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Abstract

Financial performance evaluation of firms is one of the multi-criteria decision making (MCDM) problem. The aim of this study is to evaluate and rank banking firms which are traded in ISE with respect to overall financial performances. One of the promising methods VIKOR (Vise Kriterijumska Optimizacija I Kompromisno Resenje) which is a compromise ranking method used as a multi-criteria decision making (MCDM) techniques in this study. By the application of VIKOR banks are ranked with respect to their overall performances.
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1. INTRODUCTION

In the literature there are several studies to measure bank’s performances in Turkey. For example, the performance characteristics of Turkish private and state-owned commercial banks for the 1986–1990 period was investigated by Aydogan and Booth (1996). Mercan et al (2003) used financial ratios in DEA (data envelopment analysis) to assess the 1989–99 relative financial performance of Turkish banks. Özkan-Güney and Tektaş (2006) assessed the technical efficiency of nonpublic commercial banks between 1990 and 2001 following the DEA model. Erteğrul and Karakaşoğlu (2008) evaluated and ranking branches of one bank with the Vikor method. Seçme et al. (2009), used Fuzzy AHP and TOPSIS methods to evaluate the largest five commercial banks of Turkish Banking Sector. They used both financial and non-financial indicators in their analysis.

In this study VIKOR method (the compromise ranking method) is used for evaluating the performances of the banks which are traded in ISE (Istanbul Stock Exchange). The financial ratios which published in financial statements of 2008 and their calculated weights by Seçme et al. 2009 are used for make the comparison with VIKOR method.
2. VIKOR Method

The VIKOR Method was introduced as one applicable technique to implement within MCDM (Opricovic, 1998). The VIKOR method focuses on ranking and selecting from a set of alternatives, and determines compromise solutions for a problem with conflicting criteria, which can help the decision makers to reach a final decision (Opricovic and Tzeng, 2007).

The steps of the VIKOR Method are explained in detail below (Opricoviz and Tzeng, 2004; Opricoviz and Tzeng, 2007):

**Step 1.** Determination the best \( f_i^* \) and the worst \( f_i^- \) values of all criterion functions, \( i=1,2,\ldots,n \).

If the ith function represents a benefit then

\[
 f_i^* = \max_j f_{ij} \quad f_i^- = \min_j f_{ij} \quad \text{if the i-th function represents a benefit;} \tag{1}
\]

If the ith function represents a cost then

\[
 f_i^* = \min_j f_{ij} \quad f_i^- = \max_j f_{ij} \quad \text{if the i-th function represents a cost.}
\]

**Step 2.** Computation the values \( S_j \) and \( R_j \), \( j=1,2,\ldots,J \)

\[
 S_j = \sum_{i=1}^{n} w_i (f_i^* - f_{ij})/(f_i^* - f_i^-), \tag{2}
\]

\[
 R_j = \max_i [w_i (f_i^* - f_{ij})/(f_i^* - f_i^-)], \tag{3}
\]

Here \( w_i \) are the weights of criteria, expressing their relative importance. \( S \)

**Step 3.** Computation the values \( Q_j \), \( j=1,2,\ldots,J \)

\[
 Q_j = \nu (S_j - S^*)/(S^- - S^*) + (1 - \nu) (R_j - R^*)/(R^- - R^*) \tag{4}
\]

Where \( S^* = \min_j S_j \), \( S^- = \max_j S_j \), \( R^* = \min_j R_j \), \( R^- = \max_j R_j \).

\( \nu \) is introduced as weight of the strategy of “the majority of criteria” (or “the maximum group utility”), here \( \nu = 0.5 \).

**Step 4.** Ranking the alternatives, sorting by the values \( S, R \) and \( Q \). The results are three ranking lists.
Step 5. Proposing as a compromise solution the alternative \( a' \) which is ranked the best by the measure \( Q \) (minimum) if the following two conditions are satisfied:

C1: “Acceptable advantage”:

\[
Q(a'') - Q(a') \geq DQ
\]

Where \( a'' \) is the alternative \( DQ = 1/(J - 1) \); \( J \) is the number of alternatives.

C2. “Acceptable Stability in decision making”: The alternative \( a' \) must also be the best ranked by \( S \) or/and \( R \). This compromise solution is stable within a decision making process, which could be the strategy of maximum group utility (when \( v > 0.5 \) is needed), or “by consensus” \( v \approx 0.5 \), or “with veto” \( v < 0.5 \). Here, \( v \) is the weight of decision making strategy of maximum group utility.

3. APPLICATION

It has been argued that the measurement of bank’s performances is based on several criteria and those criteria are quantitative and qualitative. Quantitative criteria are financial ratios which are selected from annual reports of banks (Rakocic and Dragasevic, 2009). This study rates the banks according to following dimensions with some financial ratios based on the year 2008: Capital adequacy, Assets quality, Profitability, Income and Expenditure Structure, Group and Sectoral Shares. In this study the relative weights which calculated with Fuzzy AHP method by Seçme et al. (2009) are used (Table 1). Criteria’s weights are normalized and got the final weights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Main criteria and weights</th>
<th>Sub criteria and weights</th>
<th>Final weight</th>
<th>Main criteria and weights</th>
<th>Sub criteria and weights</th>
<th>Final weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capital Adequacy (0.189)</td>
<td>E/(ARW + MRBA) (0.546)</td>
<td>0.1086</td>
<td>Profitability (0.161)</td>
<td>NP(L)/P/TA (0.684)</td>
<td>0.1159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E/TA (0.161)</td>
<td>0.0320</td>
<td></td>
<td>NP(L)/E (0.316)</td>
<td>0.0536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(E/FA)/TA (0.293)</td>
<td>0.0583</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assets Quality (0.128)</td>
<td>SP(net)/TA (0.081)</td>
<td>0.0109</td>
<td>Income Expenditure Structure (0.109)</td>
<td>NET-II/TA (0.122)</td>
<td>0.0140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TC/TA (0.115)</td>
<td>0.0155</td>
<td></td>
<td>NET-II/TOP (0.232)</td>
<td>0.0266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAL (net)/TC (0.125)</td>
<td>0.0168</td>
<td></td>
<td>NON-II/TA (0.276)</td>
<td>0.0317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SRL/NAL (0.125)</td>
<td>0.0168</td>
<td></td>
<td>NON-IE/TOI (0.248)</td>
<td>0.0285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FA/TA (0.071)</td>
<td>0.0096</td>
<td>Group Share (0.109)</td>
<td>PCOR/TA (0.122)</td>
<td>0.0140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCA/TA (0.083)</td>
<td>0.0112</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FCL/TL (0.107)</td>
<td>0.0144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NRP/E (0.143)</td>
<td>0.0193</td>
<td>Sectoral Share (0.128)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(NBP+NOPB)/E (0.150)</td>
<td>0.0202</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity (0.176)</td>
<td>LA/TA (0.316)</td>
<td>0.0419</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LA/STL (0.684)</td>
<td>0.0907</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Capital adequacy: \( E/(ARW+MRBA) \): equities/(assets relative weights + market risk basis of amount), \( E/TA \): equities/total assets, \( (E-FA)/TA \): (equities – fixed assets)/total assets,

Income expenditure structure: Net-II/TA: net interest income/total assets, Net-II/TOI: net interest income/total operating profits, non-II/TA: non-interest incomes/total assets, non-IE/TOI: non-interest expenses/total operating incomes, PCOR/TA: provision for credit and other receivables/total assets,

Group share and sectoral share: TA: total assets, TC: total credits, TD: total deposits) (Seçme et al., 2009)

Thirteen Turkish banks which are traded in ISE are included in this study. They are Akbank, Alternatif Bank, Denizbank, Ekonomi Bank, Finans Bank, Fortis Bank, Garanti Bank, Halk Bank, İşbank, Şekerbank, Tekstil Bank, Vakıflar Bank and Yapı ve Kredi Bank. Although Kalkınma Bank and Türk Sinai Kalkınma Bank are traded in ISE they aren’t included this study. For the purposes of deposit banks Kalkınma Bank and Türk Sinai Kalkınma Bank are dissonant. Total 27 financial ratios of these 13 banks have gathered from the publications of the Bank Association of Turkey (www.tbb.org.tr).

**Table 2:** S, R and Q scores and ranks of the Banks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Q</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akbank</td>
<td>0.288</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternatif Bank</td>
<td>0.704</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.941</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denizbank</td>
<td>0.547</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ekonomi Bank</td>
<td>0.597</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finans Bank</td>
<td>0.568</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortis Bank</td>
<td>0.574</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.640</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garanti Bank</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halk Bank</td>
<td>0.505</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>İşbank</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.080</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Şekerbank</td>
<td>0.621</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.093</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tekstil Bank</td>
<td>0.671</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.960</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vakıflar Bank</td>
<td>0.484</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.103</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yapı ve Kredi Bank</td>
<td>0.535</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Firstly the best \( f_i^+ \) and the worst \( f_i^- \) values of all criterion functions are determinate from equation (1). After that with using the equation (2), (3) and (4) \( S_j, R_j \) and \( Q_j \) are calculated for each bank \( j=1,2,...,13 \). (\( Q_j \) values are computed by selecting \( v=0.5 \)). Table 2 gives the scores of banks and their corresponding rankings.

The best alternative, ranked by \( Q \), is the one with the minimum value of \( Q \). It can be seen that Garanti Bank is the best alternative.

Garanti Bank satisfies condition \( C1 \) and \( C2 \). Because 
\[
Q(a^+) - Q(a^-) = 0.128 - 0.039 = 0.089 \geq DQ = 0.083
\]
and this bank is also the best ranked by \( R \). Therefore Garanti Bank has an acceptable advantage and acceptable stability in decision making with respect to the other banks.

4. CONCLUSION

There are several methods for ranking and comparing banks. Evaluating the financial performance of banks is a complicated process. Analyzing banks performances and monitoring their financial condition is important to depositors, owners, potential investors, managers and regulators (Yue, 1992). In this study banks are rated according to the financial ratios based on their results in 2008. The bank rating list was produced using, the multi-criteria analysis method, called the VIKOR. With this method, banks overall performance are evaluated and it provides rating of banks with respect to other.

After the evaluation Garanti Bank has the highest rate among thirteen banks which are traded in ISE. The main list of banks can be seen in the table especially with respect to \( Q \).

The VIKOR method is sensitive to criteria’s weights (\( w_i \)). So the researches using VIKOR may test the result with alternative weights. Also the weight \( v \) has an important role in identifying the ranking. Further researches may compare results with setting this value between 0 and 1. The VIKOR method can also be used another sectors as a ranking methods and VIKOR method may compare with other MCDM Methods.
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