brought to you by CORE
provided by Research Papers in Economics

BANK OF GREECE
EUROSYSTEM

Working Paper

Exploring the nexus between banking sector reform and performance: evidence from newly acceded EU countries

Sophocles N. Brissimis
Manthos D. Delis
Nikolaos I. Papanikolaou

73

JUNE 2008

BANK OF GREECE
Economic Research Department – Special Studies Division
21, E. Venizelos Avenue
GR-102 50 Athens
Tel: +30210-320 3610
Fax: +30210-320 2432

www.bankofgreece.gr

Printed in Athens, Greece
at the Bank of Greece Printing Works.
All rights reserved. Reproduction for educational and non-commercial purposes is permitted provided that the source is acknowledged.

ISSN 1109-6691

EXPLORING THE NEXUS BETWEEN BANKING SECTOR REFORM AND PERFORMANCE: EVIDENCE FROM NEWLY ACCEDED EU COUNTRIES

Sophocles N. Brissimis
Bank of Greece and University of Piraeus

Manthos D. Delis
Athens University of Economics and Business

Nikolaos I. Papanikolaou
Athens University of Economics and Business

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to examine the relationship between banking sector reform and bank performance – measured in terms of efficiency, total factor productivity growth and net interest margin – accounting for the effects through competition and bank risk-taking. To this end, we develop an empirical model of bank performance and draw on recent econometric advances to consistently estimate it. The model is applied to bank panel data from ten newly acceded EU countries. The results indicate that both banking sector reform and competition exert a positive impact on bank efficiency, while the effect of reform on total factor productivity growth is significant only toward the end of the reform process. Finally, the effect of capital and credit risk on bank performance is in most cases negative, while it seems that higher liquid assets reduce the efficiency and productivity of banks.

Keywords: Bank performance; Banking sector reform; Competition; Risk-taking
JEL classification: G21; L1; C14

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank H. Gibson, G. Hondroyiannis, Y. Tsutsui and H. Uchida for very helpful comments. The views expressed in this paper do not necessarily reflect those of the Bank of Greece.

Correspondence:
Sophocles N. Brissimis
Economic Research Department
Bank of Greece, 21 El. Venizelos Ave.,
102 50, Athens, Greece
Tel. +30210-320 2388
Email: sbrissimis@bankofgreece.gr

1. Introduction

Three interrelated determinants of bank performance standout prominently in the current theoretical and empirical debate, namely the financial reform process, the degree of competition and the risk-taking behavior of banks. At least two groups of studies involve these determinants, each aiming at different objectives. Both draw on an important paper by Keeley (1990), who argued that the deregulation of the US banking sector in the 1970s and 1980s increased competition and led to a reduction in monopoly rents and thus, through worsened performance, to a higher equilibrium risk of failure. The first group of studies followed Keeley's paradigm in examining the relationship between deregulation, bank risk-taking and competition, yielding however rather conflicting results (e.g. Matutes and Vives, 2000; Bolt and Tieman, 2004; Allen and Gale, 2004). The second approach, which is mainly empirical in nature, attempts to analyze directly whether deregulation has an impact on bank performance; yet, the findings of this group of studies too are rather contentious. Some conclude that deregulation boosts efficiency through operational savings, thus leading to a surge in productivity growth (e.g. Kumbhakar et al., 2001; Isik and Hassan, 2003). Others, however, find that deregulation has a negative effect on the performance of banks, as it stimulates a decline in productive efficiency and/or total factor productivity growth (see Grifell-Tatjé and Lovell, 1996; Wheelock and Wilson, 1999).

In the present paper we combine these two approaches by focusing on how bank performance is affected by reforms in the banking sector, and the associated changes in the industry structure and the risk-taking behavior of banks. Differently phrased, we examine the relationship between performance, reform, competition and risk-taking, where, given the sequence of the effects discussed above, bank performance may be interrelated with the risk-taking behavior of banks. To carry out such an analysis, we develop a two-stage empirical model that involves estimating bank performance in the first stage and assessing its determinants in the second.

Our model draws on the recent econometric contributions of Simar and Wilson (2007) and Khan and Lewbel (2007). In particular, bank performance, measured in terms of productive efficiency (PE) and total factor productivity (TFP) growth, is derived via nonparametric techniques and then the scores obtained are linked to

reform,[1] competition and bank risk-taking using bootstrapping techniques that account for the possible endogeneity between bank performance and risk. We opt for an application of this model to ten newly acceded EU countries, since the transition from centrally planned to market economies involved quite uniform institutional, structural and managerial changes in the relevant banking sectors.

To shed more light on the reform-competition-risk-performance nexus, this study has a number of additional features. First, further to the two nonparametric measures of PE and TFP growth, we employ the net interest margin (NIM) as a measure of bank performance. Second, instead of using concentration indices to measure competition in the banking industry, we construct a yearly index of competition for each country following a non-structural methodology. Third, by utilizing bank-level data and the important research output on banking sector reforms of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), we are able to derive a direct relationship between the reform process and bank performance. The twelve years of data used (1994-2005) capture almost the entire course of the banking sector reform process in the countries examined. Finally, to analyze the risk-taking behavior of banks, we consider three categories of risk, namely credit, liquidity and capital risk.

The rest of this paper proceeds as follows. Section 2 briefly reviews the relevant literature. Section 3 describes the first stage of the econometric methodology that corresponds to the derivation of bank performance measures; it also discusses the determinants of bank performance to be used in the second stage. Section 4 presents the empirical results of the second stage analysis, and finally Section 5 concludes.

2. Brief literature review

In an important contribution, Keeley (1990) provided both a theoretical framework and empirical evidence that the deregulation of the US banking sector led to an erosion of bank market power and consequently of the market value of their equity capital. In turn, this increased banks' incentives to take on extra risk, thus also increasing the risk of failure. Keeley's paper triggered a lively discussion about the channels through which bank performance, and hence the stability of the banking

[1] We shall use the term "bank reform", rather than "deregulation", to describe the full set of developments in the banking sectors of these countries.

system, is affected following deregulation measures. Two different yet complementary strands of literature emerged. The first examines the relationship between deregulation, market power (competition) and bank risk-taking, and the second investigates the direct effect of deregulation on bank performance.

Studies in the first strand have been mainly theoretical. Matutes and Vives (2000) confirmed Keeley's results on the liabilities side of a bank's balance sheet, while Bolt and Tieman (2004) reached similar conclusions by examining the assets side. Hellmann et al. (2000) suggested that bank regulation through capital requirements is not a Pareto optimal policy for controlling banks' risk-taking incentives and proposed that such requirements should be combined with deposit rate controls. In a series of papers, Diamond and Rajan (e.g. 2000, 2001a) pointed out that the optimal bank capital structure trades off liquidity creation and costs of bank distress. Therefore, banks are fragile during episodes of aggregate liquidity shortages, in which case capital has a strategic role to play in preventing failure. However, more recent papers advocate that the relationship between competition and financial stability may in fact be nonnegative. Allen and Gale (2004), studying a variety of models, suggested a complex and multi-faceted link. Boyd et al. (2006) examined two theoretical models, the first pointing to a negative correlation between banks' risk of failure and competition, and the second establishing the opposite result. The fact that the second model was verified empirically on the basis of large US and international samples implies that increased competition does not lead to unstable banking environments.[2]

The empirical investigation of the above models seems to face considerable difficulties in measuring both deregulation and market power, which may be an important reason for the many differences in the findings. The effect of deregulation is assessed either by dummy variables that correspond to important deregulation measures (e.g. Salas and Saurina, 2003) or by simply examining the behavior of bank performance during periods of deregulation. On the other hand, most studies, including Boyd et al. (2006), proxy competition by concentration ratios that in many aspects have proved to be poor measures of competition. Other indicators of competition/market power employed include Tobin's q (used by Salas and Saurina, 2003), the Panzar and Rosse H-statistic (used by Claessens and Laeven, 2004, and Yildirim and Philippatos, 2007) and the Lerner index (see e.g. Angelini and Cetorelli,

[2] For a fuller review of this literature, see Boyd and De Nicolo (2005).

2003). However, with a few exceptions, this literature lacks a measure of market power that shows how competition evolves over time, and thus during the deregulation process.[3]

As regards the second strand of the literature, numerous studies evaluate the direct impact of financial deregulation on bank performance without accounting for its effect through competition and risk-taking. Most of these studies measure bank performance by parametric or nonparametric estimates of bank efficiency and productivity. However, their empirical results are also rather controversial. For example, Berg et al. (1992) examined the performance of the Norwegian banking sector over the 1980s and found that in the pre-deregulation period productivity declined, whereas a rapid growth was observed in the post-deregulation period.[4] Kumbhakar et al. (2001) concluded that Spanish savings banks experienced efficiency losses during the deregulation period, while in the last few years of that period productivity was growing. Wheelock and Wilson (1999) examined both the efficiency and total factor productivity of US commercial banks in the 1984-1993 period, when significant regulatory reforms were implemented. On the one hand, they acknowledged diminishing efficiency due to rapid technological change, while on the other hand they found that large banks experienced productivity growth.[5] The discrepancies in the empirical findings may be due to the dissimilar measures of performance and samples used (the latter corresponding to different macroeconomic conditions and deregulation policies). Other parameters like the organizational form and the special features of the institutions may also have affected this relationship.

While the above literature provides significant evidence on the relationship either between deregulation, market power and bank risk-taking, or between deregulation and bank performance, a study of all the links in the deregulation-bank performance

[3] Claessens and Laeven (2004) and Yildirim and Philippatos (2007) derive country-specific H-statistics, which they subsequently regress on a number of explanatory variables using cross-sectional estimation methods. However, some authors suggest that the H-statistic does not map into a range of oligopoly solution concepts as robustly as the Lerner index does. Angelini and Cetorelli (2003) recognize this and estimate Lerner indices for each year in the sample period, which are also regressed on a number of explanatory variables in a second stage of analysis, again using cross-sectional methods. Uchida and Tsutsui (2005) suggest a method that provides yearly estimates of market power for the Japanese banking sector, thus enabling the investigation of short-term changes in the degree of competition.

[4] The positive effect of deregulation on total factor productivity is also corroborated by the recent work of Kumbhakar and Lozano-Vivas (2005) for Spanish banks.

[5] Humphrey and Pulley examined the relationship between deregulation and bank performance in the 1980s and early 1990s in the US and documented an initial decline in bank profits, with long-term adjustment being primarily due to changes in banks' business environment.

chain is missing. A possible explanation is that such a study of bank performance would require a two-stage approach, where bank performance measures derived via parametric or nonparametric techniques in the first stage would be regressed on a number of determinants reflecting deregulation, market power and risk. Unfortunately, it turns out that conventional two-stage procedures yield inconsistent results, and only very recently Simar and Wilson (2007) suggested a robust procedure for nonparametrically derived measures of performance. This will be used in our empirical analysis that follows.

3. Empirical analysis

Given the theoretical considerations discussed in the previous section, we specify the following empirical model to study the relationship between performance, reform, competition and risk-taking in banking:

$$p_{it} = a_0 + a_1 ref_t + a_2 \theta_t + a_3 x_{it} + a_4 m_t + u_{it} \tag{1}$$

where the performance p of bank i at time t is written as a function of a time-dependent banking-sector reform variable, *ref*; an index of banking industry market power, θ; a vector of bank-level variables representing credit, liquidity and capital risk, x; variables that capture the macroeconomic conditions common to all banks, m; and the error term u.

The above model is estimated on a panel of banks from ten newly acceded EU countries (listed in Table 1), which corresponds to a relatively long period, covering the banking sector reform process in these countries, namely the 1994-2005 period. We choose to focus the empirical analysis on the unconsolidated statements of commercial, savings and cooperative banks in order to reduce the possibility of aggregation bias in the results. All bank-level data used are obtained from the BankScope database. During the sample period a number of M&As and bank failures took place, which are taken into account in our dataset so as to avoid selectivity bias. Also, the data were reviewed for reporting errors or other inconsistencies (zero or negative values for the variables used). This yielded an unbalanced panel dataset of 4368 observations corresponding to 364 banks. All bank-level data are reported in

euros and are expressed in constant 1994 prices (using individual country GDP deflators). Below we discuss the variables used to estimate Eq. (1).

3.1. Measurement of performance

Bank performance is proxied alternatively by productive efficiency, total factor productivity growth and the net interest margin.

Efficiency: This refers to the distance (in terms of production) of a decision-making unit (DMU) from the best practice in the industry; it is given by a scalar measure ranging between zero (the lowest efficiency score) and one (corresponding to the optimum DMU). The literature on the measurement of efficiency follows two major approaches, using parametric and nonparametric frontiers, respectively.[6]

In the parametric frontier analysis, the technology of a DMU is specified in the context of a particular functional form for the cost, profit or production relationship that links the DMU's output to inputs and, as the term "parametric" implies, includes a stochastic term. The literature uses various parametric frontier methods depending on the assumptions made about the error term (for more details, see Kumbhakar and Lovell, 2000). The nonparametric methods of efficiency measurement include the Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) and the Free Disposal Hull (FDH). The most widely used is DEA, a programming technique that provides a linear piecewise frontier by enveloping the observed data points and yields a convex production possibilities set. As such, it does not require the explicit specification of the functional form of the underlying production relationship. In the context of the present analysis, the nonparametric efficiency estimates serve better as performance measures compared to their parametric equivalents. Indeed, regressing efficiency estimates obtained from parametric techniques would almost certainly result in problems of statistical consistency, since the covariates of Eq. (1) would be correlated with the fixed or random effects of the initial parametric regression (see Coelli et al., 2005). In contrast, Simar and Wilson (2007) have provided a procedure for robustly regressing efficiency estimates derived from nonparametric techniques on a number

[6] For a general introduction to these approaches, see Coelli et al. (2005).

of determinants.[7] For this reason, we opt here for nonparametric estimates of efficiency, while the specifics of the estimation method of Eq. (1) are provided in the next section.

Total factor productivity: Access to panel data provides the opportunity to exploit also the total factor productivity (TFP) growth of banks, again using nonparametric techniques. Analyzing the productivity of banks is of interest from a policy perspective, since increased productivity may contribute positively to the overall performance of the banking system, lower prices and improved service quality for consumers. In addition, enhanced productivity may act as a safety net against the various risks associated with the banking industry. To measure TFP change, we use standard Malmquist techniques.[8] The most popular has been the DEA-like programming technique suggested by Fare et al. (1994), which is the one followed here. The Malmquist technique allows decomposition of TFP change into technological change (TC) and technical efficiency change (TEC). An improvement in TC is considered as a shift in the frontier. Also, TEC is the product of scale efficiency change (SEC) and pure technical efficiency change (PTEC). Given this decomposition, the Malmquist index provides a powerful tool of analysis for the sources of TFP growth.[9]

The first problem encountered in evaluating bank efficiency and TFP growth is the definition and measurement of bank output. The two most widely used approaches are the 'production' and the 'intermediation' approaches.[10] While we acknowledge that it would probably be best to employ both approaches to identify whether the results are biased when using a different set of outputs, sufficient data to perform such an analysis on banks from newly acceded EU countries is generally unavailable. Hence, this study uses the 'intermediation approach' for two main

[7] For a discussion of the reasons why previous two-stage procedures using nonparametric estimates of efficiency lead to invalid inference, see Simar and Wilson (2007).

[8] To save space, we do not replicate the mathematical models here, and only provide the Malmquist formula in Appendix I. For a recent review of the literature on productivity change in banking, see Casu et al. (2004).

[9] This decomposition has been subject to a number of criticisms (see Casu et al., 2004), mainly in terms of the role of constant returns vs. variable returns to scale frontiers. However, there seems to be consensus that the Malmquist index is correctly measured by the constant returns to scale distance function even when technology exhibits variable returns to scale.

[10] Under the former approach, output is measured by the number of transactions or documents processed over a given time period (see Berger and Humphrey, 1997). Under the latter approach, output is measured in terms of values of stock variables (such as loans, deposits etc.) appearing in bank accounts.

reasons: first, this approach is inclusive of interest expenses, which usually account for over one-half of total costs, and second the BankScope database lacks the necessary data for implementing the production approach. Accordingly, we specify two outputs, namely total loans and total securities; and two inputs, i.e. operating expenses (non-interest and personnel expenses) and total deposits and short-term funding.[11] Both inputs and outputs have risen considerably during the sample period due to M&As and the rapidly growing size of banking institutions (especially of the newly established foreign institutions) of the region (summary statistics are presented in Table 1).

Given the above, we estimate PE and TFP change at the bank level for the ten countries of our sample, to obtain the Stage 1 estimation results (see Appendix for the technical details of the procedure used). Table 2 reports average estimates, denoted by *pe* and *dtfp*, by country and through time. We should bear in mind that the estimations are carried out for each country separately and therefore the efficiency scores only reflect the dispersion of efficiency within each sample, they tell us nothing about the efficiency of one sample relative to another.

Almost all countries show a gradual improvement in their PE. This is not surprising, since the banking systems examined have seen fundamental changes in their ownership structure (private vs. public, foreign vs. domestically-owned banks), including mergers. In addition, the relatively stable macroeconomic conditions of the period, coupled with a significant improvement in operating expenses management, may have led to improved PE. The majority of banks comprising the sample seem to cluster around levels of efficiency of approximately 65%, which is a score similar to that found in other recent nonparametric analyses of Western European banking systems (see e.g. Casu and Molyneux, 2003).

[11] The definition of inputs and outputs varies widely across studies of bank efficiency. In this paper, given the limitations of the BankScope database, further disaggregation of inputs and outputs is not possible (i.e. personnel expenses or fixed assets are not reported for many banks). Clearly, it is possible that the use of expenses rather than physical inputs could result in some bias against those banks that employ high-quality and therefore high-cost inputs. This potential bias should be mitigated, however, given that banks with high-quality inputs should expect to see some benefit in output terms. Hence, if high-quality inputs are sufficiently productive, such banks will not be disadvantaged from a relative efficiency perspective (see Berger and Humphrey, 1997; Drake and Hall, 2003). Also, some studies suggest that deposits have both input and output characteristics (e.g. Berger and Humphrey, 1997). However, even this distinction of deposits is difficult, given the diversity of the banking systems examined. For the sake of comparison, total deposits are treated here as inputs.

Table 2 also reports the Malmquist TFP change index (*dtfp*). A value for *dtfp* greater than one indicates positive TFP growth, while a value less than one indicates a TFP decline. All countries present considerable TFP growth over the sample period, which is representative of banking sectors under intense reform. In particular, average TFP growth has been as large as 28.6% and 26.1% in Poland and the Czech Republic, respectively. Even countries like Slovenia and Latvia, which present the lowest TFP growth in their banking systems among the countries examined (7.6% and 9.1%, respectively), exhibit relatively high TFP growth scores compared with those reported by other studies for developed banking systems (e.g. Casu et al., 2004).

For expositional brevity, we do not present all the individual components of TFP growth. However, it seems that the most important element of *dtfp* is TC, especially in the case of *dtfp* increases. Again, this is an expected result for banking sectors in rapid transition. To illustrate this result, in Figures 1 and 2 we present bivariate kernel regressions of TC and PTEC on *dtfp*, respectively.[12] In both cases, we use the Epanechnikov kernel, which is the most commonly used in the relevant studies, and a small bandwidth (equal to 0.2) that provides detailed information regarding the shape of the examined relationships. Both figures indicate positive relationships between *dtfp* and its two sources; however, the *dtfp*-TC locus is steeper, especially for higher values of *dtfp*, which is indicative of the greater importance of TC as a source of TFP growth relative to PTEC, particularly for higher values of *dtfp*.

Net interest margin: Along with the nonparametric measures of bank performance discussed so far, we also employ the net interest margin (NIM). NIM represents the amount by which the interest earned on a bank's portfolio exceeds the interest paid on deposits or borrowed funds. In the literature, NIM has emerged as a key indicator of asset productivity, since a high NIM is indicative of the effective use of earning assets and a sensible mix of interest-bearing liabilities.[13]

[12] Here we follow Balaguer-Coll et al. (2007), who suggest using the nonparametric kernel regressions to explain the nonparametric efficiency scores on the basis of various determinants. These are less powerful techniques in terms of prediction, yet they are extremely informative for explanatory purposes.

[13] Recent studies that examine the determinants of NIM include Saunders and Schumacher (2000) and Maudos and de Guevara (2004). A potential weakness of NIM may be that, as banks move toward more fee-generating activities, NIM will decline in importance as a measure of asset profitability.

3.2. Determinants of bank performance

3.2.1. Banking sector reform

Banking system restructuring was quite profound over the last decade in most of the countries of our sample. Since the mid-1990s, their banking systems were extensively reformed through the abolition of administrative interventions and regulations, which seriously hampered their development. The reforms were adopted gradually and supported the further improvement of the institutional framework and the more competent functioning of banks and financial markets in general. The objective of these countries' enetring the EU prompted efforts to further deregulate their banking systems and achieve macroeconomic convergence. During the past few years, banks tried to strengthen their position in the domestic market and acquire a size, partly through M&As, that would allow them to exploit economies of scale and have easier access to international financial markets.

Banks operating in the countries examined are gradually reaching the standards of their counterparts in the rest of EU countries. The institutional reforms briefly described above have been viewed as a means to reduce bank costs, particularly those associated with risk management and the evaluation of credit information. However, for smaller and private domestic banks, risk management techniques need to improve further (see EBRD, 2006). In fact, lending in emerging markets is greatly influenced by how banks perceive the legal environment and the level of hedging against risks that this environment entails. Institutional improvements, such as effective systems for taking collateral and recovering assets in cases of default, will play a fundamental role in the further development of the banking sector. However, given the restructuring that took place in the last decade, the newly acceded EU countries provide an excellent case for the study of the relationship between performance, reform, competition and risk-taking.[14]

Data on the banking reform process are obtained from the EBRD. In particular, we use the EBRD index of banking sector reform, either as a structural index (*ebrd*) (see Table 1 for summary statistics) or to generate time dummy variables. This index has been compiled by the EBRD with the primary purpose of assessing the progress

[14] For a detailed review of the reform process in the Central and Eastern European countries' financial sectors, see various issues of the EBRD Transition Reports (e.g. Transition Report 2006: Finance in transition).

of the banking sectors of formerly centrally planned economies. As this indicator quantifies and qualifies the degree of liberalization of the banking industry, it is suitable for an explicit evaluation of the effect of banking sector reform on the performance of banks. Related studies measure the impact of deregulation (or specific deregulation policies) on bank performance or competition; they do not focus on the reform process as a whole.[15] The values of *ebrd* range from 1.0 to 4.0+, with 1.0 indicating a rigid centralized economy and 4.0+ implying the highest level of reform, which corresponds to a fully industrialized market economy. The criteria used for the compilation of the index are common to all countries (see EBRD Transition Reports, various issues). When the index is used to formulate dummy variables, we assume that changes in the regulatory regime remain over time, and thus the (country-specific) dummies take a value of one in the year of change and remain equal to one until the end of the sample period. Obviously, the reform process, when thus treated, is viewed as permanent in that it affects banks not only in the year of change in the regulatory regime, but also in all subsequent years of the sample period (see Salas and Saurina, 2003). The upward trend of the index reflects the extensive restructuring that took place in the banking sectors examined during the sample period.

3.2.2. Bank competition

To measure the evolution of competitive conditions over time in the banking systems of the ten newly acceded EU countries, we use the methodology suggested by Uchida and Tsutsui (2005). In particular, we jointly estimate the following system of three equations that correspond to a translog cost function, to a revenue equation obtained from the profit maximization problem of banks and to an inverse loan demand function:

$$\ln C_{it} = b_0 + b_1\overline{\ln q_{it}} + \frac{1}{2}b_2(\overline{\ln q_{it}})^2 + b_3\overline{\ln d_{it}} + \frac{1}{2}b_4(\overline{\ln d_{it}})^2 + b_5\overline{\ln w_{it}} + \frac{1}{2}b_6(\overline{\ln w_{it}})^2 + b_7(\overline{\ln q_{it}})(\overline{\ln w_{it}}) + b_8(\overline{\ln q_{it}})(\overline{\ln d_{it}}) + b_9(\overline{\ln d_{it}})(\overline{\ln w_{it}}) + e_{it}^C$$

[15] For instance, Salas and Saurina (2003) and Kumbhakar and Lozano-Vivas (2005) employ all the deregulation events that occurred in the period under examination to capture the deregulation process in the Spanish banking industry. Angelini and Cetorelli (2003) measure deregulation through changes in minimum capital requirements, or the abrogation of the interest rate ceilings policy. Similarly, Yildirim and Philippatos (2007) choose foreign bank penetration to capture deregulation. Other studies also use the abolition of entry restrictions as a deregulation proxy (e.g. Demirguc-Kunt et al., 2004).

$$R_{it} = \frac{\theta_t}{\eta_t} R_{it} + r_{it} q_{it} + c_{it}(b_1 + b_2 \overline{\ln q_{it}} + b_7 \overline{\ln w_{it}} + b_8 \overline{\ln d_{it}}) + \\ C_{it} \frac{q_{it}}{d_{it}} (b_3 + b_4 \overline{\ln d_{it}} + b_8 \overline{\ln q_{it}} + b_9 \overline{\ln w_{it}}) + e_{it}^s \tag{2}$$

$$\ln p_{it} = g_0 - (1/\eta_t) \ln q_{it} + g_1 \ln gdpg_t + g_2 \ln ir_t + e_{it}^D$$

where C is the total cost of bank i at time t, q is bank output, d are deposits, w are bank inputs other than deposits, R is bank revenue, r is the interest rate on deposits, p is the price of bank output and e's are the error terms. Variables with bars are defined as deviations from their cross-sectional means in each time period, so as to remove their trend. The variables *gdpg* and *ir* are exogenous variables that affect demand. The degree of competition in each year is given by θ, which represents the well-known conjectural variations elasticity of total industry output with respect to the output of the i*th* bank.

The range of possible values of θ is given by [0, 1]. In the special case of Cournot competition, θ_{it} is simply the market share of the *i*th bank. In the case of perfect competition, $\theta_{it} = 0$; under pure monopoly, $\theta_{it} = 1$; and, finally, $\theta_{it} < 0$ implies pricing below marginal cost and could result, for example, from a non-optimizing behavior of banks. Note that in system (2) we dropped the subscript i on θ in order to capture the industry average degree of competition (on this point, see also Bresnahan, 1989). Both θ and η, which represents the market demand elasticity for bank output, are parameters to be estimated. To estimate θ, we use year dummy variables, while to estimate η, we use dummy variables for every two years.[16] A merit of this estimation method is that it provides an index of industry market power to be used in subsequent analysis.

Data for the bank-level variables are taken from BankScope and data for the control variables are taken from the EBRD's Transition Reports and the World Bank's World Development Indicators (WDI). Specifically, C is measured by total expenses, q by total earning assets, d by total deposits and short-term funding, w by the ratio of total operating expenses to total assets, R by total revenue, r by the ratio of interest expenses to total deposits and short-term funding, p by the ratio of total

[16] To estimate η we cannot use year dummy variables, because they are linearly dependent on the time-specific control variables m.

revenue to total earning assets, *gdpg* by the annual % GDP growth rate and *ir* by a short-term interest rate.[17]

Estimation is carried out for each country separately using seemingly unrelated regression. For expositional brevity, only the average results for each country are presented in Table 3.[18] The picture presented by the estimates is mixed, with some countries showing evidence of fairly competitive practices (e.g. Bulgaria and Romania), others exhibiting anticompetitive behavior (Lithuania and Slovenia) and most lying in between. Changes over time also differ across countries, yet there seems to be convergence toward middle values for θ.

3.2.3. Bank risk-taking

To capture the effect of risk in the second-stage regressions, we differentiate between three different types of risk, namely credit, liquidity and capital risk. Poor asset quality (increased credit risk) and low levels of liquidity are the two major causes of bank failures. During periods of increased uncertainty, financial institutions may decide to diversify their portfolios and/or raise their liquid holdings in order to reduce their risk. Banks would therefore improve their performance by improving screening and monitoring of both liquidity and credit risk, and such policies involve the forecasting of future levels of risk. On the other hand, increased levels of capital (lower capital risk) act as a safety net in the case of adverse developments and therefore are expected to have a positive impact on bank performance.[19] Following the empirical literature, we use the ratio of loan-loss provisions to total loans (*cr*) to measure credit risk, the ratio of liquid to total assets (lq) to proxy liquidity risk and the ratio of total equity to total assets (cap) to proxy capital risk. Table 1 reports all the bank-level risk variables used, along with some descriptive statistics, which show gradual convergence with European practice. In particular, all three ratios gradually

[17] The short-term interest rate used varies between countries (e.g. in some countries we use the interbank rate, in others the central bank rate, etc.). Since estimation is carried out for each country separately, this is not a potential problem.

[18] The full set of θ_t results is available upon request. Several robustness checks were performed (e.g. estimation using three-stage least squares), but the results remained unchanged at the 10% level of significance. Also, we used some risk variables (i.e. capital and/or credit risk) as inputs in the cost and revenue equations, yet again the results remained unchanged, with the exception of Romania (15% rise in θ) and Slovenia (10% fall).

[19] Most studies find a negative relationship between liquidity or credit risk and performance measures (e.g. Athanasoglou et al., forthcoming). As regards the capital-performance relationship, Berger (1995) suggests a positive correlation, which is mainly due to market imperfections.

decline, even though they are still far off the quality levels proposed by CAMEL analysis (below 1% for *cr*, 20-30% for *lq* and 5-8% for *cap*).[20]

3.2.4. Control variables

Finally, following the literature, the second-stage analysis includes some macroeconomic country-specific variables (*m*), namely the ratio of total investment to GDP (*invgdp*) as a proxy for fluctuations in economic activity, and a short-term interest rate (*ir*), which captures the variability of market interest rates. These variables are taken from the EBRD and the WDI. In addition to the macroeconomic variables, we also use foreign (*for*) and public (*pub*) ownership as potential determinants of bank performance.

4. Results and sensitivity analysis

4.1. Econometric procedure

The previous sections provided some hints about the estimation methodology for Eq. (1). As Simar and Wilson (2007) point out, DEA efficiency estimates are serially correlated, and consequently standard approaches to inference (such as censored regressions) are invalid. In fact, Simar and Wilson propose that bootstrap procedures be used in the second-stage regressions that allow for valid inference.[21] Yet, the theoretical considerations of Keeley (1990) and the debate that followed imply that performance and risk-taking in banking may be endogenous variables. To this end, we follow the methodology put forth by Khan and Lewbel (2007), who suggested a two-stage least squares estimation of truncated regression models. Their simulation results show that their new estimator performs well, while they explicitly state that their method is applicable in general contexts involving two-stage analyses with a nonparametric first step, such as ours. In what follows, we discuss the results obtained from estimating Eq. (1) using a procedure that combines the implications of Simar

[20] CAMEL analysis provides a framework for the evaluation of banks through the complete coverage of the factors affecting bank creditworthiness. It has emerged as the industry standard. The factors covered in this framework are capital adequacy, asset quality, management, earnings and liquidity. In a nutshell, the acronym to remember is CAMEL.

[21] In another paper, Balaguer-Coll et al. (2007) acknowledge this drawback and suggest bivariate kernel regressions in the second stage. To our knowledge, no other study uses either the Simar and Wilson (2007) or the Balaguer-Coll et al. (2007) methodology.

and Wilson (2007) and Khan and Lewbel (2007). The technical details of the estimation procedure are presented in the Appendix.

4.2. Estimation results

Table 4 presents the stage 2 results, using *pe*, *dtfp* or *nim* as the dependent variable. Note that for the regressions for *pe* and *dtfp* (columns 1-4) we use the algorithm in the Appendix. The regressions in columns 5 and 6 correspond to a panel two-stage least squares estimation (to account for the endogeneity of the risk variables). For all dependent variables we report estimates based on the EBRD index used as an ordinal index (*ebrd*), as well as on the reform dummies (*ref94-ref05*). In the *dtfp* equations we use the change in each explanatory variable (denoted by a *d* in front of the variable), since *dtfp* also reflects change. The rest of the variables used are common in all regressions: market power (*mp*), the three risk variables (*cap*, *lq*, *cr*), the two control variables (*ir*, *invgdp*) and two dummy variables that capture foreign (*for*) and public (*pub*) ownership.

The results in column 1 show substantial gains in productive efficiency following the reforms, as most of the coefficients on the reform dummies are positive and statistically significant. The largest and most significant change is reported for 2005. Reform measures taken in 1995, 1999, 2002 and 2004 had no significant effect on efficiency, while a significantly negative impact is documented for 1998 and 2001. In spite of these non-significant and/or negative changes, the positive impact that reform has on bank efficiency is dominant.[22] An overall positive relationship is confirmed by the coefficient on *ebrd* (see column 2).

Column 3 shows that the relationship between *dtfp* and the reform dummies is in most cases insignificant except for the last two years, when the relevant effect turned positive and significant, reflecting the fact that the productivity of banks gained momentum in 2004 and 2005. These results are similar to those of Isik and Hassan (2003), who find that Turkish banks have experienced a positive growth of productivity only in the last years of the financial deregulation process.[23] This

[22] The empirical results of Salas and Saurina (2003) support this argument. By regressing market power on a series of different liberalization measures, they reached similar conclusions.
[23] Our findings are also similar to those of Berg et al. (1992), who report noticeable productivity growth for Norwegian banks only in the post-deregulation period.

phenomenon may be attributed to the longer-term nature of the effect of technological improvements. When *ebrd* is employed in the regression (column 4), a positive link between reform and *dtfp* is documented, possibly driven by the last years of our sample, when countries reached higher levels of reform. In addition, the liberalization of banking sectors and the subsequent relaxation of regulatory conditions resulted in lower interest margins, as is evident from the negative relationship between *nim* and *ebrd*. A number of theoretical and empirical studies have reached the same conclusion (see e.g. Keeley, 1990; Demirguc-Kunt et al., 2004).

While the above results clearly indicate that the reform process led to increased efficiency, and later to improved TFP growth, they only provide us with a hint concerning the channels involved. An important element in this transmission process is market power. Even though competition was not significantly enhanced (see Table 3), its relationship with *pe* and *nim* is negative and positive, respectively.[24] This suggests that banks, in the light of falling net interest margins and stable competition, strive for efficiency to improve their performance. The fact that competition does not affect productivity change significantly may suggest that the negative effect of *mp* on *pe* is offset by a positive relationship between *mp* and TC. This would imply that banks with market power are leaders in technology innovation.[25]

According to the traditional view, which can be traced back to Keeley's (1990) work, deregulation in banking leads to intensified competition. Competition, in turn, erodes interest and profit margins and hence the charter value of banks; having less to lose, banks engage in riskier activities. As a result, the quality of loans deteriorates, enhancing banks' risk of failure.[26] Boyd and de Nicolo (2006) challenged the dominance of this view by showing that banks' probability of failure as well as bank profits are positively related to concentration.[27] Here we differentiate between different measures of risk to provide a clear picture of how risk management affects

[24] For a recent study of the determinants of the net interest margin with similar results to those presented here, see Maudos and de Guevara (2004).

[25] We have additionally included a three-bank concentration ratio among the regressors to capture the effect of industry concentration. However, the results showed that concentration is always an insignificant determinant of bank performance, regardless of the measure of performance employed and even when *mp* is not included in the estimated equation (nevertheless, the correlation between *mp* and concentration is as low as 0.1). These results are available upon request.

[26] In line with this view, Bolt and Tieman (2004) show that competition leads banks to relax their credit standards in order to attract more assets.

[27] By the same token, Chen (2007) provides evidence of increased screening activity due to intensified competition that leads to higher loan quality and hence to a reduction in the risk of failure.

bank performance. The results regarding capital and liquidity risk are uniform across all estimated equations, indicating a positive and a negative relationship, respectively. The latter result is new in the literature and requires some additional comments. Traditionally, banks have been solving the liquidity problem by holding cash together with a considerable amount of short-term government securities that they could sell for cash. On the other hand, a lower leverage ratio would imply a lower insolvency risk. Financial reform, however, led to the development of new banking products and alternative sources of funds for banks, which have made it easier for banks to secure liquidity.[28] The above discussion implies that banks in the newly acceded EU countries should restructure their balance sheets by raising their capital base and reducing their holdings of liquid assets.[29] Furthermore, this may suggest a strategic role for bank capital in cases of liquidity shortages (see Diamond and Rajan, 2001a; 2001b).

Concerning credit risk, the regression results reveal a significantly negative relationship with efficiency and TFP change. This shows that the banks of the countries examined should focus more on credit risk management, which has proved problematic in the recent past. Serious banking problems have arisen from the failure of banks to recognize impaired assets and create reserves for writing off these assets. A considerable help toward smoothening these anomalies would be provided by improving the transparency of the financial systems, which in turn would assist banks to evaluate credit risk more effectively and avoid problems associated with hazardous exposure. Finally, as columns 5 and 6 report, *cr* is not a significant determinant of *nim*. This may reflect the failure of net interest margin to capture the increasing importance of fee-generating activities.

Regarding the ownership variables, the results are as expected. In particular, we find that banks with public ownership are less efficient and fall behind in their TFP growth rates. Also, foreign entry reduces *nim*, while public banks do not seem to have higher margins.[30] Finally, as regards the effect of the macroeconomic control

[28] In light of the recent turmoil in financial markets, this result may be viewed as conjuctural, because during our sample period markets were working well and so liquidity was never a problem.
[29] Such a result may have similar implications as those of Hellman et al. (2000), who find that capital requirements on their own do not lead to Pareto optimality.
[30] Foreign banks improve efficiency by about 0.3% relative to domestic private banks. Analogous is the deterioration of NIM. The presence of public banks reduces efficiency by 0.2% and productivity by 1.2% the highest compared to domestic private banks.

variables on bank performance, we find a positive and significant relationship between *pe* and *ir*, and a marginally significant one with *invgdp*. Furthermore, the short-term interest rate has a negative and significant effect on productivity growth, while no such effect is found for *invgdp*. Concerning the link between *nim* and the control variables, no significant relation could be found.

5. Conclusions

This paper introduced a new empirical model into the study of bank performance. It combined two strands of literature: one mainly theoretical that studies the relationship between financial deregulation, banking industry competition and risk-taking of banks, and an empirical one that studies the evolution of bank performance during periods of financial deregulation. The rapid and quite uniform transition of newly acceded EU countries from centrally planned to market economies provides an obvious case study of the nexus between banking sector reform and performance. Given the two strands of literature, a special role in this nexus is played by banking industry competition and bank risk-taking behavior.

In a first set of results, we provided a wide range of estimates of bank efficiency, TFP growth and banking industry competition by country and through time. These results indicate that, on average, efficiency and TFP have been improving, while the competitive conditions in the banking systems examined have been subject only to small changes. Subsequently, we used these results to analyze the nexus between banking sector reform and performance. By drawing on two recent econometric contributions by Simar and Wilson (2007) and Khan and Lewbel (2007), we have been able to show that banking sector reform has a positive effect on bank efficiency, which is partly channeled through the effects of competition and risk-taking of banks. Also, TFP growth has gained ground toward the end of the reform process, capturing the longer-term effects of technological improvements. Finally, the effect of capital and credit risk on bank performance is usually negative, while increased liquid assets seem to reduce bank performance. This latter finding implies that bank capital may have a strategic role in cases of liquidity shortages and increased credit risk.

The approach followed in this paper may have considerable potential as a tool for further exploring various determinants of bank performance, for the purpose of

suggesting optimal bank management policies. A possible area for future research could be to provide a more detailed analysis of the different country-specific institutional characteristics that may affect bank performance and, more broadly, the financial stability of emerging markets.

Appendix

Here we describe the methodology of estimation and inference in two-stage semi-parametric models of production processes, building on Simar and Wilson (2007). In the first stage, we employ input-oriented DEA[31] to measure variable returns to scale PE, as well as the Malmquist index to measure TFP change. In the second stage, we describe a double bootstrap procedure that accounts for the endogeneity between bank performance and risk-taking.

Stage 1: Let us assume that for N observations there exist M inputs producing S outputs. Hence, each observation n uses a nonnegative vector of inputs denoted $x^n = (x_1^n, x_2^n, ..., x_m^n) \in R_+^M$ to produce a nonnegative vector of outputs, denoted $y^n = (y_1^n, y_2^n, ..., y_S^n) \in R_+^S$. Production technology $F = \{(y, x) : x \text{ can produce y}\}$ describes the set of feasible input-output vectors and the input sets of production technology $L(y) = \{x : (y, x) \in F\}$ describe the sets of input vectors that are feasible for each output vector (Kumbhakar and Lovell, 2000).

To measure variable returns to scale PE, we use the following input-oriented DEA model, where the inputs are minimized and the outputs are held at their current levels:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta^* = \min \theta, \text{ s.t.} \\
&\sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j x_{ji} \le \theta x_{i0} \quad i = 1, 2, ..., m; \\
&\sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j y_{rj} \ge y_{r0} \quad r = 1, 2, ..., s; \\
&\sum_{j=1}^{n} \lambda_j = 1 \\
&\lambda_j \ge 0 \qquad j = 1, 2, ..., n;
\end{aligned} \tag{1a}$$

[31] DEA may be computed either as input- or output-oriented. Input-oriented DEA shows by how much input quantities can be reduced without varying the output quantities produced. Output-oriented DEA assesses by how much output quantities can be proportionally increased without changing the input quantities used. The two measures provide the same results under constant returns to scale, but give slightly different values under variable returns to scale. Nevertheless, both output- and input-oriented models will identify the same set of efficient/inefficient DMUs. The variable vs. constant returns to scale option has no influence on the results, since both are used to calculate the various distances needed to construct the Malmquist indexes. For a more detailed discussion of the above, see Coelli et al. (2005).

where $bank_0$ represents one of the N banks under evaluation, and x_{i0} and y_{r0} are the ith input and rth output for $bank_0$, respectively. If $\theta^* = 1$, then the current input levels cannot be proportionally improved, indicating that $bank_0$ is on the frontier. Otherwise, if $\theta^* < 1$, then $bank_0$ represents an inefficient bank and θ^* represents its input-oriented efficiency score. Finally, λ is the activity vector denoting the intensity levels at which the S observations are conducted. Note that this approach, through the convexity constraint $\Sigma\lambda = 1$ (which accounts for variable returns to scale), forms a convex hull of intersecting planes, since the frontier production plane is defined by combining some actual production planes.

As regards estimation of TFP change, we follow Fare et al. (1994), who defined the Malmquist index as

$$M_0(y_s, x_s, y_t, x_t) = \left[\frac{d_0^s(y_t, x_t)}{d_0^s(y_s, x_s)} \text{x} \frac{d_0^t(y_t, x_t)}{d_0^t(y_s, x_s)} \right]^{1/2} \tag{2a}$$

where M_0 measures the productivity change between periods s (base period) and t, and $d_0^s(y_t, x_t)$ represents the distance from the period t observation to the period s technology. M_0>1 indicates positive TFP growth from period s to period t, M_0<1 indicates a decline and M_0=1 indicates constant TFP growth.

Stage 2: Here we present the algorithm used to obtain estimates on a number of endogenous explanatory factors of PE and TFP change. This is performed by combining the algorithm suggested by Simar and Wilson (2007) with the two-stage least squares truncated regression model put forth by Khan and Lewbel (2007), so as to account for the endogeneity of the risk variables. We consider all observations as cross-sections and therefore drop subscript t in Eq. (1). The algorithm is as follows:

1. Obtain maximum likelihood estimates $\hat{\alpha}_k$ of α_k and $\hat{\sigma}_u$ of σ_u in the two-stage least squares truncated regression of $\hat{p}_i$ on its k determinants (z_i) in Eq. (1), where $\hat{p}_i \leq 1$. As instruments, we use the lags of the risk variables and the current and lagged values of the reform variable. This reflects the sequence of the effects that characterize the relationship between banking sector reform and performance, as described in Section 2.

2. Loop over the next three steps L=2000 times to obtain a set of bootstrap estimates $\mathrm{B}_i = \left[(\hat{\alpha}^*, \hat{\sigma}_u^*)_b \right]_{b=1}^{L}$:

2.1 For each i=1,…,m, draw u_i from the $N(0, \hat{\sigma}_u^2)$ distribution with left-truncation at $(1 - z_i \hat{a})$. For details on how to draw from a left-truncated normal distribution, see the Appendix of Simar and Wilson (2007).

2.2 Again for each i=1,…,m, compute $p_i^* = z_i \hat{\alpha} + u_i$.

2.3 Use the maximum likelihood method to estimate the endogenous truncated regression of p_i^* on z_i, yielding estimates μ_μ^*, ν_ν^*.

3. Use the bootstrap values in B and the original estimates α, σ_u to construct estimated confidence intervals for each element of α and for σ_u. This is done by using the jth element of each bootstrap value $\hat{\alpha}^*$ to find values μ_π^*, ν_π^* such that $\Pr\left[-\nu_\pi \le (\hat{\alpha}_j^* - \hat{\alpha}_j) \le \mu_\pi^* \right] \approx 1 - \pi$, for some small conventional value of π, $\pi = 0.05$ in the present analysis. The approximation improves as $L \to \infty$. Substituting μ_π^*, ν_π^* for μ_π, ν_π in $\Pr\left[-\nu_\pi \le (\hat{\alpha}_j - \alpha_j) \le \mu_\pi \right] = 1 - \pi$ leads to an estimated confidence interval $(\hat{\alpha}_j + \mu_\pi^*, \hat{\alpha}_j + \nu_\pi^*)$.

References

Allen, F., Gale, D., 2004. Competition and financial stability. Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking 36, 453-480.

Angelini, P., Cetorelli N., 2003. The effects of regulatory reform on competition in the banking industry. Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking 35, 663-684.

Athanasoglou, P.P., Brissimis, S.N., Delis, M.D., 2006. Bank-specific, industry-specific and macroeconomic determinants of bank profitability. Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money, forthcoming.

Balaguer-Coll, M.T., Prior, D., Tortosa-Ausina, E., 2007. On the determinants of local government performance: a two-stage nonparametric approach. European Economic Review 51, 425-451.

Berg, S.A., Forsund, F.R., Jansen E.S., 1992. Malmquist indices of productivity growth during the deregulation of Norwegian banking, 1980-89. The Scandinavian Journal of Economics 94, 211-228.

Berger, A.N., 1995. The relationship between capital and earnings in banking. Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking 27, 432-456.

Berger, A.N., Humphrey, D.B., 1997. Efficiency of financial institutions: international survey and directions for future research. European Journal of Operational Research 98, 175–212.

Bolt, W., Tieman, A.F., 2004. Banking competition, risk and regulation. Scandinavian Journal of Economics 106, 783-804.

Boyd, J.H., De Nicolo, G., 2005. The theory of bank risk taking and competition revisited. Journal of Finance 60, 1329-1343.

Boyd, J.H., De Nicolo, G., Jalal, A.M., 2006. Bank risk-taking and competition revisited: new theory and new evidence. IMF Working Paper 06/297.

Bresnahan, T., 1989. Empirical studies of industries with market power. In: Schmalensee, R., Willig, R. (Eds.), Handbook of Industrial Organization. North Holland: Amsterdam.

Casu B., P. Molyneux, P., 2003. A comparative study of efficiency in European banking. Applied Economics 35, 1865-1876.

Casu, B., Girardone, C., Molyneux, P., 2004. Productivity change in European banking: a comparison of parametric and non-parametric approaches. Journal of Banking and Finance 28, 2521-2540.

Chen, X., 2007. Banking deregulation and credit risk: evidence from the EU. Journal of Financial Stability 2, 356-390.

Claessens, S., Laeven, L., 2004. What drives bank competition? Some international evidence. Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking 36, 563-583.

Coelli, T., Rao, D.S.P., O'Donnell, C.C., Battese, G.E., 2005. An Introduction to Efficiency and Productivity Analysis. Springer: New York.

Demirguc-Kunt A., Laeven L., Levine R., 2004. Regulations, market structure, institutions, and the cost of financial intermediation. Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking 36, 593-622.

Diamond, D.W., Rajan R.G., 2000. A theory of bank capital. Journal of Finance 55, 2431-2465.

Diamond, D.W., Rajan R.G., 2001a. Banks and liquidity. American Economic Review 91, 422-425.

Diamond, D.W., Rajan R.G., 2001b. Liquidity risk, liquidity creation, and financial fragility: a theory of banking. Journal of Political Economy 109, 287-327.

Drake, L., Hall, M.J.B., 2003. Efficiency in Japanese banking: an empirical analysis. Journal of Banking and Finance 27, 891-917.

EBRD Transition Report 2006, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, London.

Fare, R., Grosskopf, S., Lovell, C.A.K., 1994. Production Frontiers. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Grifell-Tatje, E., Lovell, C.A.K., 1996. Deregulation and productivity decline: the case of Spanish savings banks. European Economic Review 40, 1281-1303.

Hellmann, T.F., Murdock, K.C., Stiglitz, J.E., 2000. Liberalization, moral hazard in banking, and prudential regulation: are capital requirements enough? American Economic Review 90, 147-165.

Humphrey, D.B., Pulley, L.B., 1997. Banks' responses to deregulation: profits, technology, and efficiency. Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking 29, 73–93.

Isik, I., Hassan, M.K., 2003. Financial deregulation and total factor productivity change: an empirical study of Turkish commercial banks. Journal of Banking and Finance 27, 1455-1485.

Keeley, M.C., 1990. Deposit insurance, risk, and market power in banking. American Economic Review 80, 1183-1200.

Khan, S., Lewbel, A., 2007. Weighted and two stage least squares estimation of semiparametric truncated regression models. Econometric Theory 23, 309-347.

Kumbhakar, S.C., Lovell, C.A.K., 2000. Stochastic Frontier Analysis. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.

Kumbhakar, S.C., Lozano-Vivas, A., 2005. Deregulation and productivity: the case of Spanish banks. Journal of Regulatory Economics 27, 331-351.

Kumbhakar, S.C., Lozano-Vivas, A., Lovell, C.A.K., Hasan, I., 2001. The effects of deregulation on the performance of financial institutions: the case of Spanish savings banks. Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking 33, 101–120.

Matutes, C., X. Vives, 2000. Imperfect competition, risk taking, and regulation in banking. European Economic Review 44, 1-34.

Maudos J., de Guevara, J.F., 2004. Factors explaining the interest margin in the banking sectors of the European Union. Journal of Banking and Finance 28, 2259-2281.

Salas, V., Saurina, J., 2003. Deregulation, market power and risk behaviour in Spanish banks. European Economic Review 47, 1061-1075.

Saunders, A., Schumacher, L., 2000. The determinants of bank interest rate margins: an international study. Journal of International Money and Finance 19, 813-832.

Simar, L., Wilson, P.W., 2007. Estimation and inference in two-stage, semi-parametric models of production processes. Journal of Econometrics 136, 31-64.

Uchida, H., Tsutsui, Y., 2005. Has competition in the Japanese banking sector improved? Journal of Banking and Finance 29, 419-439.

Wheelock, D.C., Wilson, P.W., 1999. Technical progress, inefficiency and productivity change in US banking, 1984–1993. Journal of Money, Credit, and Banking 31, 213–234.

Yildirim, H.S., Philippatos, G.C., 2007. Restructuring, consolidation and competition in Latin American banking markets. Journal of Banking and Finance 31, 629-639.

Table 1a
Descriptive statistics (in thousand euros)

Country	Deposits	Operating expenses	Loans	Securities	Nim	cap	lq	cr	ebrd
Bulgaria	369543	40119	173574	52388	6.996	0.172	0.345	0.090	2.834
	1153297	114744	508450	194806	6.737	0.157	0.207	0.147	
Czech Republic	826647	64813	245522	471046	5.984	0.149	0.415	0.071	3.362
	2333851	188499	615576	2242569	1.195	0.148	0.225	0.100	
Estonia	148847	15193	83598	14177	6.727	0.201	0.470	0.066	3.501
	249862	34126	184138	39222	8.790	0.162	0.200	0.193	
Hungary	261343	20341	150198	41739	5.137	0.134	0.397	0.022	3.667
	687891	40828	448350	199562	4.086	0.123	0.233	0.134	
Latvia	221715	19882	143328	54074	5.592	0.201	0.413	0.023	3.223
	648897	44016	466209	165898	4.579	0.193	0.235	0.038	
Lithuania	119094	9898	74679	49512	5.731	0.159	0.467	0.037	3.028
	317985	17398	252820	184244	6.682	0.129	0.228	0.100	
Poland	133195	18825	81301	32103	5.286	0.172	0.373	0.054	3.248
	696864	46525	368764	273076	6.155	0.177	0.216	0.098	
Romania	365849	19960	183360	90259	5.320	0.161	0.389	0.071	2.696
	967780	41214	542599	375642	4.493	0.126	0.212	0.082	
Slovakia	316425	23273	103444	118123	5.695	0.157	0.345	0.067	3.029
	1027710	55965	316492	835073	5.934	0.247	0.235	0.078	
Slovenia	389928	31450	352859	71019	5.313	0.151	0.383	0.038	3.193
	1190925	69622	1473242	273222	4.760	0.117	0.219	0.066	
Average	322426	28353	161132	101472	5.739	0.164	0.392	0.054	3.178
	1130051	88261	621520	813899	6.808	0.162	0.223	0.094	

Note: The first number in each cell is the mean and the second is the standard deviation of the variable.

Table 2
Productive efficiency and total factor productivity change (annual means)

Country	Year	pe	dtfp	Country	Year	pe	dtfp
Bulgaria	1994	0.652		Lithuania	1994	0.751	
	1995	0.701	1.362		1995	0.675	1.010
	1996	0.754	1.255		1996	0.655	0.914
	1997	0.726	1.210		1997	0.382	0.944
	1998	0.686	1.117		1998	0.394	1.013
	1999	0.621	0.882		1999	0.377	1.767
	2000	0.767	1.740		2000	0.565	1.021
	2001	0.727	0.960		2001	0.767	1.186
	2002	0.753	1.224		2002	0.744	1.090
	2003	0.703	1.070		2003	0.853	0.925
	2004	0.681	1.025		2004	0.865	1.126
	2005	0.763	1.548		2005	0.841	1.149
	Average	0.711	1.218		Average	0.656	1.104
Czech Republic	1994	0.376		Poland	1994	0.682	
	1995	0.490	1.255		1995	0.663	0.975
	1996	0.726	1.244		1996	0.566	0.870
	1997	0.784	1.287		1997	0.575	1.176
	1998	0.663	1.627		1998	0.680	1.493
	1999	0.606	1.271		1999	0.696	0.963
	2000	0.568	1.251		2000	0.588	1.825
	2001	0.451	1.411		2001	0.487	1.484
	2002	0.410	1.081		2002	0.416	1.547
	2003	0.327	1.050		2003	0.456	1.210
	2004	0.340	1.210		2004	0.489	1.249
	2005	0.449	1.184		2005	0.592	1.357
	Average	0.516	1.261		Average	0.574	1.286
Estonia	1994	0.691		Romania	1994	0.761	
	1995	0.716	1.167		1995	0.747	0.961
	1996	0.786	1.028		1996	0.766	1.283
	1997	0.781	1.182		1997	0.732	1.305
	1998	0.707	1.010		1998	0.732	1.796
	1999	0.768	1.086		1999	0.757	1.009
	2000	0.697	0.975		2000	0.716	0.996
	2001	0.789	1.362		2001	0.724	1.113
	2002	0.853	1.096		2002	0.796	1.207
	2003	0.765	1.147		2003	0.793	1.367
	2004	0.830	0.821		2004	0.744	1.276
	2005	0.898	1.165		2005	0.825	0.874
	Average	0.773	1.094		Average	0.758	1.199

Table 2 (continued)

Country	Year	pe	dtfp	Country	Year	pe	dtfp
Hungary	1994	0.526		Slovakia	1994	0.732	
	1995	0.541	1.097		1995	0.773	1.514
	1996	0.483	1.004		1996	0.719	1.622
	1997	0.470	1.014		1997	0.734	1.125
	1998	0.623	1.235		1998	0.751	1.011
	1999	0.792	1.107		1999	0.765	0.876
	2000	0.753	0.981		2000	0.578	1.136
	2001	0.692	1.301		2001	0.534	1.299
	2002	0.661	1.161		2002	0.656	1.237
	2003	0.653	1.315		2003	0.696	1.296
	2004	0.658	1.215		2004	0.718	1.150
	2005	0.701	1.182		2005	0.785	0.924
	Average	0.629	1.147		Average	0.703	1.199
Latvia	1994	0.737		Slovenia	1994	0.580	
	1995	0.836	1.077		1995	0.676	0.985
	1996	0.821	1.039		1996	0.670	1.107
	1997	0.667	1.079		1997	0.605	1.030
	1998	0.578	1.179		1998	0.617	1.007
	1999	0.424	1.183		1999	0.619	1.184
	2000	0.528	1.128		2000	0.731	0.972
	2001	0.570	0.899		2001	0.638	1.160
	2002	0.623	1.170		2002	0.664	1.155
	2003	0.637	1.172		2003	0.596	1.093
	2004	0.707	1.133		2004	0.748	1.009
	2005	0.557	0.945		2005	0.823	1.136
	Average	0.640	1.091		Average	0.664	1.076

Table 3
Yearly estimates of banking industry competition

Year	Bulgaria	Czech Republic	Estonia	Hungary	Latvia	Lithuania	Poland	Romania	Slovakia	Slovenia
1994	0.181	0.591	0.731	0.224	0.413	1.158	0.762	-0.044	0.534	1.097
1995	0.245	0.601	0.589	0.382	0.416	0.900	0.775	-0.031	0.498	1.005
1996	0.169	0.500	0.670	0.317	0.713	1.147	0.888	0.153	0.445	0.901
1997	0.187	0.366	0.703	0.328	0.846	1.114	0.742	0.236	0.396	0.970
1998	0.183	0.437	0.684	0.449	0.683	1.134	0.754	0.279	0.412	0.977
1999	0.259	0.414	0.801	0.366	0.756	1.138	0.723	0.381	0.419	1.077
2000	0.293	0.577	0.861	0.419	0.671	1.098	0.742	0.328	0.373	1.067
2001	0.349	0.369	0.887	0.377	0.629	1.134	0.742	0.236	0.321	1.008
2002	0.210	0.651	0.936	0.473	0.832	1.163	0.771	0.293	0.284	1.012
2003	0.347	0.653	0.853	0.481	0.773	1.101	0.800	0.382	0.322	0.996
2004	0.378	0.676	0.700	0.563	0.839	1.161	0.675	0.322	0.356	1.083
2005	0.340	0.617	0.646	0.549	0.830	1.107	0.636	0.293	0.287	0.991

Table 4
Second-stage regression results for bank performance

	(1) pe		(2) pe		(3) dtfp		(4) dtfp		(5) nim		(6) nim	
	Coefficient	t-statistic	Coefficient	t-statistic	Coefficient	t-statistic	Coefficient	t-statistic	Coefficient	t-statistic	Coefficient	t-statistic
ebrd			0.233	8.02			0.184	3.36			-1.170	-2.28
ref94	0.157	2.82			0.046	0.17			-0.018	-0.12		
ref95	-0.134	-1.09			-0.317	-1.01			-0.129	-1.68		
ref97	0.235	5.67			0.238	0.81			-0.181	-2.19		
ref98	-0.111	-2.36			0.163	0.50			-0.009	-0.05		
ref99	-0.020	-0.81			-0.010	-0.05			0.071	0.38		
ref00	0.076	2.07			0.341	1.16			-0.103	-1.57		
ref01	-0.050	-1.93			0.055	0.18			0.012	0.06		
ref02	-0.022	-0.68			-0.111	-0.34			-0.107	-1.44		
ref03	0.210	2.79			0.670	0.75			-0.136	-1.91		
ref04	0.052	1.72			1.171	2.48			-0.182	-2.30		
ref05	0.287	7.86			1.514	2.94			-0.207	-2.91		
te												
ldtfp												
mp	-0.379	-4.95	-0.463	-6.32					2.539	3.57	2.103	3.11
cap	0.201	3.57	0.189	3.32					9.492	9.25	9.209	8.79
lq	-0.408	-10.26	-0.375	-9.36					-2.346	-3.21	-1.967	-2.71
cr	-0.018	-3.59	-0.019	-3.73					0.122	1.21	0.139	1.35
dmp					0.510	0.61	0.119	0.15				
dcap					1.096	2.54	1.168	1.63				
dlq					-2.254	-4.31	-2.491	-4.78				
dcr					-1.722	-28.66	-1.732	-28.62				
ir	0.003	2.33	0.004	2.87	-0.026	-2.12	-0.025	-2.62	-0.033	-1.41	-0.038	-1.59
invgdp	0.004	1.81	0.002	1.05	0.010	0.40	0.001	0.07	-0.040	-1.01	-0.040	-0.98
for	0.002	3.68	0.003	5.99	0.001	0.17	0.005	1.21	-0.025	-2.49	-0.025	-2.47
pub	-0.002	-3.28	-0.002	-2.92	-0.006	-1.02	-0.012	-2.01	0.013	1.14	0.017	1.39
cons	0.986	10.75	0.495	4.36	0.679	0.92	0.675	0.71	11.849	5.75	11.137	5.31

Figure 1. Relationship between TFP growth and TC



Figure 2. Relationship between TFP growth and PTEC



BANK OF GREECE WORKING PAPERS

51. Brissimis, S. N. and T. S. Kosma, "Market Conduct, Price Interdependence and Exchange Rate Pass-Through", December 2006.

52. Anastasatos, T. G. and I. R. Davidson, "How Homogenous are Currency Crises? A Panel Study Using Multiple Response Models", December, 2006.

53. Angelopoulou, E. and H. D. Gibson, "The Balance Sheet Channel of Monetary Policy Transmission: Evidence from the UK", January, 2007.

54. Brissimis, S. N. and M. D. Delis, "Identification of a Loan Supply Function: A Cross-Country Test for the Existence of a Bank Lending Channel", January, 2007.

55. Angelopoulou, E., "The Narrative Approach for the Identification of Monetary Policy Shocks in a Small Open Economy", February, 2007.

56. Sideris, D. A., "Foreign Exchange Intervention and Equilibrium Real Exchange Rates", February 2007.

57. Hondroyiannis, G., P.A.V.B. Swamy and G. S. Tavlas, "The New Keynesian Phillips Curve and Lagged Inflation: A Case of Spurious Correlation?", March 2007.

58. Brissimis, S. N. and T. Vlassopoulos, "The Interaction between Mortgage Financing and Housing Prices in Greece", March 2007.

59. Mylonidis, N. and D. Sideris, "Home Bias and Purchasing Power Parity: Evidence from the G-7 Countries", April 2007.

60. Petroulas, P., "Short-Term Capital Flows and Growth in Developed and Emerging Markets", May 2007.

61. Hall, S. G., G. Hondroyiannis, P.A.V.B. Swamy and G. S. Tavlas, "A Portfolio Balance Approach to Euro-area Money Demand in a Time-Varying Environment", October 2007.

62. Brissimis, S. N. and I. Skotida, "Optimal Monetary Policy in the Euro Area in the Presence of Heterogeneity", November 2007.

63. Gibson, H. D. and J. Malley, "The Contribution of Sector Productivity Differentials to Inflation in Greece", November 2007.

64. Sideris, D., "Wagner's Law in 19th Century Greece: A Cointegration and Causality Analysis", November 2007.

65. Kalyvitis, S. and I. Skotida, "Some Empirical Evidence on the Effects of U.S. Monetary Policy Shocks on Cross Exchange Rates", January 2008.

66. Sideris, D., "Real Exchange Rates over a Century: The Case of Drachma/Sterling Rate", January 2008.

67. Petroulas, P., "Spatial Interdependencies of FDI Locations: A Lessening of the Tyranny of Distance?", February 2008.

68. Matsaganis, M., T. Mitrakos and P. Tsakloglou, "Modelling Household Expenditure on Health Care in Greece", March 2008.

69. Athanasoglou, P. P. and I. C. Bardaka, "Price and Non-Price Competitiveness of Exports of Manufactures", April 2008.

70. Tavlas, G., "The Benefits and Costs of Monetary Union in Southern Africa: A Critical Survey of the Literature", April 2008.

71. Chronis, P. and A. Strantzalou, "Monetary and Fiscal Policy Interaction: What is the Role of the Transaction Cost of the Tax System in Stabilisation Policies?, May 2008.

72. Balfoussia, H., "An Affine Factor Model of the Greek Term Structure", May 2008.