 0.28 | 11.26 | 0.15 | 12.10 |
| First American Bank | 0.00 | 0.01 | 0.95 | 0.00 | 0.96 |
| KCB | 0.16 | 0.02 | 1.48 | 0.04 | 1.70 |
| Fina Bank | 0.01 | 0.08 | 2.39 | 0.02 | 2.50 |
| Habb AG Zurich | 0.06 | 0.03 | 0.95 | 0.00 | 1.03 |
| Parmount Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.28 | 0.00 | 0.29 |
| Equity Bank | 0.97 | 0.64 | 8.99 | 0.00 | 10.20 |
| CFC bank | 2.00 | 0.35 | 7.32 | 0.09 | 9.76 |

2005

| Bank | service charge | commission income | investment income | foreign exchange income | aggr y2 |
|--------------------|----------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion | Ksh Billion |
| Standard Chartered | 0.07 | 1.98 | 0.48 | 0.87 | 3.41 |
| Giro Bank | 0.01 | 0.00 | 0.95 | 0.00 | 0.95 |
| Barclays Bank | 0.10 | 0.02 | 0.91 | 0.07 | 1.10 |
| Victoria Bank | 0.00 | 0.01 | 2.02 | 0.00 | 2.03 |
| CBA | 0.10 | 0.40 | 0.02 | 0.26 | 0.78 |
| I&M Bank | 0.50 | 0.20 | 14.20 | 0.00 | 14.90 |
| Habb Bank | 0.06 | 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.00 | 0.12 |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|------|------|-------|------|-------|
| Guardian Bank | 0 01 | 0 00 | 1 02 | 0 00 | 1 03 |
| Stanbic Bank | 0 22 | 0 01 | 7 89 | 0 01 | 7 83 |
| Credit Bank | 0 01 | 0 00 | 2 89 | 0 00 | 2 87 |
| NBC Bank | 0 02 | 0 03 | 0 08 | 0 01 | 0 14 |
| HFCB | 0 17 | 0 00 | 0 20 | 0 00 | 0 37 |
| EABS | 0 18 | 0 02 | 2 00 | 0 00 | 2 21 |
| Prima Bank | 0 04 | 0 78 | 4 43 | 0 34 | 5 57 |
| TransNational Bank | 0 02 | 0 04 | 1 17 | 0 04 | 1 27 |
| National Bank | 0 08 | 0 06 | 0 23 | 0 02 | 0 38 |
| K-Rep Bank | 0 01 | 0 00 | 1 78 | 0 00 | 1 78 |
| Oriental Bank | 0 01 | 0 00 | 2 28 | 0 00 | 2 29 |
| Cooperative Bank | 0 08 | 0 03 | 15 86 | 0 04 | 16 10 |
| Aliba Bank | 0 01 | 0 01 | 1 00 | 0 01 | 1 03 |
| Imperial Bank | 0 18 | 0 02 | 0 08 | 0 03 | 0 29 |
| ABC Bank | 0 02 | 0 08 | 0 30 | 0 03 | 0 41 |
| Bank of India | 0 25 | 0 00 | 1 45 | 0 00 | 1 70 |
| CITI Bank | 0 55 | 0 48 | 25 24 | 1 83 | 27 80 |
| Dubai Bank | 0 84 | 0 00 | 11 26 | 0 00 | 12 10 |
| Consolidated Bank | 0 50 | 0 30 | 10 00 | 0 20 | 11 00 |
| First American Bank | 0 01 | 0 00 | 0 35 | 0 00 | 0 38 |
| KCB | 0 13 | 0 42 | 0 10 | 0 04 | 0 69 |
| Fina Bank | 0 01 | 0 05 | 2 00 | 0 01 | 2 07 |
| Habib AG Zunch | 0 04 | 0 01 | 0 89 | 0 00 | 0 74 |
| Parmount Bank | 0 00 | 0 00 | 1 70 | 0 00 | 1 70 |
| Equity Bank | 0 72 | 0 83 | 2 58 | 0 00 | 4 13 |
| CFC bank | 2 61 | 0 52 | 15 61 | 0 28 | 18 90 |

Source: Central Bank of Kenya.

Appendix III: Total Assets

| Bank | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
|---------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| CBA | 12,728,519,000 | 16,156,060,000 | 16,318,815,000 | 18,278,175,000 | 20,189,363,000 | 22,458,354,000 |
| coop | 23,261,762,000 | 23,569,618,000 | 28,675,030,000 | 32,364,178,000 | 46,433,933,000 | 48,528,112,000 |
| Citi Bank | 30,863,111,000 | 30,627,124,000 | 30,811,385,000 | 28,332,721,000 | 25,108,262,000 | 24,777,210,000 |
| CFC | 7,872,434,000 | 8,297,408,000 | 9,345,765,000 | 13,438,635,000 | 29,615,562,000 | 30,855,562,000 |
| Barclays | 70,649,000,000 | 73,920,000,000 | 86,914,000,000 | 96,655,000,000 | 106,195,000,000 | 104,226,000,000 |
| Stanbic | 7,543,216,000 | 7,829,370,000 | 8,110,245,000 | 9,945,868,000 | 10,470,128,000 | 10,886,240,000 |
| IAM Bank | 5,084,316,457 | 5,483,157,211 | 7,178,411,133 | 12,130,024,720 | 14,811,862,731 | 15,827,120,120 |
| KCB | 40,215,820,000 | 48,264,660,000 | 59,686,532,000 | 60,366,257,000 | 69,600,167,000 | 78,315,062,000 |
| NIC Bank | 7,442,493,000 | 8,407,845,000 | 9,329,282,000 | 11,036,266,000 | 16,889,622,000 | 17,367,480,000 |
| Standard Chartered | 80,489,520,000 | 83,213,428,000 | 84,240,823,000 | 87,235,764,000 | 86,349,455,000 | 72,969,288,000 |
| National Bank | 53,950,761,000 | 24,042,918,000 | 25,230,960,000 | 25,919,156,000 | 30,592,826,000 | 32,327,491,000 |
| HFCB | 10,553,353,000 | 11,578,736,000 | 11,262,177,000 | 11,208,487,000 | 11,308,918,000 | 11,432,164,000 |
| Bank of India | 2,528,272,486 | 3,130,519,586 | 4,662,126,166 | 5,805,009,048 | 6,038,663,766 | 6,641,235,469 |
| Akiba Bank | 4,478,230,000 | 4,627,320,000 | 3,979,081,000 | 4,168,047,000 | 4,208,937,000 | 4,248,913,000 |
| Prime Bank | 2,752,287,016 | 3,162,638,711 | 3,783,494,770 | 5,278,971,864 | 5,703,201,708 | 5,848,244,760 |
| Fina Bank | 4,649,104,000 | 4,842,423,000 | 5,261,367,000 | 5,604,908,000 | 5,926,646,000 | 6,147,449,000 |
| Habib AG Zurich | 3,268,620,000 | 3,448,841,000 | 3,796,485,000 | 4,019,662,000 | 4,136,972,000 | 4,214,365,000 |
| ABC Bank | 2,878,363,000 | 2,981,151,000 | 3,367,433,000 | 3,817,760,000 | 4,167,587,000 | 4,548,120,000 |
| Equity Bank | 1,260,000,000 | 1,883,000,000 | 2,575,435,329 | 3,923,946,301 | 6,707,420,166 | 11,456,643,000 |
| Consolidated | 2,601,827,000 | 3,175,902,000 | 2,706,960,000 | 2,442,416,000 | 2,573,126,000 | 2,666,868,000 |
| Paramount Bank | 1,462,036,000 | 1,367,911,000 | 1,256,216,000 | 1,264,581,000 | 1,212,674,000 | 1,196,447,000 |
| TrenasNational Bank | 1,368,514,000 | 1,588,008,000 | 1,731,021,000 | 1,472,708,000 | 2,689,347,000 | 2,664,662,000 |
| Habib Bank | 2,690,863,402 | 2,908,564,916 | 3,083,545,303 | 3,562,123,838 | 3,377,661,667 | 3,224,678,860 |
| Dubai Bank | 2,178,256,000 | 2,165,438,000 | 2,064,362,000 | 2,143,587,000 | 2,201,840,000 | 2,387,158,000 |
| EABS Bank | 2,045,772,000 | 2,546,733,000 | 2,945,663,000 | 3,437,205,000 | 3,438,968,000 | 3,572,341,000 |
| Credit Bank | 1,303,567,000 | 1,364,676,000 | 1,426,937,000 | 1,647,064,000 | 1,547,214,000 | 1,665,235,000 |
| Guerdan Bank | 1,224,739,000 | 1,256,601,000 | 1,274,281,000 | 1,306,659,000 | 1,351,266,000 | 1,432,964,000 |
| Qiro Bank | 2,042,692,000 | 2,168,422,000 | 2,252,659,000 | 2,375,612,000 | 1,418,048,000 | 2,674,527,000 |
| Imperial Bank | 1,238,547,000 | 1,239,562,000 | 1,242,702,000 | 12,563,411,000 | 1,126,350,000 | 1,397,382,000 |
| Victoria Bank | 1,206,693,000 | 1,263,627,000 | 1,248,239,000 | 1,272,964,000 | 1,260,426,000 | 1,358,316,000 |
| Oriental Bank | 1,173,502,000 | 1,163,162,000 | 1,199,468,000 | 1,204,063,000 | 1,217,860,000 | 1,227,500,000 |
| K-REP | 1,046,639,000 | 1,062,511,000 | 1,149,677,000 | 1,126,826,000 | 1,132,028,000 | 1,133,041,000 |
| First American Bank | 2,164,936,000 | 2,364,726,000 | 2,662,536,000 | 2,795,259,000 | 2,660,218,000 | 2,861,000,000 |

Source: Central Bank of Kenya.