Measuring Islamic banks efficiency: the case of world Islamic banking sectors

Ahmad, Nor Hayati Bt and Noor, Mohamad Akbar Noor Mohamad and Sufian, Fadzlan

Universiti Utara Malaysia, Universiti Putra Malaysia

October 2010

Measuring Islamic Banks Efficiency: The Case of World Islamic Banking Sectors

PROFESSOR DR NOR HAYATI BT AHMAD [a]
Universiti Utara Malaysia

MOHAMAD AKBAR NOOR MOHAMAD NOOR [* b]
Universiti Utara Malaysia

FADZLAN SUFIAN [c d]
Khazanah Nasional Berhad
Universiti Putra Malaysia

[a] Professor of Finance, College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia.
Mailing address: Professor of Finance Office, COLGIS Building, College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia, 06010 Sintok, Kedah
e-mail: ayati@uum.edu.my
Tel: 604- 9286404 ext 6403, Fax: 604-9285762.

Corresponding author:
[b] College of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia.
e-mail: mohamadakbarnoor@yahoo.co.uk; kabear80@hotmail.com

[c] Assistant Vice President, Khazanah Research & Investment Strategy, Malaysia.
[d] Faculty of Economics & Management, Universiti Putra Malaysia.
e-mail: fadzlan.sufian@khazanah.com.my; fadzlan14@gmail.com.

Measuring Islamic Banks Efficiency: The Case of World Islamic Banking Sectors

ABSTRACT

The paper investigates the efficiency of the Islamic banking sectors in the world covering 25 countries during the period of 2003-2009. The efficiency estimates of individual banks are evaluated using the non-parametric Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) method. The empirical findings suggest that during the period of study, pure technical efficiency outweighs scale efficiency in World Islamic banking countries. We find that banks from the high income countries were the leaders by dominating the most efficiency frontier during the period of study.

1.0   INTRODUCTION

Islamic banks today exist in all parts of the world, and are looked upon as a viable alternative system which has many things to offer. While it was initially developed to fulfill the needs of Muslims, Islamic banking has now gained universal acceptance. Islamic banking is recognized as one of the fastest growing areas in banking and finance. Since the opening of the first Islamic bank in Egypt in 1963, Mit Ghamr Local Savings Bank of Egypt . Islamic banking has grown rapidly all over the world. So in comparison, Islamic banking is relatively new phenomenon. Even then, the real growth of Islamic finance did not begin until the 1980s when Middle East countries experienced a large growth in surplus funds. Since then Muslim investment has spread throughout Europe and Asia, and Islamic finance is still expanding. Direct Islamic financing methods, such as with Islamic bonds, are gaining popularity in the West as is Islamic based funds management.

The number of Islamic financial institutions worldwide has risen to over 300 today in more than 75 countries concentrated mainly in the Middle East and Southeast Asia (with Bahrain and Malaysia the biggest hubs), but are also appearing in Europe and the United States. The Islamic banking total assets worldwide are estimated to have exceed $250 billion and are growing at an estimated pace of 15 percent a year. Saleh and Zeitun (2007) found that interesting development of Islamic banking globally. This sector has not only grown in the Muslim world, but has also gained significant attention in the Western world, with over 250 Islamic banks worldwide controlling approximately US$400 billion in assets and client money. The growth of these banks is proof of their success, and an indication that these banks continue to grow in number and size worldwide.

Islamic banking operations started out as a mere deposit taking and lending facility and has since transformed into all aspects of banking, money and capital market operations, including fully fledged stock exchanges. The Islamic resurgence in the late 1960's and 1970's, further intensified by the 1975 oil price boom, which introduced a huge amount of capital inflows to Islamic countries has initiated the call for a financial system that allows Muslim to transact in a system that is in line with

their religious beliefs. Before the re-emergence of the Islamic financial system, Muslims throughout the world has only conventional financial system to fulfill their financial needs.

Islamic financial products are aimed at investors who want to comply with the Islamic laws (*syaria'*) that govern a Muslim's daily life. *Syaria'* law forbids the giving or receiving of *riba'*[1] (because earning profit from an exchange of money for money is considered immoral); mandate that all financial transactions be based on real economic activity; and prohibit investment in sectors such as tobacco, alcohol, gambling, and armaments. Despite that, Islamic financial institutions are providing an increasingly broad range of financial services, such as fund mobilization, asset allocation, payment and exchange settlement services, and risk transformation and mitigation.

Among other reasons which attributed to the rapid growth of the Islamic banking and finance industry are the growing oil wealth, with demand for suitable investments soaring in the Gulf region and the competitiveness of many of the products, attracting strong demand from Muslim and non-Muslim investors. Despite the growing interest and the rapid growth of the Islamic banking and finance industry, analysis of Islamic banking at a cross-country level is still at its infancy. This could partly be due to the unavailability of data, as most of the Islamic financial institutions are not publicly traded.

The aim of this paper is to fill a demanding gap in the literature by providing the empirical evidence on the performance of Islamic banks in the world during the period 2003 to 2009. The efficiency estimate of each Islamic bank is computed by using the non-parametric Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) method. The method allows us to distinguish between three different types of efficiency measures, namely technical, pure technical, and scale. Unlike the previous analysis of Islamic bank efficiency, we have constructed and analyzed the results derived from dynamic panels, which is critical in a dynamic business environment as a bank may be the most efficient in one year

---

1 *Riba'* the English translation of which is *usury* is prohibited in Islam and is acknowledged by all Muslims. The prohibition of *riba'* is clearly mentioned in the Quran, the Islam's holy book and the traditions of Prophet Muhammad *(sunnah)*. The Quran states: "Believers! Do not consume *riba',* doubling and redoubling…" (3.130); "God has made buying and selling lawful and *riba'* unlawful… (2:274).

but may not be in the following year (s). A dynamic panel analysis will also highlight any significant changes taking place in the Islamic banking sector during the period of study.

Since the countries of coverage are span across 25 countries, we also will study the efficiency result base on the Islamic bank country of origin. The countries are diversified in term of the economy activity; we divided the classification by using 2003 Gross National Income (GNI) published by World Bank. According to 2003 GNI per capita, calculated using the *World Bank Atlas method*[2]. The income groups are: low income, $765 or less; middle income, $766 - $9,385 and high income, $9,386 or more.

Base on 2003 GNI report, some high income countries may also be developing countries. Our samples in the paper will include this particular country and study the differences of country background into the efficiency of it Islamic Banks. The GCC (Persian Gulf States) countries, for example, are classified as developing high income countries. This paper unfolds as follows. Section 2 provides an overview of the related studies in the literature, followed by a section that outlines the method used and choice of input and output variables for the efficiency model. Section 4 reports the empirical findings. Section 5 concludes and offers avenues for future research.

2.0   REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

While there have been extensive literatures examining the efficiency features of the contemporary banking sector, particularly the U.S. and European banking markets, the work on Islamic banking is still in its infancy. Typically, studies on Islamic bank efficiency have focused on theoretical issues and the empirical work has relied mainly on the analysis of descriptive statistics rather than rigorous statistical estimation (El-Gamal and Inanoglu, 2004). However, this is gradually

---

[2] Atlas conversion factor, Calculating gross national income (GNI—formerly referred to as GNP) and GNI per capita in U.S. dollars for certain operational purposes, the World Bank uses the Atlas conversion factor. The purpose of the Atlas conversion factor is to reduce the impact of exchange rate fluctuations in the cross-country comparison of national incomes.

changing as a number of recent studies have sought to apply various frontier techniques to estimate the efficiency of Islamic banks.

Hassan and Hussein (2003) examined the efficiency of the Sudanese banking system during the period of 1992 and 2000. They employed a variety of parametric (cost and profit efficiencies) and non-parametric DEA techniques to a panel of 17 Sudanese banks. They found that the average cost and profit efficiencies under the parametric were 55% and 50% respectively, while it was 23% under the non-parametric approach. During the period of study, they found that the Sudanese banking system have exhibited 37% allocative efficiency and 60% technical efficiency, suggesting that the overall cost inefficiency of the Sudanese Islamic banks were mainly due to technical (managerially related) rather than allocative (regulatory).

Yudistira (2004), for example, with a global sample of 18 Islamic banks, found Islamic banks to be more efficient than conventional banks. In contrast, Hassan (2006) in a larger study of 43 Islamic banks found them somewhat less cost efficient than conventional banks. Mokhtar et al., (2006), similarly, in a study of Malaysian Islamic banks found that while Islamic banks had grown faster, their overall efficiency was lower than the conventional banks.

Saleh and Zeitun (2007) analyzed the performance and efficiency of Jordan Islamic Banks for 1998 to 2003 period. The contribution of the paper is the measures show the ability and the efficiency of both Islamic banks to increase their income and reduce expenses. Viverita et al. (2007), of their study of Islamic bank in Asia, Africa and Middle East found the average Middle East bank size was some US $2 billion with Asia Islamic banks averaging US $900 million and African banks just US $151 million. The other finding is the age of each bank was correlated against the various efficiency results. It could be expected that newer banks may have had a chance to implement newer technologies. In this case, technical efficiency results were not correlated with the bank's age.

Hussein (2003) provides an analysis of the cost efficiency features of Islamic banks in Sudan between 1990 and 2000. Using the stochastic cost frontier approach, he estimates cost efficiency for a

sample of 17 banks over the period. The interesting contribution of this paper is that specific definitions of Islamic financial products are used as outputs. In addition, the analysis is also novel as Sudan has a banking system based entirely on Islamic banking principles. The results show large variations in the cost efficiency of Sudanese banks with the foreign owned banks being the most efficient. State owned banks are the most cost inefficient.

Samad (1999) was among the first to investigate the efficiency of the Malaysian Islamic banking sector. In his paper, he investigates the relative performance of the full-fledged Malaysian Islamic bank compared to its conventional bank peers. During the period of 1992 to 1996 he found that the managerial efficiency of the conventional banks was higher than that of the full-fledged Islamic bank. On the other hand, the measures of productive efficiency revealed mixed results. He suggests that the average utilization rate of the Islamic bank is lower than that of the conventional banks. Similarly, he found that profits earned by the full-fledged Islamic bank either through the use of deposit or loan able funds, or used funds are also lower than the conventional banks, reflecting the weaker efficiency position of the full-fledged Islamic bank. In contrast, the productivity test by loan recovery criterion indicate that the efficiency position of the full-fledged Islamic bank seems to be higher and bad debts as a percentage of equity, loans, and deposits also show a clear superiority over the conventional bank peers.

Sufian (2006) examined the efficiency of the Malaysian Islamic banking sector during the period 2001-2004 by using the non-parametric Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) method. He found that scale efficiency outweighs pure technical efficiency in the Malaysian Islamic banking sector, implying that Malaysian Islamic banks have been operating at non-optimal of operations. He suggests that the domestic Islamic Banking Scheme banks have exhibited a higher technical efficiency compared to their foreign Islamic Banking Scheme bank peers. He suggests that during the period of study the foreign Islamic Banking Scheme Banks inefficiency were mainly due to scale rather than pure technical.

More recently, (Sufian et al. 2008) examined the efficiency of the Malaysian Islamic banking sector during the period 2001-2006 by using the non-parametric Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) method. The empirical findings suggest that during the period of study, pure technical inefficiency outweighs scale inefficiency in the Islamic banking sector implying that the Islamic banks have been managerially inefficient in exploiting their resources to the fullest extent. The empirical findings seem to suggest that the MENA Islamic banks have exhibited higher technical efficiency compared to their Asian Islamic banks counterparts. During the period of study he fined that pure technical inefficiency has greater influence in determining the total technical inefficiency of the MENA and the Asian Islamic banking sectors.

3.0   METHODOLOGY

A non-parametric Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) is employed with variable return to scale assumption to measure input-oriented technical efficiency of World Islamic banking sectors. DEA involves constructing a non-parametric production frontier based on the actual input-output observations in the sample relative to which efficiency of each firm in the sample is measured (Coelli, 1996). Let us give a short description of the Data Envelopment Analysis[3]. Assume that there is data on K inputs and M outputs for each N bank. For ith bank these are represented by the vectors x_i and y_i respectively. Let us call the K x N input matrix – X and the M x N output matrix – Y. To measure the efficiency for each bank we calculate a ratio of all inputs, such as ($u'y_i/v'x_i$) where u is an M x 1 vector of output weights and v is a K x 1 vector of input weights. To select optimal weights we specify the following mathematical programming problem:

$$min_{u,v} \ (u'y_i \,/\, v'x_i),$$

$$u'y_i \,/\, v'x_i \leq 1, \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, N,$$
$$u,v \geq 0 \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (1)$$

<hr>

3 Good reference books on efficiency measures are Thanassoulis (2001), Cooper et al. (2000), and Avkiran (2002).

The above formulation has a problem of infinite solutions and therefore we impose the constraint $v'x_i = 1$, which leads to:

$$\min_{\mu, \varphi} (\mu' y_i),$$

$$\varphi' x_i = 1$$
$$\mu' y_i - \varphi' x_j \leq 0 \quad j = 1, 2, \ldots, N,$$
$$\mu, \varphi \geq 0 \tag{2}$$

where we change notation from u and v to μ and φ, respectively, in order to reflect transformations. Using the duality in linear programming, an equivalent envelopment form of this problem can be derived:

$$\min_{\theta, \lambda} \theta,$$

$$y_i + Y\lambda \geq 0$$
$$\theta x_i - X\lambda \geq 0$$
$$\lambda \geq 0 \tag{3}$$

where θ is a scalar representing the value of the efficiency score for the ith decision-making unit which will range between 0 and 1. λ is a vector of $N \times 1$ constants. The linear programming has to be solved N times, once for each decision-making unit in the sample. In order to calculate efficiency under the assumption of variable returns to scale, the convexity constraint ($N1'\lambda = 1$) will be added to ensure that an inefficient firm is only compared against firms of similar size, and therefore provides the basis for measuring economies of scale within the DEA concept. The convexity constraint determines how closely the production frontier envelops the observed input-output combinations and is not imposed in the constant returns to scale case. The variable returns to scale technique therefore forms a convex hull which envelops the data more tightly than the constant returns to scale, and thus provides efficiency scores that are greater than or equal to those obtained from the constant returns to scale model.

3.1   Data Sample, Inputs-Outputs Definition, and the Choice of Variables

It is commonly acknowledged that the choice of variables in efficiency studies significantly affects the results. The problem is compounded by the fact that variable selection is often constrained by the paucity of data on relevant variables. The cost and output measurements in banking are especially difficult because many of the financial services are jointly produced and prices are typically assigned to a bundle of financial services. Two approaches dominate the banking theory literature: the production and intermediation approaches (Sealey and Lindley, 1977).

Under the production approach, pioneered by Benston (1965), the banks are primarily viewed as providers of services to customers. The input set under this approach includes physical variables (e.g. labour, material) or their associated costs, since only physical inputs are needed to perform transactions, process financial documents, or provide counseling and advisory services to customers. The output under this approach represents the services provided to customers and is best measured by the number and type of transactions, documents processed or specialized services provided over a given time period. This approach has primarily been employed in studying the efficiency of bank branches.

Under the intermediation approach, financial institutions are viewed as intermediating funds between savers and investors. In our case, Islamic banks produce intermediation services through the collection of deposits and other liabilities and in turn these funds are invested in productive sectors of the economy, yielding returns uncontaminated by usury (*riba'*). This approach regard deposits, labour and physical capital as inputs, while loans and investments are treated as output variables.

Following among others, Hassan (2005), and Sufian (2006), a variation of the intermediation approach or asset approach originally developed by Sealey and Lindley (1977) will be adopted in the definition of inputs and outputs used in this study. Furthermore, as at most times bank branches are

engaged in the processing of customer documents and bank funding, the production approach might be more suitable for branch efficiency studies (Berger and Humphrey, 1997).

Due to entry and exit factor, the efficiency frontier is constructed by using an unbalanced sample of 77 Islamic banks operating in the World during the period 2003-2009 (see Appendix 1) yielding 270 bank year observations. We are able to collect data on three outputs and three inputs variables. Data for the empirical analysis is sourced from individual bank's annual balance sheet and income statements and BankScope database by IBCA. The BankScope database converts the data to common international standards to facilitate comparisons and all financial information is reported both in local currency and in US dollar. We use US dollar data which makes the comparison across country consistent. The Islamic banks are modeled as multi-product firms producing three outputs namely, *Total Loans* (*y1*), which include loans to customers and other banks, *Income* (*y2*), which include income derived from investment of depositors' funds and other income from Islamic banking operations, and *Other Earning Asset* (*y3*), which include investment securities held for trading, investment securities available for sale (AFS), and investment securities held to maturity, by engaging three inputs namely, *Total Deposits* (*x1*), which include deposits from customers and other banks, *Labor cost (X2)* and *Total Assets* (*x3*). All variables are measured in millions of US Dollars (US$) and are deflated against the respective countries inflation rates.

[**Insert Table 1**]

3.0   RESULTS

In this section, we will discuss the technical efficiency change (TE) of the World Islamic banking sectors, measured by the DEA method and its decomposition into pure technical efficiency (PTE) and scale efficiency (SE) components. In the event of the existence of scale inefficiency, we will attempt to provide evidence on the nature of the returns to scale of each Islamic bank. The Islamic banks' efficiency is examined for each year under investigation.

As suggested by Bauer et al. (1998), DeYoung and Hasan (1998), and Isik and Hassan (2002), constructing an annual frontier specific to each year is more flexible and thus more appropriate than estimating a single multiyear frontier for the banks in the sample. Following the earlier studies, for the purpose of the study, we prefer to estimate separate annual efficiency frontier for each year. In other words, there were six separate frontiers constructed for the study. Isik and Hassan (2002) contended that the principal advantage of having panel data is the ability to observe each bank more than once over a period of time. The issue is also critical in a continuously changing business environment because the technology of a bank that is most efficient in one period may not be the most efficient in another. Furthermore, by doing so, we alleviate, at least to an extent, the problems related to the lack of random error in DEA by allowing an efficient bank in one period to be inefficient in another, assuming that the errors owing to luck or data problems are not consistent over time (Isik and Hassan, 2002).

4.1   Efficiency of the World Islamic Banking Sectors

Table 2 presents the mean efficiency scores of the World Islamic banks from 2003 to 2009 via dedicated panel respectively. It is clear that the World Islamic banks' efficiency was on increasing on 2003 and 2004 before decline for 3 years in 2005 to 2007 before increase in two last year in sample period on 2008 and 2009. The results seem to suggest that the World Islamic banks have exhibited mean technical efficiency of 66.0%, suggesting mean input waste of 34.0%. This implies that the World Islamic banks could have produced the same amount of outputs by only using 66.0% of the amount of inputs it employed.

From Table 4 it is also clear that country income status whether the Islamic Bank operated affected the efficiency level does not specifically at high income country only. Table 4 summarizes the highest and lowest efficiency score of Islamic Bank sample. We take 2 specific sample of year 2008 and 2003. Year 2008 with 3 bank share the score of the highest efficiency score is Faisal Islamic

Bank of Egypt that fall under middle income country, Asia Islamic Bank of Singapore that been categorize high income country and Tadhamon International Islamic Bank of Yemen from Low income country. Year 2003 the most efficient is 2 banks Kuwait Finance House of Kuwait and Al Rajhi Bank from Saudi, both from high income country. It shows that the most efficient bank from the sample study is not specifically to certain income country group only but shared among three classification groups. It applies also to the lowest efficient bank for this two year, started at 2008 with Bank Islam Brunei Darussalam from high income country followed by Faisal Islamic Bank of Egypt on 2003 from middle income country. From 2003 to 2009 by referring to table 4 all the highest efficient score is 100%. While the lowest is varies from the region of 5% to 7%.

During the period of study, we encounter one financial crisis happened, that is Global Financial Crisis (GFC) on 2008. During GFC, the result at table 2 indicated that, the trend is increasing from 50% in 2007 to 65% in 2008 and continuously increases to 95% in 2009. The result from table 2 clearly stated that World Islamic Bank efficiency level is increasing during GFC period. There is possibility Islamic Bank has better prepared for it and also possibility on migration of consumer confidence from conventional banking system to Islamic banking model during GFC that cause the result that favor Islamic bank.

[Insert Table 2]

4.2   Composition of the Efficiency Frontier

While the results above highlight the sources of technical inefficiency of the Islamic banks, we next turn to discuss the sources of the scale inefficiency of the Islamic banks. As have been mentioned earlier, a bank can operate at CRS or VRS where CRS signifies that an increase in inputs results in a proportionate increase in outputs and VRS means a rise in inputs results in a disproportionate rise in outputs. Further, a bank operating at VRS can be at increasing returns to

scale (IRS) or decreasing returns to scale (DRS). Hence, IRS means that an increase in inputs results in a higher increase in outputs, while DRS indicate that an increase in inputs results in lesser output increases.

To identify the nature of returns to scale, first the CRS scores (obtained with the CCR model) is compared with VRS (using BCC model) scores. For a given bank, if the VRS score equals to its CRS score, the bank is said to be operating at constant returns to scale (CRS). On the other hand, if the scores are not equal, a further step is needed to establish whether the bank is operating at IRS or DRS. To do this, the DEA model is used under the non-increasing returns to scale assumptions (NIRS). If the score under VRS equals the NIRS score, then the bank is said to be operating at DRS. Alternatively, if the score under VRS is different from the NIRS score, than the bank is said to be operating at IRS (Coelli et al., 1998).

During the period of study, high income country Islamic banks seem to have dominated the highest three efficiency frontier, leading by Bahrain, followed by UAE and number three by Qatar. There is eight Islamic banks have failed to appear at least once on the frontier. All of the eight Islamic banks were fall under low and middle income country.

In general, the table indicates that while the small banks tend to operate at CRS or IRS, the large banks tend to operate at CRS or DRS, the findings which are similar to the earlier studies by among others McAllister and McManus (1993) and Noulas et al. (1990). To recap, McAllister and McManus (1993) have suggested that while the small banks have generally exhibited IRS, the large banks on the other hand tend to exhibit DRS and at best CRS. As it appears, the low and middle income country where the Islamic banks operated, experienced increasing returns to scale (IRS) in their operations during the period of the study. One implication is that for the low and middle income country Islamic banks, a proportionate increase in inputs would result in more than a proportional increase in outputs. Hence, the Islamic banks at low and middle income country which have been operating at IRS could achieve significant cost savings and efficiency gains by increasing

its scale of operations. In other words, substantial gains can be obtained from altering the scale via internal growth or further consolidation in the sector. In fact, in a perfectly competitive and contestable market, the efficient banks should absorb the scale inefficient banks, in order to exploit cost advantages. Thus, the banks that experience IRS should either eliminate their scale inefficiency or be ready to become a prime target for acquiring banks, which can create value from underperforming banks by streamlining their operations and eliminating their redundancies and inefficiencies (Evanoff and Israelvich, 1991). On the other hand, the results seem to suggest that the Islamic bank operated at high income country incline to be more efficient compare to Islamic bank operated at low and middle income country.

[Insert Table 3 and 4]

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

In this paper, we examine the performance of the World Islamic banks that consist of 25 countries namely Bahrain, Bangladesh, Brunei, Egypt, Gambia, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Jordan, Kuwait, Malaysia, Mauritania, Pakistan, Palestine, Saudi Arabia, Singapore, Syria, Thailand, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, Qatar, Yemen, South Africa, Sudan and Yemen during the period of 2003-2009 with 77 Islamic banks involved. The efficiency estimates of individual banks are evaluated using the non-parametric Data Envelopment Analysis (DEA) approach.

The empirical findings suggest that during the period of study, pure technical efficiency outweighs scale efficiency in the World Islamic banking sector implying that the Islamic banks have been managerially efficient in exploiting their resources to the fullest extent. The empirical findings seem to suggest that the World Islamic banks have exhibited high pure technical efficiency. During the period of study we find that pure technical inefficiency has greater influence in determining the total technical inefficiency of the World Islamic banking sectors.

14

Due to its limitations, the paper could be extended in a variety of ways. Firstly, the scope of this study could be further extended to investigate on result that contributes the efficiency during GFC. There is possibility Islamic Bank has prepared for the crisis or there is possibility on migration of consumer confidence from conventional banking system to Islamic banking model during GFC, but studying details of contribution factor during 2006 to 2009 we may find the actual reason that contributed on this factor.

Secondly, it is suggested that further analysis into the investigation of the World Islamic banking sector efficiency to consider specific factors that contribute high income country leading the efficiency over the years compare to bank operated at middle and low income country. Base on table 4, it consistency stated most of the efficiency bank over the years were from high income country. Finally, future research into the efficiency of the Islamic banking sector efficiency could also consider the production function along with the intermediation function.

Despite these limitations, the findings of this study are expected to contribute significantly to the existing knowledge on the operating performance of the Islamic banking industry in the World. Nevertheless, the study have also provide further insight to bank specific management as well as the policymakers with regard to attaining optimal utilization of capacities, improvement in managerial expertise, efficient allocation of scarce resources and most productive scale of operation of the Islamic banks in the industry. This may also facilitate directions for sustainable competitiveness of Islamic banking operations in the future.

REFERENCES

Avkiran, N.K. (2002) *Productivity Analysis in the Service Sector with Data Envelopment Analysis*. Camira: N.K. Avkiran.

Batchelor and Wadud (2004) Technical and Scale Efficiency of Islamic Banking Operations in Malaysia: An Empirical Investigation with Longitudinal Perspective: *Labuan Bulletin of International Business & Finance 2(1), 2004, 51-69*

Benston, G.J. (1965) Branch Banking and Economies of Scale, *Journal of Finance* 20 (2), 312-331.

Bauer, P.W., Berger, A.N., Ferrier, G. D. and Humphrey, D.B. (1998), Consistency Conditions for Regulatory Analysis of Financial Institutions: A Comparison of Frontier Efficiency Methods, *Journal of Economics and Business* 50 (2), 85-114.

Berger, A.N. and Humphrey, D.B. (1997) Efficiency of Financial Institutions: International Survey and Directions for Future Research, *European Journal of Operational Research* 98 (2), 175-212.

Coelli, T. (1996) A Guide to DEAP Version 2.1: A Data Envelopment Analysis (Computer Program), *Working Paper*, CEPA, University of New England, Armidale.

Coelli, T., Rao, D.S.P. and Batesse, G.E. (1998) *An Introduction to Efficiency and Productivity Analysis*. Boston, MA: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Cooper, W.W., Seiford, L. M. and Tone, K. (2000) *Data Envelopment Analysis.* Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

DeYoung, R. and Hasan, I. (1998), The Performance of De Novo Commercial Banks: A Profit Efficiency Approach, *Journal of Banking and Finance* 22 (5), 565-587.

El-Gamal and Inanoglu (2004) Islamic Banking in Turkey: Boon or Bane for the Financial Sector, *Proceedings of the Fifth Harvard University Forum on Islamic Finance*, Cambridge: Center for Middle Eastern Studies, Harvard University.

Evanoff. D.D. and Israelvich, P.R. (1991) Productive Efficiency in Banking, *Economic Perspectives* Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago (July/August), 11-32.

Hassan, M.K. (2005) The Cost, Profit and X-Efficiency of Islamic Banks, Paper Presented at the 12th ERF Annual Conference, 19th-21st December, Egypt.

Hassan, M.K and Hussein, K.A. (2003) Static and Dynamic Efficiency in the Sudanese Banking System, *Review of Islamic Economics* 14, 5-48.

Hussein, K.A. (2003) Operational Efficiency in Islamic Banking: The Sudanese Experience, *Working Paper No. 1*, Islamic Research and Training Institute (IRTI), Islamic Development Bank.

Isik, I. and Hassan, M.K. (2002), Technical, Scale and Allocative Efficiencies of Turkish Banking Industry, *Journal of Banking and Finance* 26 (4), 719-766.

Katib, M.N. (1999) Technical efficiency of commercial banks in Malaysia. *Banker's Journal Malaysia*, 111, 40-53.

McAllister, P.H. and McManus, D.A. (1993) Resolving the Scale Efficiencies Puzzle in Banking, *Journal of Banking and Finance* 17 (2-3), 389-405.

Mokhtar, H., N. Abdullah and S. Al-Habshi (2006), Efficiency of Islamic banking in Malaysia: A stochastic frontier approach, *Journal of Economic Cooperation, 18*(1): 5-22.

Noulas, A.G. Ray, S.C. and Miller, S.M. (1990) Returns to Scale and Input Substitution for Large U.S. Banks, *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking* 22 (1), 94-108.

Saleh, A.S and Zeitun, R (2007) Islamic Banks in Jordan: Performance and Efficiency Analysis, *Review of Islamic Economics* 11 (1), 41-62.

Samad, A. (1999) Comparative Efficiency of the Islamic Bank vis-à-vis Conventional Banks in Malaysia, *IIUM Journal of Economics and Management* 7 (1), 1-25.

Sealey, C. and Lindley, J.T. (1977) Inputs, Outputs and a Theory of Production and Cost at Depository Financial Institutions, *Journal of Finance* 32 (4), 1251-1266.

Sufian, F. (2006) Size and Returns to Scale of the Islamic Banking Industry in Malaysia: Foreign Versus Domestic Banks, *IIUM Journal of Economics and Management* 14 (2), 147-175**.**

Sufian, F., Noor, M.A.M. and Abdul, M.M.Z,(2008) The Efficiency of Islamic Banks: Empirical Evidence from the MENA and Asian Countries Islamic Banking Sectors. *The Middle East Business and Economic Review,* Vol.20, No.1

Thanassoulis, E. (2001) *Introduction to the Theory and Application of Data Envelopment Analysis: A Foundation Text with Integrated Software*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Yudistira, D. (2004), *Efficiency in Islamic Banking: An empirical analysis of eighteen banks*, Islamic Economic Studies, 12(1): 1-19.

Viverita, Brown,K. and Skully, M. (2007) Efficiency Analysis of Islamic Banks in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East, *Review of Islamic Economics* 11 (2), 5-16

Table 1: Summary Statistics of the Variables Employed in the DEA Model (in million of USD)

		Inputs	Mean	Min	Max	Std. Dev.
2003		Loan/ Advances (y1)	504.2	100	5,327.74	953.15
		Income (y2)	218.93	100.02	1,202.67	245.76
		Other Earning Asset (y3)	248.23	100	924	241.14
2004		Loan/ Advances (y1)	536.19	100	6,004.76	1,160.13
		Income (y2)	487.03	100.5146	10,416.44	1,598.04
		Other Earning Asset (y3)	349.91	100	2,948.77	542.21
2005		Loan/ Advances (y1)	499.6	100	7,812.78	1,128.10
		Income (y2)	276.4	100	2,230.19	409.95
		Other Earning Asset (y3)	323.66	100	2,792.07	466.53
2006		Loan/ Advances (y1)	1,343.53	100	36,187.49	4,920.73
		Income (y2)	51,267.32	100	2,112,488.00	293,026.56
		Other Earning Asset (y3)	804.62	100	20,379.23	2,755.69
2007		Loan/ Advances (y1)	1519.03	0.4	18,671.14	3,505.80
		Income (y2)	255.62	0.055398	4,841.30	784.24
		Other Earning Asset (y3)	2,328.30	0.222547	58,728.30	9,021.58
2008		Loan/ Advances (y1)	1,760.39	0	14,348.50	2,756.63
		Income (y2)	145.6	3.04765	1,136.19	214.21
		Other Earning Asset (y3)	870.87	36.22882	6,458.56	1,257.60
2009		Loan/ Advances (y1)	2,440.08	537.3	7,179.08	2,792.14
		Income (y2)	194.33	4.3	470.22	207.72
		Other Earning Asset (y3)	1,446.82	136.2178	2,563.10	1,076.33
		Inputs	**Mean**	**Min**	**Max**	**Std. Dev.**
2003		Deposits (x1)	1,684.02	100.2	14,534.00	3,300.34
		Labour (x2)	120.49	100	266.93	38.56
		Fixed Asset (x3)	122.45	100	664.86	87.12
2004		Deposits (x1)	5,721.14	101.13	169,950.96	26,147.79
		Labour (x2)	184.34	100	2,775.08	411.3
		Fixed Asset (x3)	110.04	100	289.95	29.84
2005		Deposits (x1)	1,959.94	100	19,153.49	3,917.47
		Labour (x2)	137.24	100	802.36	106.85
		Fixed Asset (x3)	109.69	100	209.48	21.62
2006		Deposits (x1)	521,095.84	100	22,000,100.00	2,955,759.22
		Labour (x2)	2,243.73	100	102,030.89	13,507.71
		Fixed Asset (x3)	120.59	100	369.8	53.27
2007		Deposits (x1)	4,640.32	0	115,155.10	17,768.07
		Labour (x2)	41.77	0.01	484.13	93.84
		Fixed Asset (x3)	92.32	0	2,534.00	382.91

2008	**Deposits (x1)**	**2,039.78**	**0**	**18,100.05**	**3,380.45**
	Labour (x2)	**31.15**	**0.47964**	**240.46**	**49.7**
	Fixed Asset (x3)	**43.13**	**0.059955**	**371.93**	**77.6**
2009	**Deposits (x1)**	**3,457.00**	**232.3**	**7,151.25**	**3,340.16**
	Labour (x2)	**30.78**	**2.269824**	**75.1**	**36.06**
	Fixed Asset (x3)	**14.81**	**0.1**	**40.32**	**20.08**

Source: Banks Annual Reports & Bankscope database compiled by IBCA.

Table 2: Summary Statistics of Efficiency Scores 2003 – 2009

The table presents mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation of the World Islamic banks technical efficiency (TE), and its mutually exhaustive pure technical efficiency (PTE) and scale efficiency (SE) components derived from the DEA. Panel A, B, C, D, E, F and G shows the mean, minimum, maximum and standard deviation of TE, PTE, and SE of the Islamic banks for the years from 2003 to 2009 respectively. Panel G presents the World Islamic banks mean, minimum, maximum, and standard deviation of TE, PTE, and SE scores for all years. The TE, PTE, and SE scores are bounded between a minimum of 0 and a maximum of 1.

Banks	Mean	Minimum	Maximum	Std. Dev
Panel A: All Countries 2003				
Technical Efficiency	0.70	0.31	1.00	0.25
Pure Technical Efficiency	0.94	0.56	1.00	0.09
Scale Efficiency	0.75	0.44	1.00	0.24
Panel B: All Countries 2004				
Technical Efficiency	0.74	0.37	1.00	0.20
Pure Technical Efficiency	0.97	0.58	1.00	0.10
Scale Efficiency	0.77	0.53	1.00	0.20
Panel C: All Countries 2005				
Technical Efficiency	0.56	0.33	1.00	0.23
Pure Technical Efficiency	0.99	0.89	1.00	0.02
Scale Efficiency	0.57	0.33	1.00	0.23
Panel D: All Countries 2006				
Technical Efficiency	0.54	0.15	1.00	0.26
Pure Technical Efficiency	0.96	0.00	1.00	0.13
Scale Efficiency	0.55	0.17	1.00	0.26
Panel E: All Countries 2007				
Technical Efficiency	0.50	0.01	1.00	0.35
Pure Technical Efficiency	0.68	0.01	1.00	0.36
Scale Efficiency	0.76	0.09	1.00	0.28

Panel G: All Countries 2008					
Technical Efficiency	0.65	0.02	1.00	0.33
Pure Technical Efficiency	0.76	0.02	1.00	0.31
Scale Efficiency	0.84	0.28	1.00	0.22
Panel H: All Countries 2009				
Technical Efficiency	0.95	0.76	1.00	0.11
Pure Technical Efficiency	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.00
Scale Efficiency	0.95	0.76	1.00	0.11
Panel I: All Countries All Years				
Technical Efficiency	0.66	0.28	1.00	0.25
Pure Technical Efficiency	0.90	0.44	1.00	0.14
Scale Efficiency	0.74	0.37	1.00	0.22

Note: Detailed results are available from the authors upon request

Table 3: Composition of Production Frontiers from 2003 to 2009

	Financial Institutions	**Country of Origin**	**2003**	**2004**	**2005**	**2006**	**2007**	**2008**	**2009**	**Count Bank**
1	ABC Islamic Bank	Bahrain			IRS	IRS	CRS	IRS		**1**
2	Al Amin Bank	Bahrain		IRS	IRS	IRS				**0**
3	Al Baraka Islamic Bank	Bahrain	CRS	IRS	IRS	IRS	DRS	DRS		**1**
4	Arab Banking Corporation	Bahrain	IRS	CRS	IRS	IRS				**1**
5	Arcapita Bank B.S.C.	Bahrain	IRS	CRS	CRS	CRS	CRS	IRS	CRS	**9**
6	Arab Islamic Bank	Bahrain								**3**
7	Bahrain Islamic Bank	Bahrain	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS	DRS			**0**
8	Gulf Finance House	Bahrain	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS				**0**
9	Al Salam Bank	Bahrain				IRS				**0**
10	Shamil Bank	Bahrain	CRS	CRS	CRS	IRS	DRS	CRS		**12**
11	Taib Bank	Bahrain	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS				**0**
12	Ithmaar Bank	Bahrain			IRS	IRS				**0**
13	Al Arafah Islami Bank	Bangladesh	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS	DRS	IRS		**2**
14	Shah Jalal Islami Bank	Bangladesh	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS	CRS	CRS		**2**
15	ICB Islamic Bank Limited	Bangladesh	IRS			IRS	DRS	IRS		**2**
16	Islamic Bank Bangladesh	Bangladesh	CRS	CRS	IRS	IRS				**5**
17	Islamic Development Bank of Brunei Bhd	Brunei	CRS	IRS	CRS	DRS	DRS			**7**
18	Bank Islam Brunei Darussalam Berhad	Brunei	CRS	CRS	IRS	IRS	CRS	IRS		**5**
19	Faisal Islamic Bank	Egypt	IRS	CRS	IRS			CRS		**7**
20	Arab Gambian Islamic Bank	Gambia		IRS	IRS	IRS				**0**
21	Bank Muamalat Indonesia	Indonesia			IRS	IRS				**0**
22	Bank Mellat	Iran			IRS	CRS	DRS			**1**

#	Bank	Country								Score
23	Bank Refah	Iran			IRS					**2**
24	Al Bilad Islamic Bank	Iraq				IRS		IRS		**0**
25	Jordan Islamic Bank	Jordan	CRS	CRS	IRS					**3**
26	Arab Islamic Bank	Jordan				IRS	DRS			**0**
27	Islamic International Arab Bank	Jordan	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS			**2**
28	Jordan Dubai Islamic Bank	Jordan	IRS	IRS	IRS	CRS				**5**
29	Kuwait Finance House	Kuwait	CRS	DRS	CRS		CRS			**4**
30	Affin Islamic Bank Berhad	Malaysia				IRS	DRS	CRS	CRS	**2**
31	Alliance Islamic Bank	Malaysia				IRS		CRS	DRS	**1**
32	Bank Islam Malaysia Berhad	Malaysia				IRS		DRS		**0**
33	Bank Islam Malaysia (L) Berhad	Malaysia	IRS							**0**
34	Bank Muamalat Malaysia Berhad	Malaysia				IRS	IRS	CRS		**1**
35	CIMB Islamic Bank Berhad	Malaysia				IRS	IRS	CRS	IRS	**1**
36	EONCAP Islamic Bank Berhad	Malaysia				IRS		CRS		**1**
37	Kuwait Finance House Malaysia	Malaysia				IRS	DRS		CRS	**1**
38	Hong Leong Islamic Bank	Malaysia					DRS	IRS	CRS	**1**
39	Maybank Islamic Berhad	Malaysia						CRS		**1**
40	RHB Islamic Bank Bhd	Malaysia			IRS			CRS		**1**
41	BAMIS-Banque Al Wava Mauritanienne Islamique	Mauritania	IRS	IRS			CRS	DRS		**1**
42	AlBaraka Islamic Bank B.S.C.	Pakistan	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS		IRS		**0**
43	Meezan Bank	Pakistan	IRS	IRS	IRS	CRS				**1**
44	Standard Chartered Modharaba	Pakistan	IRS	IRS	IRS					**0**
45	Bank Islami Pakistan	Pakistan				IRS	IRS	DRS		**0**
46	Dawood Islamic Bank	Pakistan				IRS	DRS	IRS		**0**
47	Dubai Islamic Bank	Pakistan				IRS		IRS		**0**
48	Emirates Global Islamic Bank	Pakistan				IRS	IRS			**0**
49	Arab Islamic Bank	Palestine	IRS	IRS	IRS					**0**
50	Al Rajhi Banking	Saudi Arabia	CRS	CRS			IRS			**3**
51	Bank AlJazira	Saudi Arabia	CRS		CRS					**2**
52	EG Saudi Finance Bank	Saudi Arabia		IRS	IRS	IRS	CRS			**1**
53	The Islamic Bank of Asia	Singapore						CRS		**1**
54	Syria International Islamic Bank	Syria					DRS	DRS		**0**
55	Islamic Bank of Thailand	Thailand	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS	DRS	IRS		**0**
56	Al Baraka Turk	Turkey			IRS					**0**
57	Kuwait Finance House	Turkey	IRS							**0**
58	Ihlas Finan	Turkey				IRS	DRS			**0**

#	Bank	Country								Count Bank
59	Abu Dhabi Islamic Bank	UAE	CRS	IRS		CRS	IRS	DRS		4
60	Dubai Islamic Bank	UAE	CRS	CRS	CRS	IRS		DRS		9
61	Mashreq Bank	UAE	CRS	IRS	IRS	IRS				1
62	Emirates Islamic Bank	UAE		IRS	IRS	IRS	CRS	DRS		1
63	Sharjah Islamic Bank	UAE	CRS		IRS	IRS	CRS	DRS		2
64	Noor Islamic Bank	UAE						CRS		1
65	European Islamic Investment Bank Plc	United Kingdom			IRS	IRS	CRS	CRS		2
66	Islamic Bank of Britain PLC	United Kingdom			IRS	IRS	DRS	IRS		0
67	Qatar Islamic Bank	Qatar	IRS	CRS	IRS	CRS	IRS	IRS		4
68	Qatar International Islamic Bank	Qatar	CRS	CRS	CRS	CRS	DRS	CRS		11
69	Islamic Bank of Yemen	Yemen	IRS	IRS	IRS					0
70	Tadhamon International Islamic Bank	Yemen	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS	DRS	CRS		3
71	Saba Islamic Bank	Yemen	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS	DRS	CRS		1
72	Al Baraka South Africa	South Africa	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS				0
73	Al Baraka Sudan	Sudan	CRS	CRS	CRS	IRS				4
74	Al Shamal Islamic Bank	Sudan	CRS				DRS	IRS		3
75	Faisal Islamic Bank	Sudan		IRS	IRS	IRS	DRS	IRS		0
76	Islamic Co-operative Development Bank	Sudan	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS	DRS	IRS		0
77	Sudanese Islamic Bank	Sudan	IRS	IRS	IRS	IRS	DRS			0
78	Tadamon Islamic Bank	Sudan	IRS	IRS		IRS	DRS	IRS		0
		Count Year	16	12	8	8	11	14		

Total Countries   **25**

Note: CRS – (Constant Returns to Scale); DRS – (Decreasing Returns to Scale); IRS – (Increasing Returns to Scale).

The banks corresponds to the shaded regions have not been efficient in any year in the sample period (2001-2006) compared to the other banks in the sample.

'Count Year' denotes the number of banks appearing on the efficiency frontier during the year.

'Count Bank' denotes the number of times a bank has appeared on the efficiency frontier during the period of study.

Table 4: 2003-2009 Summary Table Efficiency

Year	Highest	Country Level	Lowest	Country Level
2009	1.000	Highest. Bahrain, Arcapita Bank: high.	0.25	Lowest. Malaysia, Affin Bank: middle.
2008	1.000	Highest. Egypt, Faisal Islamic Bank: Middle. Singapore, Asia Islamic Bank: High. Yemen, Tadhamon International Islamic Bank: Low	0.054	Lowest. Brunei,Bank Islam Brunei Darussalam Berhad: High
2007	1.000	Highest. Iraq, Al Bilad Islamic Bank: Middle. Kuwait, Kuwait Finance House: High. Saudi Arabia, EG Saudi Finance Bank: Middle.	0.071	Lowest. Iran, Bank Tejarat: Middle

2006	1.000	Highest. Iran, Bank Mellat: Middle. Mauritania, BAMIS-Banque Al Wava Mauritanienne Islamique: Low	0.149	Lowest. Iraq, Al Bilad Islamic Bank: Middle
2005	1.000	Highest. Kuwait, Kuwait Finance House: High	0.302	Lowest. Thailand, Islamic Bank of Thailand: Middle.
2004	1.000	Highest. Egypt, Faisal Islamic Bank: Middle. Qatar, Qatar Islamic Bank: High	0.525	Lowest. Thailand, Islamic Bank of Thailand: Middle.
2003	1.000	Highest. Kuwait, Kuwait Finance House: High. Saudi Arabia, Al Rajhi Bank: High	0.307	Lowest. Egypt, Faisal Islamic Bank: Middle.

APPENDIX 1

	Financial Institutions	Country of Origin	
			Classification countries
1	ABC Islamic Bank	Bahrain	High income country
2	Al Amin Bank	Bahrain	
3	Al Baraka Islamic Bank	Bahrain	
4	Arab Banking Corporation	Bahrain	
5	Arcapita Bank B.S.C.	Bahrain	
6	Bahrain Islamic Bank	Bahrain	
7	Gulf Finance House	Bahrain	
8	Shamil Bank	Bahrain	
9	Taib Bank	Bahrain	
10	Ithmaar Bank	Bahrain	
11	Al Arafah Islami Bank	Bangladesh	Low income country
12	Shah Jalal Islami Bank	Bangladesh	
13	ICB Islamic Bank Limited	Bangladesh	
14	Islamic Bank Bangladesh	Bangladesh	
15	Islamic Development Bank of Brunei Bhd	Brunei	High income country
16	Bank Islam Brunei Darussalam Berhad	Brunei	
17	Faisal Islamic Bank	Egypt	Middle income country
18	Arab Gambian Islamic Bank	Gambia	Low income country
19	Bank Muamalat Indonesia	Indonesia	Middle income country
20	Bank Mellat	Iran	Middle income country
21	Bank Refah	Iran	
22	Bank Tejarat	Iran	
23	Al Bilad Islamic Bank	Iraq	Middle income country
24	Jordan Islamic Bank	Jordan	Middle income country
25	Arab Islamic Bank	Jordan	
26	Islamic International Arab Bank	Jordan	
27	Jordan Dubai Islamic Bank	Jordan	
28	Kuwait Finance House	Kuwait	High income country
29	Affin Islamic Bank Berhad	Malaysia	Middle income country
30	Alliance Islamic Bank	Malaysia	
31	Bank Islam Malaysia Berhad	Malaysia	
32	Bank Islam Malaysia (L) Berhad	Malaysia	
33	Bank Muamalat Malaysia Berhad	Malaysia	
34	CIMB Islamic Bank Berhad	Malaysia	

35	EONCAP Islamic Bank Berhad	Malaysia	
36	Kuwait Finance House Malaysia	Malaysia	
37	Hong Leong Islamic Bank	Malaysia	
38	Maybank Islamic Berhad	Malaysia	
39	RHB Islamic Bank Bhd	Malaysia	
40	BAMIS-Banque Al Wava Mauritanienne Islamique	Mauritania	Low income country
41	AlBaraka Islamic Bank B.S.C.	Pakistan	Low income country
42	Meezan Bank	Pakistan	
43	Standard Chartered Modharaba	Pakistan	
44	Bank Islami Pakistan	Pakistan	
45	Dawood Islamic Bank	Pakistan	
46	Dubai Islamic Bank	Pakistan	
47	Emirates Global Islamic Bank	Pakistan	
48	Arab Islamic Bank	Palestine	Low income country
49	Al Rajhi Banking	Saudi Arabia	Middle income country
50	Bank AlJazira	Saudi Arabia	
51	EG Saudi Finance Bank	Saudi Arabia	
52	The Islamic Bank of Asia	Singapore	High income country
53	Syria International Islamic Bank	Syria	Middle income country
54	Islamic Bank of Thailand	Thailand	Middle income country
55	Al Baraka Turk	Turkey	Middle income country
56	Kuwait Finance House	Turkey	
57	Ihlas Finan	Turkey	
58	Abu Dhabi Islamic Bank	UAE	High income country
59	Dubai Islamic Bank	UAE	
60	Mashreq Bank	UAE	
61	Emirates Islamic Bank	UAE	
62	Sharjah Islamic Bank	UAE	
63	Noor Islamic Bank	UAE	
64	European Islamic Investment Bank Plc	United Kingdom	High income country
65	Islamic Bank of Britain PLC	United Kingdom	
66	Qatar Islamic Bank	Qatar	High income country
67	Qatar International Islamic Bank	Qatar	
68	Islamic Bank of Yemen	Yemen	Low income country
69	Tadhamon International Islamic Bank	Yemen	
70	Saba Islamic Bank	Yemen	
71	Al Baraka South Africa	South Africa	Middle income country
72	Al Baraka Sudan	Sudan	Low income country
73	Al Shamal Islamic Bank	Sudan	
74	Faisal Islamic Bank	Sudan	
75	Islamic Co-operative Development Bank	Sudan	
76	Sudanese Islamic Bank	Sudan	
77	Tadamon Islamic Bank	Sudan	

Total Countries   25   Total Banks   77
Low Income Country - (Income Per Capita: $765 or less)
Middle Income Country - (Income Per Capita: $766 to $ 9,385)
High Income Country - (Income Per Capita: $9,386 or more)