



Heriot-Watt University
Research Gateway

Determinants of financial performance of Islamic banks: An intellectual capital perspective

Citation for published version:

Nawaz, T & Haniffa, R 2017, 'Determinants of financial performance of Islamic banks: An intellectual capital perspective', *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 130-142.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/JIABR-06-2016-0071>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1108/JIABR-06-2016-0071](https://doi.org/10.1108/JIABR-06-2016-0071)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Heriot-Watt Research Portal](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via Heriot-Watt Research Portal is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

Heriot-Watt University has made every reasonable effort to ensure that the content in Heriot-Watt Research Portal complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact open.access@hw.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Emerald

Journal of Islamic
Accounting and
Business Research

Determinants of financial performance of Islamic banks: An intellectual capital perspective

Journal:	<i>Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research</i>
Manuscript ID	JIABR-06-2016-0071.R2
Manuscript Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Islamic financial institutions, Intellectual capital, Resource-based theory, Financial performance, VAIC

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Determinants of financial performance of Islamic banks: An intellectual capital perspective

Abstract

Purpose – The purpose of this paper is to empirically examine the effect of intangible resources i.e. intellectual capital (IC) on financial performance of 64 Islamic financial institutions (IFIs) operating in eighteen different countries for the period 2007–2011, while controlling for firm-specific variables viz. bank-size, level of risk, listing status, firm-complexity, type of auditor and operating region.

Design/methodology/approach – The required data to calculate different constituents of IC is derived from Bankscope database. Value Added Intellectual Coefficient (VAIC) methodology devised by Pulic is used to determine the impact of IC on financial performance of IFIs.

Findings – Results indicate a significant positive relationship between Value Added Intellectual Coefficient (VAIC) and accounting performance based on ROA. The results further indicate a significant positive relationship between accounting performance and capital employed efficiency (CEE) and human capital efficiency (HCE), but no significant relationship with regards to structural capital efficiency (SCE). Overall, the results suggest that value creation capability of IFIs is highly influenced by HCE and CEE.

Research limitations – The main limitation of the present study lies in its methodological tool, the VAIC methodology, which has been criticised by some researchers as not really measuring IC. Despite the inherent limitation of the VAIC methodology which relies on secondary data published in annual reports, it is still considered by some researchers as one of the best available tool to measure firms' IC in the absence of access to detailed internal information on IC.

Practical implications – The findings may serve as a useful input for Islamic bankers in managing their investments in IC within their institutions.

Originality/value – The main contribution of this paper is to use a previously little studied area, Islamic banking and finance, to identify the effect of intellectual capital on performance.

Keywords: Islamic financial institutions, Intellectual capital, Resource-based theory, Financial performance, VAIC.

1 Introduction

Traditional economic theory describes the basic resources for a firm to operate in terms of the classic land, labour and other economic assets (Sullivan, 2000). However, in the knowledge-economy era, organizations worldwide have recognized that a firm's intangible resources are more likely to contribute to the firm attaining and sustaining superior performance (Eisenhardt and Schoonhoven, 1996). Therefore, effective management of intellectual capital (IC) has been acknowledged as the most important source of value creation and competitive advantage of the modern organizations, including the financial services industry. To compete effectively in today's knowledge-intensive era, financial institutions may need to embrace a new set of strategic priorities (Li, 2001) in order to survive and also to compete with powerful new players entering the marketplace such as the Islamic financial institutions (IFIs).

Research on IC has been one of the most prolific research domains in the management literature in the last two decades. Studies focusing on high-tech industries such as IT (Hsu and Wang, 2012), biotechnology (Hermans and Kauranen, 2005), and manufacturing (Tseng and Goo, 2005) have shown a significant relationship between IC and corporate performance. Lately, studies have shown a sustained interest in the services sector and specifically in financial institutions (Al-Musali and Ismail, 2014; Curado et al., 2014; El-Bannany, 2008; Murthy and Mouritsen, 2011; Mention and Bontis, 2013; Kubo and Saka, 2002; Nimtrakoon, 2015) in comprehending how IC impacts on performance. However, studies conducted within the financial sector have shown mixed evidence on the relationship between IC and performance of banks. Furthermore, there is a dearth of research that has looked at the impact of IC on performance of Islamic financial institutions. The present study seeks to contribute to the literature in the area by empirically examining the impact of IC on performance of IFIs. We used the Value Added Intellectual Coefficient (VAIC) and its sub-components, human capital efficiency (HCE), structural capital efficiency (SCE) and capital employed efficiency

(CEE) developed by (Pulic, 2004) as proxies for IC. In a departure from prior research, our study is in a cross-country context.

The remainder of the paper is organised as follows. The next section presents a review of the literature and development of the hypotheses to be tested in the current study. Section 3 describes the research method employed followed by a discussion of the findings in Section 4. The final section presents the concluding remarks.

2 Background and Development of Hypotheses

Stewart (2007) posits that every business relies increasingly on knowledge and old-fashioned experience. Added together, this knowledge is intellectual capital (IC) which can be defined as the sum of everything everybody in the company knows that will help to provide competitive edge in the market. According to Sullivan (2000), IC basically constitutes knowledge, lore and innovations while Sveiby (1997) describes IC as the knowledge, experience, employee intellect and knowledge resources stocked up in an organization's databases system processes, culture and philosophy. According to CIMA (2001), IC is the possession of knowledge and experience, professional knowledge and skills, good relationships, and technological capacities, which when applied will give organizations competitive advantage.

IC can be further broken down into various components. Edvinsson and Malone (1997) classified IC into human capital and structural capital. The former is grounded on the knowledge created and stored by a firm's employees, while the latter is based on the embodiment, empowerment and supportive infrastructure of human capital. Structural capital can be further divided into organizational capital (knowledge created by and stored in an organization's information technology systems and processes that speeds the flow of knowledge through the organization) and customer capital (the relationships that an

1
2
3 organization has with its customers). Hsu and Wang (2012) simplifies that human capital can
4
5 leave the firm whenever it desires since the firm does not own it. Structural capital, on the
6
7 other hand, is knowledge that has been converted into something owned by the firm (e.g.
8
9 patents). The present study adopts the classic sub-division of IC into human and structural
10
11 capital proposed by Edvinsson and Malone (1997).
12
13

14
15 It is widely accepted that a firm's capability to innovate is closely tied to its
16
17 intellectual capital (Subramaniam and Youndt, 2005). Accordingly, firms are viewed as the
18
19 distributed knowledge systems composed of individuals who embody knowledge (Un and
20
21 Cuervo-Cazurra, 2004). Equally, somewhat sophisticated structural mechanism is essential to
22
23 transform the intellectual ideas into tangible assets. Such an environment is provided by the
24
25 structural capital, which enables an organization to create and leverage knowledge. Strong
26
27 structural capital will also have a supportive culture that encourages employees to try and
28
29 learn new knowledge. In other words, it is important to recognise that human and structural
30
31 capitals are interdependent i.e. the implementation of structural capital relies on human
32
33 capital and the quality of human capital determines the quality of structural capital. At the
34
35 same time, financial capital is also essential to run the business like well-oiled machines.
36
37
38

39
40 In the case of Islamic financial institutions, IC is highly significant due to the fact that
41
42 the whole phenomenon of Islamic banking is based on the intangible intellectual ideology of
43
44 *Shariah*, the Islamic religious law, which guides Islamic Economics. Under *Shariah*, IFIs are
45
46 duty-bound: 1) not to deal with interest-based (*riba*) activities; 2) not allowed to undertake
47
48 speculative (*gharar*) activities; and 3) prohibited from financing specific illicit (*haram*)
49
50 activities. Besides, IFIs are based on trust; hence, safeguarding reputation, credibility and
51
52 legitimacy are the alternative performance objectives for IFIs rather than attaining pure
53
54 financial outcomes. Therefore, IFIs are expected not to cause moral hazard and suffer from
55
56 agency problem. Furthermore, the risk sharing principle and real economic transactions
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 backed by tangible asset, suggests clear differences in the funding and activity structures of
4
5 Islamic and conventional financial institutions (Beck et al., 2013). Since IFIs came into
6
7 existence to provide ethical/cooperative financial solutions to the society at large and are not
8
9 subject to any particular ethical group, such institutions are expected to be more innovative in
10
11 providing alternative banking solutions by exploiting their various intellectual capitals in
12
13 order to gain competitive advantage and enhance firm performance. IFIs require a
14
15 subsequently higher degree of intellectual capabilities, especially human intellectual capital
16
17 for endorsement of product innovation. Hence, value creation in Islamic finance industry is a
18
19 combination of human, structural and financial capital and it is important to examine which
20
21 of the three components contributes most to the value creation of IFIs.
22
23
24
25
26

27 **2.1 Development of Hypotheses**

28
29 The resource-based view of the firm argues that differences in profitability across
30
31 organizations can be explained by differences in their portfolio of resources and how these
32
33 resources are articulated (Wernerfelt, 1984). According to Barney (1991), the resource-based
34
35 theory recognizes intangible assets as critical factors in generating sustainable competitive
36
37 advantage necessary for the creation of superior business performance. Markets around the
38
39 globe have witnessed an industrial shift from being capital-intensive to knowledge-based.
40
41 The traditional performance measures fail to measure and monitor multiple dimensions of
42
43 performance as they concentrate almost exclusively on financial aspects of the organizations
44
45 (Amaratunga et al., 2001). Therefore, new techniques are necessary to measure the value of
46
47 intangibles and their impact on firm's performance.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

2.1.1 Value Added Intellectual Capital and Performance

The primary pursuit of any business is to create and maintain value (O'Cass and Ngo, 2011).

The concept of value added (VA), which refers to the overall value creation efficiency of all resources a firm possesses, is increasingly viewed as an important variable in assessing performance. Various authorities argue that value creation in the knowledge-intensive sectors such as the banking industry require both IC and physical assets (Stewart 2007; Bontis, 1998; Pulic, 2004; Goh, 2005). On the other hand, the extent literature at times tend to treat the sub-components of IC i.e. human IC and structural IC as completely independent construct, thereby losing sight of the whole IC. This is not to say that defining and understanding the subcategories of IC is not important but quite the contrary. In fact, developing theoretically based subcategories of IC is a necessity in advancing our ability to operationalize and understand the abstract and sometimes confusing concept. Youndt et al. (2004) posits that treating human IC and structural IC as discrete, unidimensional phenomena tends to simplify reality by not explicitly acknowledging the potential patterns of coexistence among these differing types of IC. Therefore, in order to fully understand how IC develops and drives performance, it may be helpful to look at an organization's overall profile of IC in the aggregate before independently focusing on individual parts.

Accordingly, it is expected that the higher a firm's aggregate stock of IC, the more successful the firm will be and the greater will be its competitive advantage. In other words, the higher the value added intellectual coefficient of IC that the IFI has, the higher will be its accounting performance based on ROA. Therefore, our first hypothesis is stated as follows:

Hypothesis 1: There is a significant positive relationship between VAIC and IFIs' performance

The extent literature suggests that IC is typically understood to consist of human IC, which is creative, and structural or organizational IC which consists of best practices. Murthy

1
2
3 and Mouritsen (2011) argue that each of the intellectual capital elements *viz.* human IC and
4 structural IC, has a fragile identity and causality, and therefore it has only limited individual
5 power to increase creativity, or to consolidate best practice. Therefore, it is necessary to
6 measure the contribution of each resource i.e. human IC, structural IC, and financial capital
7 separately. Accordingly, we also measure the sub-components of VAIC *viz.* HCE, SCE, and
8 CEE separately, to examine which of the three components contributes most to the value
9 creation of IFIs.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 **2.1.2 Human Capital and Performance**

22 Colombo and Grilli (2005) suggest that firms with greater human IC (i.e. higher education or
23 skill) are likely to have better entrepreneurial judgment and as long as human IC continues to
24 be developed, staff can improve their job performance and ultimately improve the firm's
25 performance (Hsu, 2007). Human IC increases as staff accumulate specialized information,
26 skills and know-how, which allow them to communicate efficiently and effectively, thus
27 reducing decision-making errors, and improving performance (Luthans and Youssef, 2004).
28 This inference also finds support in other literature streams. Human capital theorists (Becker,
29 1964; Schultz; 1961), for instance, simply reason that an increase in worker skills, knowledge,
30 and abilities will most likely translate into increased organizational performance. In other
31 words, human IC generates new ideas and techniques that can be embodied in production
32 equipment and processes; this initiates changes in production and service delivery methods;
33 and improves internal relations (between workers and management) as well as external
34 relations (between customers, suppliers, regulators, and firm), and alternatively improves
35 organizational performance (Berg, 1969). Likewise, Dakhli and De Clercq (2004) suggest
36 that a firm's stock of human IC will influence its profitability.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the case of IFIs, human IC is important as employees are expected to not only have
4 conventional knowledge and skills related to the provision of such services but also having
5 good knowledge on *Shariah* as this will enhance the credibility and reputation of IFIs in the
6 market place. Thus, our next hypothesis is as follows:
7
8
9
10

11
12 *Hypothesis 1a: There is a significant positive relationship between HCE and IFIs'*
13 *performance*
14
15

16 17 18 **2.1.3 Structural Capital and Performance**

19
20 Structural IC provides an environment which enables an organization to create and leverage
21 knowledge. An organization with strong structural IC will have a supportive culture that
22 encourages employees to try and learn new knowledge (Florin et al., 2003). De Brentani and
23 Kleinschmidt (2004) suggest that an organization's operation processes and the organizational
24 commitment to sufficient resources will have a significant impact on performance. A similar
25 suggestion is made by Youndt et al. (2004), who found structural IC to be typically
26 associated with financial returns and Tobin's Q. Likewise, Hsu and Wang (2012) posit that
27 structural IC, i.e. operations, procedures and the processes of knowledge management, propel
28 organizations' value creation activities which in turn will have a positive effect on their
29 performance. In other words, firms require advanced technologies to compete in today's fast-
30 paced economy and greater care is needed to manage structural IC so that the required level of
31 performance is achieved. Huang and Liu (2005), for example, employed multiple regression
32 models to examine the relationships between innovation capital and information technology
33 (IT) capital (i.e. structural IC) and firm's performance, and reported that investment in
34 structural IC has a positive effect on performance.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 IFIs adopt different structural process and system to track and record their transactions.
54 Unlike the conventional banking system, penalty on late payment, for instance, is not credited
55 into the account receivables. Such penalties are considered as interest and are subject to a
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 charity account set for the benevolence loans and other charitable purposes. This requires
4
5 development and investment in the structural processes that may affect their firm
6
7 performance. Therefore, our next of hypothesis is:
8
9

10 Hypothesis 1b: *There is a significant positive relationship between SCE and IFIs'*
11 *performance*
12

13 14 **2.1.4 Financial Capital and Performance**

15
16 Research generally explains that IC has to be contextualized by other resources including
17
18 physical and financial ones (Youndt et al., 2004; de Castro and Sáez, 2008). At the crux of
19
20 this research is that IC does have the positive agenda of growth where it is understood to
21
22 bring financial capital forward. Yet, the dilemma is that IC as a resource is not only
23
24 expensive but must compete with many other types of investments that emerge as part of
25
26 organizational processes such as financial planning and budgeting. While prior research has
27
28 identified difficulties in establishing credible, statistical relations between non-financial and
29
30 financial performance measures (Ittner, 2008; Wyatt, 2008), Murthy and Mouritsen (2011)
31
32 analysed the relationship between IC and financial capital and conclude that the relationship
33
34 between IC and financial capital is complementary rather than causal. However, the study
35
36 suggests that better firm performance is achievable subject to the combination of firm's IC
37
38 and financial capital.
39
40
41
42

43
44 Most of the IFIs are based along the Arabian Peninsula, which is blessed with
45
46 petrodollar. The powerful groups in the Gulf-region, particularly the Royal families, their
47
48 extended families, and to a lesser degree those having close working relationship with them
49
50 (Hudaib and Haniffa, 2009), own most of the wealth in the Gulf-region. This provided
51
52 Islamic banking an opportunity to lure the huge sums of petrodollars amassed in Royal hands,
53
54 as well as the small group of local capitalist élites, to benefit the wider society. However, the
55
56 social impacts of such an arrangement remain unknown to date. What is known is that a
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 major proportion of this wealth is channelled through IFIs for investment purposes as the
4 clients seek investment opportunities that will not violate their religious obligations. IFIs
5 offer such platform that brings huge sums of money into the *Shariah*-compliant business and
6 subsequently, increases the physical and financial capital base of IFIs. The financial capital
7 raised from shareholders and depositors must be managed efficiently as it is based on the
8 Islamic concept of *amanah* (trust). Since no interest is involved in Islamic banking and profit
9 is solely earned through employing capital in different projects, we expect the efficiency of
10 capital employed to be positively associated with the overall performance of IFIs. Hence, our
11 next hypothesis is;

12
13
14 Hypothesis 1c: *There is a significant positive relationship between CEE and IFIs*
15 *performance.*
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 24 25 26 27 28 29 **3 Research Design**

30
31 The sample of IFIs in our study was selected based on the Bankscope database which has a
32 unique collection of micro-level banking information for different countries and is widely
33 used for international studies and policymaking (Demirgüç-Kunt and Detragiache, 1998).
34 Initially, a total of 157 Islamic financial institutions (IFIs) representing 21 countries
35 worldwide were identified. Since we dealt with a panel data for 5 years from 2007 to 2011,
36 we filtered the database for data availability and selected a final sample of 64 IFIs operating
37 in eighteen different geographical regions into three main groupings, namely, Asia, Europe
38 and the Middle-East.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 53 54 **3.1 Dependent Variable**

55 The dependent variable in our model is the performance of IFIs. Performance is
56 operationalized in terms of the monetary terms that a firm receives in exchange for the price
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 it pays for products or services (Hsu and Wang, 2012). This rationale is supported by the
4
5 transaction cost theory (Williamson, 1985), which has dominated theoretical and empirical
6
7 research in this area. Financial-based index such as return on assets (ROA) and return of
8
9 equity (ROE) are traditionally employed to measure performance (Usoff et al., 2002). ROA
10
11 gives an idea as to how efficient management is at using its assets to generate earnings, while
12
13 ROE measures a firm's efficiency at generating profits from every dollar of net assets, and
14
15 shows how well a company uses investment dollars to generate earnings growth.
16
17
18

19
20 These traditional accounting based performance measures have been criticized for
21
22 their inadequacy in guiding strategic decisions. In particular, they do not consider the cost of
23
24 capital incurred to fund the projects that generate these returns, and thus are severely lacking
25
26 as instruments to guide managers in their quest for value-creating venues. In addition, they
27
28 often fail to shed light on underlying causes for high or low performance of organizations
29
30 (Bontis, 1998). However, some researchers (e.g., Stewart, 2007) argue that financial-
31
32 performance measures, particularly ROA, are more appropriate in IC studies because they
33
34 can be used to illustrate the financial value of intangible assets. While some studies have used
35
36 more than one financial-performance measure i.e. ROA, return on sales, and ROE
37
38 simultaneously (see Ho and Williams, 2003; Youndt et al., 2004), others have used single
39
40 measure (e.g., El-Bannany, 2008; Hsu and Wang, 2012). Consistent with the latter stream of
41
42 research, this study uses ROA as an accounting based performance measure of IFIs. Return
43
44 on equity is ruled out because it is seen to be more sensitive to capital structure.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51 **3.2 Independent Variables**

52
53 The value added intellectual coefficient (VAICTM) devised by Pulic (2000) forms the basis in
54
55 measuring the efficiency of value added (VA) by a firm's total resources as well as each
56
57 major resource component (Ho and Williams, 2003). VAICTM is a composite sum of three
58
59
60

1
2
3 indicators termed as: (1) Human Capital Efficiency (HCE), an indicator of the efficiency of
4 VA by human capital resources employed; (2) Structural Capital Efficiency (SCE), an
5 indicator of the efficiency of VA by structural capital; and (3) Capital Employed Efficiency
6 (CEE), which indicates how much value is created for every monetary unit invested in
7 financial or physical capital. Algebraically the VAICTM relationship is formalized as:
8
9

$$10 \quad VAIC^{TM} = HCE + SCE + CEE$$

11
12 Where VAICTM = VA intellectual coefficient; HCE = human capital coefficient;
13
14 SCE = structural capital coefficient, and CEE = capital employed coefficient.
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 Value added (VA) of a firm is calculated by subtracting expenses from revenues. HCE is
24 calculated by dividing a company's VA by its expenditures on human capital. SCE is
25 calculated by dividing a company's investment expenses on structural capital by its VA. A
26 firm's CEE is obtained by dividing its VA by the book value of the net assets. A high
27 coefficient indicates higher value creation using the firm's resources including IC.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **3.3 Proxy Measures for Control Variables**

39 As knowledge creation, diffusion, and storage are inherently evolutionary in nature, the
40 degree to which an organization develops its IC may vary across the sample. Accordingly, a
41 number of firm-specific variables as suggested by the extant literature are used in this study
42 (i.e. Al-Musali and Ismail, 2014; Beck et al., 2013; Nimtrakoon, 2015). Standard proxies
43 used to measure the control factors in this study are formally defined as: (i) firm-size, proxied
44 by the natural logarithm of total capital, (ii) level of risk, which is measured using leverage as
45 a proxy, (iii) firm-complexity, using number of subsidiaries as proxy, (iv) listing status,
46 dichotomous, yes/no (v) type of auditor, dichotomous, yes/no, and (vi) operating region is
47 calculated as 1 if the bank is based in Gulf-region, 0 otherwise.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

4 Empirical Results and Analysis

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Following prior studies (e.g., Chen and Chen, 2012) continuous variables are Winsorized at the 5th and 95th percentiles respectively in order to mitigate the effects for outliers. The data is normally distributed after removing the outliers. Table 1 provides the descriptive statistics *viz.* mean, standard deviation, minimum, maximum, standardised skewness and kurtosis, for the dependent and independent variables used in our models. Focusing first on the dependent variables in Table 1, it can be seen that the overall accounting performance of sampled IFIs is sound as indicated by ROA with a mean of 0.67, suggesting that during the study period sampled IFIs were able to generate profit.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

As for the continuous independent variables, it can be seen that the average mean of 3.93 for value added intellectual coefficient (VAIC) suggests that during the period 2007-2011, the sample IFIs were generally efficient in generating value from their intellectual capital. Descriptive statistics related to the segregated independent variables indicate that HCE, SCE and CEE all have positive means of 2.94, 0.7 and 0.19 respectively. This suggests that HCE remained the main value driver for IFIs during the study period, indicating the effective utilization of human capital.

For firm-specific control variables, it can be seen that the mean size of IFIs is 14.36. The results lend support to the findings of the earlier research (Khan, 2010, Beck et al., 2013), which documented the stability of IFIs during the recent financial crisis. Level of risk, measured using leverage as proxy has a minimum and maximum value of 4.37 and 77.99 respectively, indicating the risk diversity within the industry.

Table 1 also presents the results based on Pearson's correlation. It can be seen that our variable of interest, VAIC, is positively correlated with accounting-based performance measures at 0.56. Similarly, all the sub-components of value added i.e. HCE, CEE and SCE, are positively related to ROA with the exception of SCE, which is positive but not significant.

Before running the regression, we conducted analysis of residuals, plots of the studentised residuals against predicted values and they indicate no problems of homoscedasticity and linearity. Residuals of standard tests on skewness and kurtosis indicated some problem with the normality assumption for four of the variables and we transformed the data accordingly using natural logarithm and cube root to get the best fit. To test the hypotheses developed in this study, we ran the following main regression model:

$$ROA = \alpha + \beta_1 VAIC + \beta_2 FSize + \beta_3 Risk + \beta_5 Sub + \beta_4 Listing + \varepsilon \quad \text{Regression Eq.}$$

4.2 Does Intellectual Capital affect financial performance of IFIs?

Table 2 reports the results of the regression analysis based on accounting performance, ROA. We run the model four times, referred to as Model 1, 1a, 1b and 1c. Model 1 is our main regression model, which examines the association between accounting-based performance of IFIs and VAIC. Value added intellectual coefficient (VAIC) is found to have a significant ($p < 0.01$) positive relationship with ROA, thus supporting hypothesis 1. This suggests that IFIs are efficient in creating value through their intellectual capital and financial capital resources. A significant negative relationship at 10% level can be seen between accounting based performance of IFIs and risk while all other firm-related control variables are not statistically significant in Model 1.

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

1
2
3 In addition to the main model, three models are developed to measure the segregated impact
4 of IC on accounting performance of IFIs. Models 1a, 1b and 1c are the same as Model 1 but
5
6
7 this time, the composite measure VAIC was substituted with the independent variables
8
9
10 related to the three dimensions of VAIC *viz.* HCE, SCE, and CEE. Model 1a examines the
11
12 association between accounting-based performance of IFIs and human capital efficiency. The
13
14 results from Model 1a are reported in the fourth column of Table 2, which indicates
15
16 significant positive relationship at 1% level between human capital efficiency and ROA,
17
18 supporting hypothesis 1a. The results corroborate human IC as the primary source of value
19
20 creation, which allows for better understanding of the hidden values of intellectual wealth
21
22 (Subramaniam and Youndt, 2005). These findings are consistent with earlier studies (Goh,
23
24 2005; Mavridis and Kyrmizoglou, 2005; Mention and Bontis, 2013), which reported that
25
26 human IC contributes both directly and indirectly to business performance in the banking
27
28 sector.
29
30

31
32 Model 1b examines the association between accounting-based performance of IFIs
33
34 and SCE. The results in Model 1b, reported in the fifth column of Table 2, show no
35
36 significant relationship between structural capital efficiency and accounting-based
37
38 performance measure, thus not supporting our hypothesis 1b. However, this result does lend
39
40 support to the argument that there may be trade-offs between the elements of intellectual
41
42 capital, as proposed by Murthy and Mouritsen (2011), suggesting that multiple forms of
43
44 intellectual capital may be unproductive. Consequently, not all investments in the elements of
45
46 IC are profitable for IFIs (Youndt et al., 2004; Li, 2001).
47
48

49
50 Model 1c examines the association between accounting-based performance of IFIs
51
52 and capital employed efficiency (CEE). Results in Model 1c, reported in the sixth column of
53
54 Table 2, are similar to those of Model 1a but with a slightly higher coefficient. The results
55
56 suggest a significant positive relationship at the 1% level between CEE and ROA, thus
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 supporting hypothesis 1c. Firm-specific control variables are not significant with the
4
5 exception of risk and listing status, which are both significant at the 1% level in the predicted
6
7 direction.
8
9

10 The overall results are in agreement with previous studies (Al-Musali and Ismail,
11
12 2014; Curado et al., 2014; Nimtrakoon, 2015; Reed et al., 2006), which documented a
13
14 positive relationship between IC and bank's accounting performance. Furthermore, our
15
16 results indicate a significant positive relationship between financial performance and the
17
18 variables, capital employed efficiency (CEE) and human capital efficiency (HCE), suggesting
19
20 that ROA captures the value added intellectual coefficient from both CEE and HCE. Overall,
21
22 our findings in the context of IFIs are consistent with previous research in the context of
23
24 conventional banks by prior studies (Mavridis, 2004; Goh, 2005; Murthy and Mouritsen,
25
26 2011), that posit that the best performing banks are those that utilized their human intellectual
27
28 capital and physical capital.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 **5 Summary and Conclusion**

36
37 The main contribution of this paper is to examine the impact of intellectual capital (IC) on the
38
39 accounting-based performance of 64 Islamic financial institutions (IFIs) operating in eighteen
40
41 different countries worldwide for the period of 2007–2011, while controlling for firm-specific
42
43 variables. Results indicate a significant positive relationship between Value Added
44
45 Intellectual Coefficient (VAIC) and financial performance based on ROA. Our results further
46
47 indicate a significant positive relationship between financial performance and the variables,
48
49 capital employed efficiency (CEE) and human capital efficiency (HCE), suggesting that ROA
50
51 captures the Value Added Intellectual Coefficient from both CEE and HCE. Overall our
52
53 findings in the context of IFIs are consistent with previous research in the context of
54
55 conventional banks. Islamic finance is still a rapidly evolving area, and new research is
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 clearly needed to understand the key dynamics of such way of banking in the networked
4
5 economy.
6

7 The study is not without limitations. The main limitation on the present study lies in
8
9 its methodological tool, the VAIC methodology. Pulic (2004) argues that labour expenses are
10
11 to be equated as investment in corporate human capital rather than an expense. However, if
12
13 human capital is seen as an investment, the question arises as to whether it would be
14
15 represented as an asset, which Pulic (2004) failed to address. Countering Pulic's view, it is
16
17 argued that if human capital was an asset, labour expenses would have to be added to capital
18
19 employed for the calculation of VAIC. Furthermore, Pulic (2004) considers the remaining
20
21 operating expenses to represent structural capital as the residual of value added less human
22
23 capital. The review of this project argues that Pulic's residual approach faces two major
24
25 weaknesses. First, the residual approach assumes that all operating expenses are related to IC.
26
27 Second, it may not capture all IC as favourable financial relations (i.e. relational capital) are
28
29 omitted, which may be reflected in interest expenses rather than operating expenses. Despite
30
31 these flaws, IC studies have continued to utilised the concept of VAIC (Goh, 2005; Kamath,
32
33 2007; Joshi et al., 2013; Nimtrakoon, 2015) and scholars still appreciate VAIC methodology
34
35 (Andriessen, 2004; Bontis, 2001). Therefore, it should be noted that despite the inherent
36
37 limitations of VAIC, the contributions made by the present study are still valid given data
38
39 availability. While IC management can draw on internal data to examine IC, external data on
40
41 IC value are rarely available for IC research. Therefore, IC research has investigated
42
43 numerous approaches to find indicators of IC value from different perspectives. In the
44
45 absence of internal data, VAIC methodology is still the best available tool to measure firms'
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
IC.

References

- Al-Musali, M.A.K. and Ismail, K.N.I.K., 2014. Intellectual capital and its effect on financial performance of banks: Evidence from Saudi Arabia. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 164(1), pp.201-207.
- Amaratunga, D., Baldry, D. and Sarshar, M., 2001. Process improvement through performance measurement: the balanced scorecard methodology. *Work Study*, 50(5), pp.179-189.
- Andriessen, D., 2004. *Making sense of intellectual capital: designing a method for the valuation of intangibles*. Routledge.
- Barney, J., 1991. Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, 17(1), pp.99-120.
- Beck, T., Demirgüç-Kunt, A. and Merrouche, O., 2013. Islamic vs. conventional banking: Business model, efficiency and stability. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 37(2), pp.433-447.
- Becker, G.S., 1964. Human capital theory. *Columbia, New York*.
- Berg, I. E. 1969. *Jobs: The Great Training Robbery*, New York, Praeger Publishers.
- Bontis, N., 2001. Assessing knowledge assets: a review of the models used to measure intellectual capital. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 3(1), pp.41-60.
- Bontis, N., 1998. Intellectual capital: an exploratory study that develops measures and models. *Management Decision*, 36(2), pp.63-76.
- Chen, S.S. and Chen, I.J., 2012. Corporate governance and capital allocations of diversified firms. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 36(2), pp.395-409.
- Colombo, M.G. and Grilli, L., 2005. Founders' human capital and the growth of new technology-based firms: A competence-based view. *Research Policy*, 34(6), pp.795-816.
- CIMA 2011. *Managing the intellectual capital within today's knowledge-based organisations: Technical Briefing*.
- Curado, C., Guedes, M.J. and Bontis, N., 2014. The financial crisis of banks (before, during and after): an intellectual capital perspective. *Knowledge and Process Management*, 21(2), pp.103-111.

- 1
2
3 Dakhli, M. and De Clercq, D., 2004. Human capital, social capital, and innovation: a multi-
4 country study. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development*, 16(2), pp.107-128.
5
6
7 de Castro, G.M. and Sáez, P.L., 2008. Intellectual capital in high-tech firms: The case of
8 Spain. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 9(1), pp.25-36.
9
10
11 De Brentani, U. and Kleinschmidt, E.J., 2004. Corporate culture and commitment: impact on
12 performance of international new product development programs. *Journal of Product*
13 *Innovation Management*, 21(5), pp.309-333.
14
15
16 Demirgüç-Kunt, A. and Detragiache, E., 1998. Financial liberalization and financial fragility.
17
18
19 Edvinsson, L. and Malone, M.S., 1997. Intellectual Capital: Realizing Your Company's True
20 Value by Finding Its Hidden Brainpower, New York, Harper Collins Publishers, Inc.
21
22
23 El-Bannany, M., 2008. A study of determinants of intellectual capital performance in banks:
24 the UK case. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 9(3), pp.487-498.
25
26
27 Florin, J., Lubatkin, M. and Schulze, W., 2003. A social capital model of high-growth
28 ventures. *Academy of Management Journal*, 46(3), pp.374-384.
29
30
31 Goh, C.P., 2005. Intellectual capital performance of commercial banks in Malaysia. *Journal*
32 *of Intellectual Capital*, 6(3), pp.385-396.
33
34
35 Hermans, R. and Kauranen, I., 2005. Value creation potential of intellectual capital in
36 biotechnology—empirical evidence from Finland. *R&D Management*, 35(2), pp.171-
37 185.
38
39
40 Ho, C.A. and Williams, S.M., 2003. International comparative analysis of the association
41 between board structure and the efficiency of value added by a firm from its physical
42 capital and intellectual capital resources. *The International Journal of*
43 *Accounting*, 38(4), pp.465-491.
44
45
46 Hsu, L.C. and Wang, C.H., 2012. Clarifying the effect of intellectual capital on performance:
47 the mediating role of dynamic capability. *British Journal of Management*, 23(2),
48 pp.179-205.
49
50
51 Hsu, D.H., 2007. Experienced entrepreneurial founders, organizational capital, and venture
52 capital funding. *Research Policy*, 36(5), pp.722-741.
53
54
55
56 Huang, C.J. and Liu, C.J., 2005. Exploration for the relationship between innovation, IT and
57 performance. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 6(2), pp.237-252.
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Hudaib, M. and Haniffa, R., 2009. Exploring auditor independence: an interpretive
4 approach. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 22(2), pp.221-246.
5
6
7 Ittner, C.D., 2008. Does measuring intangibles for management purposes improve
8 performance? A review of the evidence. *Accounting and Business Research*, 38(3),
9 pp.261-272.
10
11
12 Joshi, M., Cahill, D., Sidhu, J. and Kansal, M., 2013. Intellectual capital and financial
13 performance: an evaluation of the Australian financial sector. *Journal of Intellectual*
14 *Capital*, 14(2), pp.264-285.
15
16
17 Kamath, G.B., 2007. The intellectual capital performance of the Indian banking
18 sector. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 8(1), pp.96-123.
19
20
21 Khan, F., 2010. How 'Islamic' is Islamic Banking?. *Journal of Economic Behavior &*
22 *Organization*, 76(3), pp.805-820.
23
24
25 Kubo, I. and Saka, A., 2002. An inquiry into the motivations of knowledge workers in the
26 Japanese financial industry. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 6(3), pp.262-271.
27
28
29 Li, F., 2001. The Internet and the deconstruction of the integrated banking model. *British*
30 *Journal of Management*, 12(4), pp.307-322.
31
32
33 Luthans, F. and Youssef, C.M., 2004. Human, social, and now positive psychological capital
34 management: Investing in people for competitive advantage. *Organizational*
35 *Dynamics*, 33(2), pp.143-160.
36
37
38 Mavridis, D.G., 2004. The intellectual capital performance of the Japanese banking
39 sector. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 5(1), pp.92-115.
40
41
42 Mention, A.L. and Bontis, N., 2013. Intellectual capital and performance within the banking
43 sector of Luxembourg and Belgium. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 14(2), pp.286-
44 309.
45
46
47 Murthy, V. and Mouritsen, J., 2011. The performance of intellectual capital: mobilising
48 relationships between intellectual and financial capital in a bank. *Accounting,*
49 *Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 24(5), pp.622-646.
50
51
52 Nimtrakoon, S., 2015. The relationship between intellectual capital, firms' market value and
53 financial performance: Empirical evidence from the ASEAN. *Journal of Intellectual*
54 *Capital*, 16(3), pp.587-618.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 O'Cass, A. and Ngo, L.V., 2011. Examining the firm's value creation process: a managerial
4 perspective of the firm's value offering strategy and performance. *British Journal of*
5 *Management*, 22(4), pp.646-671.
6
7
8 Pulic, A., 2004. Intellectual capital-does it create or destroy value? *Measuring Business*
9 *Excellence*, 8(1), pp.62-68.
10
11 Pulic, A., 2000. VAIC™—an accounting tool for IC management. *International Journal of*
12 *Technology Management*, 20(5-8), pp.702-714.
13
14
15 Reed, K.K., Lubatkin, M. and Srinivasan, N., 2006. Proposing and testing an intellectual
16 capital-based view of the firm. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(4), pp.867-893.
17
18
19 Schultz, T.W., 1961. Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review*, 51(1),
20 pp.1-17.
21
22
23 Stewart, T.A., 2007. *The wealth of knowledge: Intellectual capital and the twenty-first*
24 *century organization*. Crown Business.
25
26
27 Subramaniam, M. and Youndt, M.A., 2005. The influence of intellectual capital on the types
28 of innovative capabilities. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(3), pp.450-463.
29
30
31 Sullivan, P.H., 2000. *Value driven intellectual capital: how to convert intangible corporate*
32 *assets into market value*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc..
33
34
35 Sveiby, K.E., 1997. *The new organizational wealth: Managing & measuring knowledge-*
36 *based assets*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.
37
38
39 Tseng, C.Y. and James Goo, Y.J., 2005. Intellectual capital and corporate value in an
40 emerging economy: empirical study of Taiwanese manufacturers. *R&D*
41 *Management*, 35(2), pp.187-201.
42
43
44 Un, C.A. and Cuervo-Cazurra, A., 2004. Strategies for Knowledge Creation in Firms. *British*
45 *Journal of Management*, 15(1), pp.27-41.
46
47
48 Usoff, C.A., Thibodeau, J.C. and Burnaby, P., 2002. The importance of intellectual capital
49 and its effect on performance measurement systems. *Managerial Auditing*
50 *Journal*, 17(1/2), pp.9-15.
51
52
53 Wernerfelt, B., 1984. A resource-based view of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal*, 5(2),
54 pp.171-180.
55
56
57 Williamson, O.E., 1985. *The economic institutions of capitalism*. Simon and Schuster.
58
59
60

Wyatt, A., 2008. What financial and non-financial information on intangibles is value-relevant? A review of the evidence. *Accounting and Business Research*, 38(3), pp.217-256.

Youndt, M.A., Subramaniam, M. and Snell, S.A., 2004. Intellectual capital profiles: an examination of investments and returns. *Journal of Management Studies*, 41(2), pp.335-361.

Table 1

Correlation Matrix and Descriptive Statistics of Performance Measures and Continuous Independent Variables

	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	Skew.	Kurt.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. ROA	0.666	2.374	-3.81	3.809	-0.483	2.245	1.00									
2. VAIC	3.925	2.018	0.361	7.03	-0.289	2.214	0.5578***									
3. HCE	2.941	1.85	-0.281	5.898	-0.234	2.241	0.656***	0.9065***								
4. SCE	0.698	0.219	0.267	1.052	-0.441	2.8	-0.0299	0.4111***	0.2147***							
5. CEE	0.191	0.156	-0.094	0.488	0.059	2.487	0.566***	0.56***	0.6076***	-0.0558						
6. lnFSize	14.361	1.557	10.787	16.836	-0.674	2.736	0.3376***	0.3725***	0.4397***	0.0366	0.4516***					
7. Risk	42.504	21.858	4.369	77.986	0.009	1.973	0.1795**	0.1685**	0.204***	-0.1406*	0.4576***	0.3397***				
8. Sub	6.031	6.875	0	20	0.989	2.613	0.1494**	-0.0584	-0.0424	0.0109	0.0477	0.2423***	-0.036			
9. Listing	0.481	0.5	0	1	0.075	1.006	0.2479***	0.1269*	0.1893***	-0.0481	0.1575**	0.226***	0.1814**	0.2753***		
10. Acstd	0.466	0.5	0	1	0.138	1.019	-0.0248	-0.0673	-0.0361	-0.097	-0.0682	-0.0493	0.0636	-0.0673	-0.1005*	
11. Region	0.469	0.5	0	1	0.125	1.016	-0.0126	-0.0971	-0.0877	-0.2852***	0.0017	-0.0548	-0.0626	-0.0517	0.2107***	0.1118*

Notes: Return on Assets (ROA) = Net income available to stockholder / Total assets, VA = total revenue – total expenses, Human capital (HC) = Total personal expenses, HCE = VA/HC, Structural capital (SC) = VA – HC, SCE = SC/VA, Physical capital (CE) = Physical and financial capital employed, CEE = VA/CE, VAIC = HCE + SCE + CEE, Firm-size (FSize) = Log of total assets, Risk = Using leverage as proxy (Total debt/ Total assets), Firm complexity = Total number of subsidiaries (Sub), Listing status (Listing) = dichotomous, yes/no, Accounting Standard (Acstd) = 1 if the bank follows IFRS, 0 otherwise and Operating region (Region) = 1 if the bank is based in Gulf-region, 0 otherwise. Pearson correlation: *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1.

Table 2
Cross-sectional Regression of ROA on VAIC, HCE, SCE, CEE and Control Variables

	<i>Predicted Sign</i>	<i>Model 1</i>	<i>Model 1a</i>	<i>Model 1b</i>	<i>Model 1c</i>
N		320	320	320	320
VAIC	+	0.664***			
HCE	+		1.118***		
SCE	+			-1.330	
CEE	+				11.76***
lnFSize	+	0.0362	-0.177	0.466**	0.0452
Risk	-	-0.0166*	-0.0222***	-0.00610	-0.0371***
Sub	+/-	0.0274	0.0447	-0.00672	-0.0257
Listing	+/-	-0.680	-0.860	-0.945	2.463***
Constant		-1.596	1.013	-4.344*	-1.683
R-squared		0.256	0.434	0.038	0.362
Adj. R-squared		0.243	0.431	0.025	0.352

Notes: * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01