IJER © Serials Publications
13(4), 2016: 1399-1409
ISSN: 0972-9380

FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE ISLAMIC BANKING UNIT IN INDONESIA: A COMPARATIVE STUDY PRIVATE BANKS AND REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT BANKS

Hamdi Agustin*

***Abstract**: One of the unique banking in Indonesia is a Regional Development Banks (RDB), which is a districts government-owned bank. Indonesia banks have Islamic banking units, where the status usually in division and business unit of the Bank's parent (conventional). But there are no funds will be mixed with the conventional, because they have a different system of financial records between sharia units and conventional units. The purpose of this study is to comparing the performance of RDB and private banks which has Islamic banking units. The population and sample consists of 24 Islamic business units Regional Development Banks (RDB) and private owned banks. From the 24 banks, only 18 banks were selected to be the sample. The banks are 7 private banks and 11 regional development banks. The period of this study is from 2010 to 2014. Data are taken from the bank's annual reports. This study using panel data and using pooled Ordinary Least Squares (OLS), random effect and fixed effect analysis. The results showed that RDB of Islamic banking units is better than Islamic business unit of private banks; this suggests that due to several factors. First, lending only to employees of the local government where government employees are very difficult to stop. Because of they are difficult to be dismissed; the probability that they are unable to repay loans is very low despite the unstable economic situation. Second, since RDB provide services only to an area only, so it has special knowledge about the area. This simplifies the RDB to assess loan applications from customers and identify viable loans. Third, the performance of RDB supervised by local governments This study also shows that DIBU, DEPOSIT, LDR, CAR and NPL plays a significant factor in explaining the performance of Islamic banking unit in Indonesia banks.*

***Keyword:** Financial Performance, Islamic Banking Unit, Regional Development Banks and Private Banks*

1. INTRODUCTION

Islamic bank as to conventional banks is for-profit organizations. However, bank Islam prohibits usury or business activity that is not in accordance with Islamic principles.

* Department of Management, Faculty of Economic, Universitas Islam Riau, Pekanbaru, Riau, Indonesia 28284, *E-mail: hamdiagustin@yahoo.com*

The fundamental difference Islamic banks and conventional banks are both of institutions and businesses that relied on the principle of the capitalist economy, so the advantage is simply translated into the level and aspect of sheer material and reward results with the system of interest, while the Islamic bank is a banking principles which are based on Islamic values, thus favoring not only profit, but the spiritual benefits such as social and obtain the blessing of Allah SWT.

These two types of banks can be found in most countries in the world. There are private owned banks and government owned banks, but the uniqueness of Indonesian banking system is that there is another government owned banks category, which is called the community development banks. Community development banks in Indonesia exist in every district. They are monetary organizations operated on a local basis. In terms of coverage, their coverage is much smaller than the private and the publicly owned banks. RDB categorized as focused bank, i.e. the bank with regional focus. RDB has two systems, namely Islamic banking unit and conventional banking. Hence this study will try to identify whether the bank system pattern will affect the bank performance.

Regional development banks and private owned banks have Islamic business units where the statuses of the Bank's parent (conventional) level usually division, department, group, business unit, or even a product. But there are no funds will be mixed with the conventional, because the recording. Even though the transaction is done in a conventional parent bank counter, bank records in the system is also different and reporting to the Bank Indonesia is also different, so in principle the funds received from Islamic banks will not be mixed with conventional banks. Operational of Islamic banks are still not in accordance with Islamic sharia real. This can impact negatively for Muslims. In this case, Muslims had they own opinion that the system of Islamic banks is equal to the conventional system.

In previous literature, a lot of work is done on determining the factors which influence the bank performance in Indonesia. But a little work is done on of RDB, especially the comparison between the performances of RDB and private owned banks and that have sharia units and determining which factors have significant influence on bank performance of banking sector during the period of 2010-2014.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

The extent of literature on Islamic banking divided into theoretical and empirical dimension. The earliest works dealing with the potential of Islamic banking include Mannan (1968), Ahmad (1987), Saeed (1996) and Iqbal and Mirakhor (1999). These authors discussed a wide range of institutional issues including concepts and principles that are subject to interpretation. Due to the rapid growth in Islamic banking in these recent decades, it calls for opportunities for the academics to conduct study in analyzing its' financial performance using financial ratios. Some previous studies investigated performance of Islamic Banks and compare it with conventional banks performance

(Samad, 1999; Samad and Hassan, 2000; Iqbal, 2001; Roslyand Bakar, 2003; Samad, 2004; Kader *et al.*, 2007; Widagdo and Ika; 2007; Beck *et al.*, 2010; Jaffar and Manarvi, 2011; Ansari and Rehman, 2011; Wahidudin *at al.*, 2012; Merchant, 2012; Zeitun, 2012; Babatunde and Olaitan, 2013).

Both Islamic banks and conventional banks are financial intermediation that helps to transfer the funds from investors, depositors or savers to borrowers. Regular Conventional Banks cannot be involved in venture transactions or merchandizing transactions, which is allowed in Islamic banks. But there are merchant banks who are allowed to do merchandizing. The main difference between Islamic banks and conventional banks are practice of interest rate and speculative transactions, investment in alcohol, in tobacco and in pig made products are prohibited in accordance with Islamic principles. Generally, conventional banking Principles is manmade, whereas in Islamic banks principles and rules are based on Sharia who set up the principles, simply to say transactions of Islamic banks are based on profit and loss sharing. As we are aware of, that interest rate for Conventional Banks is main source of earnings. As a proof, interest is forbidden in not only Islam and in Christianity as well. Likewise, as it is being stated in Quran chapter 3,verse 130 "O you who have believed, do not consume usury, doubled and multiplied, but fear Allah that you may be successful." And another proof in Quran chapter 2, verse 275 is "Allah has permitted trade and has forbidden interest. Unlike Islamic Banks, the conventional banks are not allowed to purchase commodities with the aim of reselling them, in other words it is forbidden for them to buy capital assets or fixed assets such as: building, tracks, cars, machineries with the purpose to resell them with markup unless they do not use for their own.

Several studies have documented that the state-owned banks have lower assets, higher costs and lower quality assets compared with private banks (Berger *et al.*, 2004; Micco *et al.*, 2004; Berger *et al.*, 2005). Additionally, Cornett *et al.* (2010) states that the bank holds government to lower profits have small capital and high-risk loans so as to reduce the bank's performance. They found that during the financial crisis, government banks have performed better than private banks in terms of cash flow, capital base and loan quality. After the financial crisis, private banks have performed better than government bank in terms of capital adequacy ratio, asset quality and management efficiency.

Micco *et al.* (2007) studied the relationship between bank ownership and bank profits in 179 countries. They found that state-owned banks have a negative impact on developing countries and has no influence on the industrial countries. State-owned banks in developing countries tend to have lower earnings margins and higher overhead costs than privately owned banks. They did not find evidence of a difference between the performance of government banks and domestic in industrialized countries. Flamini *et al.* (2009) studied 389 banks in Africa for the period 1998 to 2006 and found that state-owned banks have a negative effect on ROA. Bank-owned bank suffered a loss of bank management inefficient compared to privately owned banks. Fu and Heffernan (2009) investigate bank in China for the period 1985-2002. The results showed that the private bank is more profitable than the bank because the government has a growth advantage and higher efficiency of the government bank, despite having a market share which is smaller than the state banks.

Iannotta *et al.* (2007) studied three forms of bank ownership privately owned banks, joint venture banks and state-owned bank with a sample of 181 banks in 15 European countries for the period 1999-2004. Bank performance is measured using gross profit. The results showed that state-owned banks have lower profitability of private banks because the government has a shortage of bank capital, low deposit, the amount of lending to small and high liquidity levels of government so that the bank cannot operate optimally. Yu and Neus (2009) and Dietrich and Wanzenried (2009) also found that private banks earn higher returns compared to government banks in Germany and Switzerland respectively. The results of this study with Reaz (2005) who found the bank the government has return on assets is lower than the private banks in Bangladesh.

Berger *et al.* (2005) using data Argentina for the period 1990 to 1999 and found that state-owned banks have a weak profit before privatization. After privatization performance of these banks has increased. Omran (2007) investigated 12 banks in Egypt for the period 1996-1999. At that time, many state-owned bankswere privatized. The results showed private banks have profitability and efficiency of banks that have a mix of majority ownership by the government. This contrast with the findings Althanasoglou *et al.* (2008) who found a private bank in Egypt have lower performance due to mergers and acquisitions undertaken by these banks. Meanwhile, Chantapong (2005) found no effect of bank ownership on ROA and ROE in Indonesia and Thailand.

3. DATA AND METHODS

The population and sample consists of 24 Islamic business units Regional Development Banks (RDB) and private owned banks. In the 24 banks, only 18 banks were selected to be the sample. The banks are 7 private banks and 11 regional development banks. The period of this study is from 2010 to 2014. The data are taken from banks' annual reports. In this study, method using panel data and using pooled ordinary least square (OLS), random effect and fixed effect analysis. To test if Islamic Banking Unit influences performance of banks, the following model is estimated:

$$ROA_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 {*}DIBU_{it} + \beta_2 {*}DEPOSIT_{it} + \beta_3 {*}LDR_{it} + \beta_4 {*}CAR_{it} + \beta_5 {*}NPL_{it} + \beta_6 {*}SIZE_{it} + e_{it}$$

Where:

ROAit	:	Return on assets of bank i in period t,
DIBUit	:	A dummy variable that takes on a value of one if Islamic banking unit of RDBi in period t, zero otherwise,
DEPOSITit	:	natural logarithm of total deposit.
LDRit	:	total loans to deposit ratio.
CARit	:	capital equation ratio.

NPLit	:	non-performing loans.
SIZEit	:	natural logarithm of total assets
eit	:	error term of bank i in period t.

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on Table 1 shows the ROA, DEPOSIT, LDR and SIZE differ significantly where DEPOSIT, LDR and private banks SIZE more higher than RDB. However, ROA of RDB is higherthan private banks. It shows the RDB have higher returns than private banks. It is caused by RDB know their respective regions so that loans can provide optimal benefits because they concentrated on their respective areas. To ensure that there is no problem of multico-linearity, variance inflation factors (VIF) are estimated and since the results show that the VIF are below 10.

Table 1
Comparisons of Mean of Selected Variables BetweenDifferent Systems of Banks

Ratios	*Means all bank (%)*	*Means (%)*	*p-Value (2 tailed)*
ROA	3.0428		0.000***
RDB	3.4516		
Private banks	2.4003		
DEPOSIT	15.1432		0.000***
RDB	13.3313		
Private banks	17.9904		
LDR	87.7088		0.003**
RDB	85.1033		
Private banks	91.7286		
CAR	17.0148		0.169
RDB	17.4346		
Private banks	16.3671		
NPL	1.1786		0.207
RDB	1.0802		
Private banks	1.3331		
SIZE	15.9375		0.000***
RDB	14.4453		
Private banks	18.2823		

*, ** and *** denote significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% level, respectively, p-value in parentheses

Table 2 presents the pooled regression results without adjusting standard errors andwith robust standard errors for heteroscedasticity. When we test for heteroscedasticity using Breusch-Pagan test, we find that we can reject the null hypothesis of equal variances. Thus, a better estimation model should account for heteroscedasticity. The results ofdata processing using the pooled regression results indicate standard errors with out adjusting variable DIBU, LDR, CAR and NPLROA significantly influence the results, while the pooled regression with robustst and ardmethod is no different, only an additional variable DEPOSIT significantly to ROA.

Table 2
Regression Without Adjusting and with Robust Standard ErrorsDependent Variable: ROA

Variable	*OLS without standard errors*		*OLS with robust standard errors*	
	Coef.	*p-value*	*Coef.*	*p-value*
Constan	-1.445673	0.341	-1.445673	0.278
DIBU	1.049996	0.005***	1.049996	0.052*
DEPOSIT	-.0497795	0.408	-.0497795	0.073*
LDR	.0297095	0.010***	.0297095	0.010***
CAR	.0839541	0.017**	.0839541	0.094*
NPL	-.331598	0.012**	-.331598	0.041**
SIZE	.0593074	0.603	.0593074	0.461
R-squared	0.3385		0.3385	
Adjusted R-squared	0.2907		-	
Prob> F	0.0000		0.0000	
Number observation	90		80	

*, ** and *** denote significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% level, respectively, p-value in parentheses

DIBU has a positive effect on ROA.Theory agency noted that the company managed by managers who do not have a stake in the firm will lead to a conflict of interest between managers and shareholders. However the results of this study found that even a bank manager had no interest in the bank, they still manage the bank very well. This may be due to several factors. First, lending only to employees of the local government where government employees are very difficult to stop. Because they are difficult to be dismissed, the probability that they are unable to repay loans is very low despite the unstable economic situation. Second, since RDB provide services only to an area only, so it has special knowledge about the area. This simplifies the RDB to assess loan applications from customers and identify viable loans. Third, the performance of RDB supervised by local governments, weakness bank manager showed the inability of local governments to identify a competent manager. This in turn will give a negative impact on the ability of local governments. This finding is contrast with Reaz (2005), Beck *et al.* (2005), Berger *et al.* (2005), Omran (2007), Micco *et al.* (2007), Iannotta *et al.* (2007), Fu and Heffernan (2008), Yu and Neus (2009) and Flamini *et al.* (2009) in which studies have found that private banks have better profit compared with a bank controlled by the government. The results of this study also differs with Hadad *et al.* (2003), Fernandez *et al.* (2005) and Chantapong (2005) who found the bank's ownership structure has not affect the bank's profitability.

DEPOSIT has a negative effecton ROA. It shows the Third Party Fund (DPK) burden on banks to pay the profit sharing ratio compared to owners of capital the bank receives the funds. This finding is contrast with Sudiyat no, Bambang (2010) and Hasan, Ghufran (2014). LDR has a positive effect on ROA. Loan to deposit ratio concerns the ability of a bank to anticipate changes in funding sources. This could have serious consequences on a bank's capacity to meet its obligations when they fall due. Effective liquidity management seeks to ensure that, even under adverse conditions, a bank will have access to the funds necessary to fulfill customer needs, maturing liabilities and capital requirements for operational purposes. The principal source of liquidity in the Indonesian banking industry is the large deposit base and, to a lesser extent, interbank borrowings. In recent years, almost all major Indonesian banks have exhibited excess liquidity as funds withdrawn from the Indonesia stock exchange were channeled into various types of deposits accounts. The result of study is related to Steinherr and Huveneers (1994), Haron, Sudin, (2004) and Alexius, C., & Sofoklis, V. (2009).

CAR has a positive effect on ROA. This suggests that bank shave greater equity better prepared for the changes in economic conditions. Large bank capital could reduce the cost of bank ruptcy and allow banks to makeloans at a lower cost. In addition a large bank capital allows the bank to take the opportunity while the economy is in good conditions where, for example, the bank may increase the amount of the loan and this will increase profits for the good economic conditions are likely customers are able topay their debts. The result is consistent with previous research study conducted by Demirguc-Kuntand Huizinga (2000), Pasioras and Kosmidou (2007), Iannotta *et al.* (2007), A than as oglou *et al.* (2008), Sufian (2010), Davydenko (2010), Sastrosuwi to and Suzuki (2012), Ramadan (2011) and Sufian and Habibullah (2012).

NPL has a negative effect on ROA. The loan loss is the most important determinant of bank profitability, and which can be defined as the possibility of losing all or part of the interest, loan asset or both. Theoretically, the increase in the Company's exposure to credit risk adversely affects the profitability of the company, and in order to improve profitability, the company shall act to reduce its exposure to credit risk through more effective credit risk management and control. This shows that loan-loss can reduce bank profits so that the lower the value of ROA**.** The result of study shows related to study of Mamatzakis and Remoundos (2003). Berger and Bonaccorsi (2006), Al-Hashimi A. (2007). Athanasoglou *et al.* (2008) Alexius and Sofoklis (2009) and Chen and Lion (2011), Ramadan, I. Z. (2011).

SIZE has not effect on ROA. This finding is contrast with Bashir (2003), Hassan dan Bashir (2005), Pasiouras dan Kosmidou (2007), Flamini *et al.* (2009), Naceur dan Goaied (2008) dan Riewsathirathorn *et al.* (2011) founda positive effect on ROA.

Mean while the results of data processing using methods and Fixed Effect Random Effectare not different from the pooled regression method without adjusting results with robust standard errors and standard. The results of data processing by using Random Effect DIBU are only significant variable to ROA. While, results using the Fixed Effect variable DEPOSIT, LDR and CAR significantly to ROA.

Table 3
Regression with Random Effect and Fixed Effect Dependent Variable: ROA

Variable	*Random Effect*		*Fixed Effect*	
	Coef.	*p-value*	*Coef.*	*p-value*
Constan	1.104753	0.632	25.5613	0.000
DIBU	1.264121	0.061*	dropped	dropped
DEPOSIT	-.0610296	0.571	-1.733227	0.000***
LDR	.0126098	0.270	.0203875	0.053*
CAR	-.0325879	0.417	-.0894288	0.022**
NPL	-.0999921	0.477	.1996541	0.135
SIZE	.1041152	0.582	.2030526	0.428
R-squared	0.2289		0.0153	
Adjusted R-squared	-		-	
Prob> chi2	0.3500		0.0000	
Number observation	90		90	

*, ** and *** denote significance at the 10%, 5% and 1% level, respectively, p-value in parentheses

5. CONCLUSION

In this study, we examine the performance of Islamic banking unit in Indonesia from 2010 to 2014. Our study uncovers interesting results; find that the Islamic banking unit of community development banks performs better than the Islamic banking unit of private banks. This suggests that due to several factors. First, lending only to employees of the local government where government employees are very difficult to stop. Because they are difficult to be dismissed, the probability that they are unable to repay loans is very low despite the unstable economic situation. Second, since RDB provide services only to an area only, so it has special knowledge about the area. This simplifies the RDB to assess loan applications from customers and identify viable loans. Third, the performance of RDB supervised by local governments This study also shows that DIBU, DEPOSIT, LDR, CAR and NPL plays a significant factor in explaining the performance of Islamic banking unit in Indonesia banks.

References

Alexius, C., & Sofoklis, V. (2009), Determinant of bank profitability: Evidence from the Greek banking sector. Economic Annals, LIV(182), 93-118.

Al-Hashimi A. (2007), "Determinants of Bank Spreads in Sub-Saharan Africa," *www.scribd.com/doc/36905178/Thesis-Final-Draft*

Ansari, A. and Rehman, A. (2011), Financial performance of Islamic and conventional banks in Pakistan: A comparative study, 8th International Conference on Islamic Economics and Finance - Doha. 1 (1), 1-19.

Athanasoglou, P. P., Brissimis, S. N., & Delis, M. D. (2008), Bank specific, industry specific and macroeconomic determinants of bank profitability. *Journal of International Financial Markets, Institutions and Money*, 18(2), 121-136.

Babatunde, O.A. and Olaitan, O. A. (2013), The performance of conventional and Islamic banks in the United Kingdom: A comparative analysis. Journal of Research in Economics and International Finance, 2(2), 29-38.

Bashir, A. M. (2003), Determinants of profitability in Islamic banks: Some evidence from Middle East, Islamic Economic studies, 11(1), 31-57.

Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A. and Merrouche, O. (2010), Islamic vs. Conventional Banking: Business Model, Efficiency and Stability. Working Paper 5446 (WPS5446). The World Bank Development Research Group Finance and Private Sector Development Team.

Berger A. N., Demirguc-Kunt A., Levine R., &Haubrich J. G. (2004), Bank concentration and competition: An evolution in the making. *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, 36(3), 433-451.

Berger, A N., &Bonaccorsi. E. P. (2006), Capital structure and firm performance: A new approach to testing agency theory and an application to the banking industry. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 29, 1065-1102.

Berger, A. N., Clarke, G. R., Cull, R., Klapper, L., & Udell, G. F. (2005), Corporate governance and bank performance: A joint analysis of the static, selection, and dynamic effects of domestic, foreign, and state ownership. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 29(8-9), 2179-2221.

Chantapong, S. (2005), Comparative study of domestic and foreign bank performance in Thailand: The regression analysis. Economic Change and Restructuring, 3, 63-83.

Chen, S. H., & Liao, C. C. (2011), Are foreign banks more profitable than domestic banks? Home and host country effects of banking market structure, governance, and supervision. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 35, 819-839.

Cornett, M. M., Guo, L., Khaksari, S., & Tehranian, H. (2010), The impact of state ownership on performance differences in privately-owned versus state-owned banks: An international comparison. *Journal Financial Intermediation*, 19, 74-94.

Davydenko, A. (2010). Determinants of bank profitability in Ukraina. Undergraduate Economic Review, 7(1), 1-30.

Demirgüç-Kunt, A., & Huizinga, H. (2000), Determinants of commercial bank interest margins and profitability: Some international evidence. *World Bank Economic Review*, 13(2), 379-408.

Dietrich, A., & Wanzenried, G. (2009), What determines the profitability of commercial banks? New evidence from Switzerland (Working Paper 0010/2009). Switzerland: Lucerne University of Applied Sciences and Arts. Retrieved March, 2009, from *http://www.sgvs.ch / congress 09/upload/p_1.*

Fernandez, A. I., Fonseca, A. R., & Gonzalez, F. (2005), Does ownership affect banks profitability? Some international evidence.In E.Klein (8th ed.), Capital formation and banking (157-178). Nova Science Publishers, Inc.

Flamini, V., McDonald, C., & Schumacher, L. (2009), The determinants of commercial bank profitability in Sub-Saharan Afrika (IMF Working Paper 09/15). Washington, DC: International Monetary Fund. *Retrieved from http://www.imf.org/ external/ pubs /ft/ wp/2009/ wp0915.pdf.*

Heffernan, S. & Fu, X., (2009), The effects of reform on China's bank structure and performance. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 33, 39-52.

Haron, Sudin (2004), Determinants of Islamic Bank Profitability. *The Global Journal of Finance and Economics*, 1(1), 11-33.

Hasan, Ghufran, (2014), Pengaruh Dana Pihak Ketiga, Non Performing Financial Ratio Biaya, Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR),Financing to Deposit Ratio Dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Profitabilitas Pada Bank Umum Sharia, Skripsi, Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta.

Hassan, M. K. & Bashir, A. (2005), Determinants of Islamic Banking Profitability.Proceedings of the Economic Research Forum 10th Annual Conference, Marakesh-Morocco.

Iannotta, G., Nocera, G., & Sironi, A. (2007), Ownership structure, risk and performance in the European banking industry. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 31(7), 2127-2149.

Iqbal, M. (2001), Islamic and conventional banking in the nineties: A comparative stud. Islamic Economic Studies, 8(2): 1-28.

Iqbal, Z. and Mirakhor, A. (1999), Progress and challenges of Islamic banking. Thunderbird *International Business Review.* 41(4-5). 56-68.

Jaffar, M. and Manarvi, I. (2011), Performance comparison of Islamic and conventional Banks in Pakistan. *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 11(1), 59-66.

Kader, J.M., Asarpota, A.J. and Al-Maghaireh, A. (2007), Comparative Financial Performance of Islamic Banks vis-à-vis Conventional Banks in the UAE. Proceeding on Annual Student Research Symposium and the Chancellor's Undergraduate Research Award. retrieved *http://sra. uaeu.ac.ae/CURA /Proceedings* (May 31, 2007).

Mamatzakis, E. C., & Remoundos, P. C. (2003), Determinants of Greek commercial banks profitability 1989-2000. SPOUDAI, 53(1), 84-94.

Mannan, M. A. (1968), Islam and trend in modern banking: Theory and practice of interest free banking. *Islamic Review and Arab Affairs*, 73-95.

Merchant, I. P. (2012), Empirical study of Islamic Banks Versus Conventional Banks of GCC, *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, 12(20), 33-41.

Micco, A., Panizza, U., & Yañez, M. (2004), Bank ownership and performance (IDB Working Paper No. 429). Inter-American Development Bank, Research Department. Retrieved November, 2004, from SSRN: *http://ssrn.com/abstract=1818718 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139 / ssrn. 1818718.*

Micco, A., Panizza, U., Yanez, M. (2007), Bank ownership and performance: Does politics matter?. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 31, 219-241.

Naceur, S. B, & Goaied, M. (2008), The determinants of commercial bank interest margin and profitability: evidence from Tunisia. *Frontiers in Finance and Economics*, 5(1), 106–130.

Omran, M. (2007), Privatization, state ownership and bank performance in Egypt. World Development, 35(4), 714-733.

Pasiouras, F., & Kosmidou, K. (2007), Factors influencing the profitability of domestic and foreign commercial banks in the European Union. Research in International Business and Finance, 21(2), 222-237.

Ramadan, I. Z. (2011), Bank specific determinants of Islamic banks profitability: An empirical of the Jordanian market. *International Journal of Academic Research*, 3(6), 73-80.

Reaz, M. (2005), Linking Corporate Governance and Bank Performance: Evidence from Bangladesh. Bangladesh: North South University. Retrieved from *https://docs.google.com/viewer?.*

Riewsathirathorn, P., Jumroenvong, S., & Jiraporn, P. (2011), The impact of ownership concentration on bank performance and risk-taking: Evidence from East Asia. Retrieved March 8, 2011 from *https ://docs.google.com/viewer? a=v&q= cache: FKCwgmi4x0AJ :www.bus.tu.ac.th/uploadPR/web.*

Rosly, S. A. and Bakar, M.A.A. (2003), Performance of Islamic and Mainstream Banks in Malaysia. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30 (12), 1249-1265.

Saeed, M (1996), Islamic Banking and Interest. E.J. Brill, The Netherlands.

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

Samad, A. (2004), Performance of Interest Free Islamic Banks vis-à-vis Interest-Based Conventional Banks of Bahrain. *IIUM Journal of Economics and Management*, 12 (2), 1-25.

Samad, A. and Hassan, M. K. (2000), The performance of Malaysian Islamic Bank during 1984 -1997: An explanatory study. *Thoughts on Economics*, 10 (1&2), 7-26.

Sastrosuwito, S., & Suzuki, Y. (2012), The determinants of post-crisis Indonesian banking system profitability. *Economics and Finance Review*, 1(11), 48-57.

Steinherr A. and Huveneers C. (1994), On the Performance of Differently Regulated Financial Institution: Some Empirical Evidence. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 18, 271-306.

Sudiyatno, Bambang, (2010), Analisis Pengaruh Dana Pihak Ketiga, Bopo, Car Dan Ldr Terhadap Kinerja Keuangan Pada Sektor Perbankan Yang Go Public Di Bursa Efek Indonesia (Bei) (Periode 2005 2008). Skripsi,UniversitasStikubank, Semarang.

Sufian, F. (2010), Developments in the profitability of the Thailand banking sector: panel evidence from the post Asian crisis period. *International Journal Economics and Accounting*, 1(1/2), 161-179.

Sufian, F., & Habibullah, M. S. (2010), Assessing the impact of financial crisis on bank performance empirical evidence from Indonesia. *ASEAN Economic Bulletin*, 27(3), 245-62.

Wahidudin, A.Z., Subramanian, U. and Kamaluddin, P. (2012), Determinants of profitability-A comparative analysis of Islamic banks and conventional banks in ASEAN countries.2nd International Conference on Accounting, Business and Economic, MS Garden Hotel, Kuantan Pahang; Malaysia.

Widagdo, A. and Ika, S.R. (2007), The Interest prohibition and financial performance of Islamic Banks: Indonesia Evidence. Paper presented in 19th Asian-pacific Conference on International Accounting Issues. Malaysia, Kuala Lumpur.

Yu, P., & Neus, W. (2009), Market structure, scale efficiency and risk as determinants of German banking profitability. Retrieved from *http://econstor.eu /bitstream/ 10419/ 22093/1/ 294.pdf.*

Zeitun, R. (2012), Determinants of Islamic and Conventional banks performance in GCC countries using panel data analysis. *Global Economy and Finance Journal*, 5 (1), 53-72.