

Comparative Health Analysis of Bank Syariah Indonesia and Maybank Islamic Berhad (2022–2024): Evidence from RGEC-Based Financial Ratios

Annisa Izzatul Jannah¹, Diah Amalia², Naifa Nur Marischa³, Nayla Ikhsani Azyan⁴, Restu Setia Ningati⁵, Fitriana Kurniati⁶

¹²³⁴⁵⁶Faculty of Economics and Business Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Jalan Dr Setiabudi No. 229, Bandung, West Java, 40154, Indonesia

Email: annisaizzatul05@upi.edu; diahamalia@upi.edu; naifamarischa@upi.edu; naylaazyan@upi.edu; restusetia13@upi.edu; fitriana.kurniati@upi.edu

ABSTRACT

This study aims to compare the financial health of Bank Syariah Indonesia (BSI) and Maybank Islamic Berhad (MIB) during the period 2022–2024 by employing the Risk Profile, Good Corporate Governance, Earnings, and Capital (RGEC) framework. The analysis focuses on several key financial indicators—namely, Non-Performing Financing (NPF), Financing to Deposit Ratio (FDR), Return on Assets (ROA), Return on Equity (ROE), Net Income (NI), Operating Expenses to Operating Income Ratio (BOPO), and Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR). Using a descriptive-comparative design supported by quantitative ratio analysis, the study evaluates the relative soundness of the two leading Islamic banks in Indonesia and Malaysia. The findings reveal that BSI exhibits stronger overall financial health, particularly in profitability (ROA, ROE) and efficiency (BOPO). At the same time, MIB demonstrates superior asset quality, as indicated by a lower NPF ratio. The differences suggest that BSI's post-merger integration and market expansion contributed positively to its financial stability, whereas MIB's conservative credit risk management maintained its financing quality. The study provides empirical evidence of how structural and operational dynamics influence the performance of Islamic banking institutions across distinct regulatory environments. These insights are expected to support policymakers and practitioners in enhancing risk management and competitiveness in Islamic financial systems.

Keywords: Islamic banking; financial health; RGEC; comparative analysis; Bank Syariah Indonesia; Maybank Islamic Berhad

INTRODUCTION

Southeast Asia, particularly Indonesia and Malaysia, has become a critical region for Islamic banking development, thanks to strong regulatory frameworks, large Muslim populations, and policy support for financial inclusion (Warde, 2020; Hassan & Kayed, 2021). Indonesia's Bank Syariah Indonesia (BSI) and Malaysia's Maybank Islamic Berhad (MIB) represent the flagship Islamic banks in their respective countries, serving as key benchmarks for assessing the performance, resilience, and sustainability of Islamic financial institutions in the region.

Following the merger of three Indonesian Islamic banks into BSI in 2021, the bank has rapidly strengthened its capital structure and operational scale. Meanwhile, MIB, as Malaysia's largest Islamic commercial bank, has maintained stable performance and consistently high-quality asset management (Basri et al., 2018). Although both institutions operate based on similar Shariah principles, they have significant differences in terms of market maturity, regulatory oversight, and business strategy—factors that can affect their financial health and performance results. Therefore, a comparative study between the performance of Islamic banking in Indonesia and Malaysia is very important (Abdullah, 2017).

Although various studies have analysed the performance of Islamic banks using CAMEL or RGEC models, most of them focus on individual countries, specific institutions, or pre-merger periods. Comparative analyses between central Islamic banks operating in distinct regulatory and economic environments remain limited. Consequently, there is a lack of empirical evidence explaining how structural, operational, and contextual differences influence financial health across leading Islamic banks in Southeast Asia.

This study aims to fill this gap by conducting a comparative analysis of the financial health of BSI and MIB during the period 2022–2024 using the RGEC-based framework—encompassing risk profile (NPF, FDR), earnings (ROA, ROE, NI, BOPO), and capital (CAR). By integrating quantitative ratio analysis with comparative interpretation, this study contributes to: (1) providing empirical insights into the post-merger financial trajectory of BSI and the post-pandemic performance of MIB; (2) identifying differences in financial soundness linked to institutional structure and market maturity; and (3) offering policy implications for enhancing financial resilience and competitiveness in the Islamic banking industry.

METHOD

This study adopts a quantitative descriptive–comparative research design to evaluate and compare the financial health of Bank Syariah Indonesia (BSI) and Maybank Islamic Berhad (MIB) during the period 2022–2024. The research framework is grounded in the Risk Profile, Good Corporate Governance, Earnings, and Capital (RGEC) model issued by the Financial Services Authority of Indonesia (OJK), which serves as an advanced adaptation of the traditional CAMEL approach (Mullineux & Murinde, 2019). The comparative design was chosen to identify differences in financial soundness between the two largest Islamic banks in Indonesia and Malaysia, which operate under distinct regulatory frameworks and market conditions but share similar Sharia-compliant principles. The study relies exclusively on secondary data obtained from the annual financial statements of both institutions covering fiscal years 2022, 2023, and 2024. Data were extracted from: (1) Bank Syariah Indonesia Annual Reports (2022–2024), available through BSI’s official website and the OJK publication archive; (2) Maybank Islamic Berhad Annual Reports (2022–2024), available through Maybank’s official investor relations portal and Bank Negara Malaysia’s (BNM) financial disclosures.

All numerical figures were converted to percentages to ensure comparability across institutions and years. The selection of these banks was based on purposive sampling, as both represent the dominant entities within their respective national Islamic banking systems. Financial health is evaluated using seven quantitative indicators representing three dimensions of the RGEC framework—Risk Profile, Earnings, and Capital. The Good Corporate Governance (GCG) variable was excluded from the quantitative analysis due to the lack of standardised public scoring across both jurisdictions.

Table 1. Operational Definitions of Financial Health Variables Based on the RGEC Framework

Dimension	Indicator	Formula / Measurement	Interpretation
Risk Profile	Non-Performing Financing (NPF)	$(\text{Non-performing financing} \div \text{Total financing}) \times 100$	A lower ratio indicates better asset quality and risk control.
	Financing to Deposit Ratio (FDR)	$(\text{Total financing} \div \text{Total deposits}) \times 100$	Indicates liquidity and intermediation capacity; optimal range 80–90%.
Earnings	Return on Assets (ROA)	$(\text{Net income} \div \text{Total assets}) \times 100$	Measures overall profitability and efficiency of asset use.
	Return on Equity (ROE)	$(\text{Net income} \div \text{Shareholders' equity}) \times 100$	Reflects return to investors; higher value denotes greater profitability.
	Net Income (NI)	Net profit after tax (in percentage growth)	Represents earnings stability and operational success.
	Operating Expenses to Operating Income (BOPO)	$(\text{Operating expenses} \div \text{Operating income}) \times 100$	A lower value indicates higher efficiency in cost management.
Capital	Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR)	$(\text{Capital} \div \text{Risk-weighted assets}) \times 100$	Evaluates capital strength and ability to absorb financial shocks.

The analysis was conducted in three stages: (1) descriptive statistics to examine trends (2022–2024); (2) comparative tests (independent t-test for normal data; Mann-Whitney U for non-normal data) to identify significant differences between the banks ($\alpha=0.05$); and (3) simple linear regression to evaluate performance trends over time.

All statistical computations are conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics (version 29) and validated through manual recalculations in Microsoft Excel to ensure accuracy. Interpretation of the RGEC ratios follows the benchmarks set by OJK Regulation No. 8/POJK.03/2014 and the Bank Negara Malaysia (BNM) guidelines. Each indicator is classified into qualitative categories (Very Healthy, Healthy, Fairly Healthy, Less Healthy, Unhealthy) based on threshold ranges. These categories complement the statistical findings and provide a holistic view of each bank’s financial condition. There are two acknowledged limitations: (1) The observation period (2022–2024) is relatively short, which may limit the generalisation of trends; (2) The GCG dimension expenditure limits the analysis to financial indicators only, ignoring qualitative assessments based on governance. Nevertheless, this methodological approach provides a solid basis for comparative analysis of the financial health of Islamic banks in different national contexts. Despite these limitations, the methodological approach offers a robust basis for comparative analysis of financial health between Islamic banks across distinct national contexts.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

The financial health of Bank Syariah Indonesia (BSI) and Maybank Islamic Berhad (MIB) was assessed using seven key indicators that represent the Risk Profile, Earnings, and Capital components of the RGEC

framework. Table 1 presents the annual ratios of both banks during the observation period (2022–2024), along with their classification according to OJK and BNM benchmarks.

Table 2. Comparative RGEC-Based Financial Ratios (2022–2024)

Indicator	Year	BSI (%)	Category	MIB (%)	Category
NPF	2022	2.42	Healthy	0.95	Very Healthy
	2023	1.70	Very Healthy	0.80	Very Healthy
	2024	1.40	Very Healthy	0.75	Very Healthy
FDR	2022	79.37	Healthy	105.00	Less Healthy
	2023	82.60	Healthy	101.00	Less Healthy
	2024	84.12	Healthy	98.50	Healthy
ROA	2022	1.98	Very Healthy	1.57	Healthy
	2023	2.05	Very Healthy	1.64	Healthy
	2024	2.18	Very Healthy	1.72	Healthy
ROE	2022	16.84	Very Healthy	20.97	Very Healthy
	2023	17.65	Very Healthy	21.34	Very Healthy
	2024	18.12	Very Healthy	22.10	Very Healthy
NI Growth	2022	8.23	Healthy	7.84	Healthy
	2023	9.54	Very Healthy	8.10	Healthy
	2024	9.88	Very Healthy	8.43	Healthy
BOPO	2022	75.88	Very Healthy	56.19	Very Healthy
	2023	74.26	Very Healthy	57.03	Very Healthy
	2024	73.40	Very Healthy	56.90	Very Healthy
CAR	2022	20.29	Very Healthy	17.84	Very Healthy
	2023	20.81	Very Healthy	18.30	Very Healthy
	2024	21.12	Very Healthy	18.60	Very Healthy

(Note: Classifications follow OJK Regulation No. 8/POJK.03/2014 and BNM standards.)

Overall, both Islamic banks maintained a very healthy financial condition throughout 2022–2024, albeit with differing strengths. BSI showed steady improvement in profitability and operational efficiency, indicated by rising ROA and ROE alongside a gradual reduction in BOPO. MIB consistently exhibited superior asset quality, evidenced by a lower NPF ratio across all three years, though its liquidity position (FDR above 100% in 2022–2023) suggested an aggressive financing policy. These patterns reflect the contrasting operational contexts: BSI’s post-merger consolidation in Indonesia’s rapidly expanding Islamic finance market, and MIB’s mature market position within Malaysia’s well-regulated but saturated financial sector. To assess whether the observed differences were statistically meaningful, independent t-tests (and Mann–Whitney U tests where applicable) were performed for each indicator. The results are summarised in Table 3.

Table 3. Summary of Comparative Statistical Tests

Indicator	Mean Difference (BSI–MIB)	Test Type	p-value	Effect Size (Cohen’s d)	Interpretation
NPF	+0.67	Mann–Whitney	0.042	0.62	Significant; MIB lower NPF → better asset quality
FDR	–20.4	t-test	0.031	0.70	Significant; MIB more aggressive liquidity management
ROA	+0.41	t-test	0.048	0.58	Significant; BSI is more profitable.
ROE	–3.2	t-test	0.065	0.52	Not significant; comparable shareholder returns
NI	+1.22	t-test	0.039	0.64	Significant; BSI has higher net income growth.
BOPO	+18.7	Mann–Whitney	0.071	0.49	Not significant; both are highly efficient
CAR	+2.3	t-test	0.027	0.68	Significant; BSI maintains a more substantial capital buffer.

($\alpha = 0.05$; positive values indicate higher BSI ratios)

The results reveal significant differences in NPF, FDR, ROA, NI, and CAR, indicating that these indicators meaningfully distinguish the two banks’ financial health. BSI outperforms MIB in profitability, income growth, and capital adequacy, whereas MIB maintains an advantage in asset quality and liquidity risk-taking behaviour. Regression-based trend testing confirmed that both banks demonstrated positive financial trajectories between 2022 and 2024. BSI exhibited upward trends in ROA ($\beta = +0.10$, $p = 0.032$) and ROE ($\beta = +0.64$, $p = 0.046$),

coupled with a decline in NPF ($\beta = -0.51$, $p = 0.028$). MIB also recorded improving profitability, but at a slower pace, with a ROA growth rate of $\beta = +0.07$ ($p = 0.071$). These findings align with post-merger consolidation effects observed in other large-scale Islamic banking integrations (Alharthi, 2017; Riana, 2022), suggesting that operational synergies contribute to efficiency and capital reinforcement over time.

Discussion

The risk profile analysis highlights a structural contrast between the two institutions. MIB's consistently low NPF ratio (<1%) indicates strong credit quality management, supported by Malaysia's advanced risk-based regulatory environment (Effendi et al., 2017). Conversely, BSI's moderate NPF ratios (1.4–2.4%) remain within the healthy range, reflecting prudent post-merger financing policies but also the challenges of expanding into underserved segments. The FDR comparison reinforces this: MIB's >100% ratio signals higher liquidity exposure, whereas BSI's 79–84% indicates a more conservative intermediation stance, consistent with Indonesia's evolving Sharia market maturity (Incekara & Cetinkaya (2019).

BSI demonstrated superior profitability performance, with both ROA and ROE improving annually. This reflects the realisation of merger synergies, particularly in cost efficiency and scale economies (Putri & Ningtyas, 2022). The decrease in BOPO from 75.9% to 73.4% underscores improved cost discipline and digitalisation initiatives, which are among the expected benefits of post-merger integration (Puteh et al., 2018). Meanwhile, MIB's relatively stable earnings suggest maturity and operational steadiness, though with limited growth potential in a saturated domestic market. These results support prior findings by Ghozali, et al. (2022), who argued that size expansion through consolidation can enhance earnings performance in Islamic banks.

Both banks maintained very healthy CAR ratios (above 17%), exceeding minimum regulatory thresholds (10.5% in Indonesia; 8% in Malaysia). However, BSI's higher CAR (average 20.7%) suggests stronger capital resilience, which may enhance investor confidence and align with OJK's post-merger capital adequacy expectations (El-Ansary et al., 2019). This finding is consistent with Srairi (2020), who noted that capital strength positively correlates with Islamic bank stability and risk-absorption capacity. The comparative findings reveal that while both banks are financially sound, their performance reflects different strategic orientations and regulatory environments: (1) BSI's advantage stems from post-merger scale efficiency and capital consolidation, consistent with the Resource-Based View (RBV) theory of organisational performance; (2) MIB's stability derives from mature risk management practices, supporting the Institutional Theory perspective that regulatory maturity and organisational experience enhance resilience (Alam, et al., 2021). Collectively, the results affirm the relevance of the RGEC framework in evaluating Islamic banks across jurisdictions, providing an integrative model that captures both risk control and profitability dynamics. The study also contributes to comparative Islamic finance literature by empirically demonstrating that institutional maturity—not merely size—determines sustained financial health.

CONCLUSION

This study conducted a comparative assessment of the financial health of Bank Syariah Indonesia (BSI) and Maybank Islamic Berhad (MIB) for the period 2022–2024, applying the RGEC-based analytical framework that integrates risk profile, earnings, and capital dimensions. The results demonstrated that both banks maintained a generally very healthy financial condition during the period of observation, but with distinct structural characteristics and strategic orientations. Empirical findings revealed that BSI outperformed MIB in profitability and capital adequacy, as evidenced by higher ROA, NI growth, and CAR ratios. These outcomes suggest that post-merger consolidation enhanced operational efficiency and strengthened capital buffers, aligning with the Resource-Based View (RBV) theory that emphasises internal capability building as a determinant of firm performance. Conversely, MIB exhibited superior asset quality, as indicated by consistently lower NPF ratios, reflecting mature credit management practices and intense regulatory supervision within Malaysia's Islamic banking framework — a result consistent with the Institutional Theory perspective.

Overall, the comparative analysis underscores that differences in regulatory maturity, market saturation, and organisational structure significantly shape the financial performance of Islamic banks, even when operating under similar Sharia principles. The RGEC framework proved robust for evaluating cross-country Islamic banking institutions, offering an integrated tool for assessing both stability and profitability. The study contributes to the growing empirical literature by providing post-pandemic and post-merger evidence on the evolving competitiveness of Southeast Asian Islamic banks.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, A. (2017). A comparison between Malaysia and Indonesia in Islamic banking industry. *Research Journal of Business and Management*, 4(3), 276–286.
- Alam, M. K., Karbhari, Y., & Rahman, M. D. (2021). Adaptation of new institutional theory in shariah governance practice, structure and process. *Asian Journal of Business Environment*, 11(1), 5–15.

- Alharthi, M. (2017). Financial performance and stability in Islamic banks: Evidence from GCC countries. *Corporate Ownership and Control*, 14(4), 103–113.
- Basri, M. F., Muhamat, A. A., & Jaafar, M. N. (2018). The efficiency of Islamic banks in Malaysia: Based on DEA and Malmquist productivity index. *Journal of Emerging Economies and Islamic Research*, 6(3), 15–27.
- Effendi, J., Thiarany, U., & Nursyamsiah, T. (2017). Factors influencing non-performing financing (NPF) at sharia banking. *Walisongo: Jurnal Penelitian Sosial Keagamaan*, 25(1), 1–18.
- El-Ansary, O., El-Masry, A., & Yousery, Z. (2019). Determinants of capital adequacy ratio (CAR) in MENA region: Islamic vs. conventional banks. *International Journal of Accounting and Financial Reporting*, 9(2), 287–313.
- Ghozali, M., Kamri, N. B., & Khafid, M. A. Z. (2022). The merger of Indonesian Islamic banks: Impact on the Islamic economy development. *Al-Iktisab: Journal of Islamic Economic Law*, 6(1), 23–39.
- Hassan, M. K., & Kayed, R. N. (2021). *The art of Islamic banking and finance: Tools and techniques for community-based banking* (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- İncekara, A., & Cetinkaya, H. (2019). Liquidity risk management: A comparative analysis of panel data between Islamic and conventional banking in Turkey. *Procedia Computer Science*, 158, 955–963.
- Mullineux, A., & Murinde, V. (Eds.). (2019). *Handbook of Islamic banking*. Cheltenham, England: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Puteh, A., Rasyidin, M., & Mawaddah, N. (2018). Islamic banks in Indonesia: Analysis of efficiency. In *Proceedings of MICoMS 2017* (pp. 331–336). Emerald Publishing Limited.
- Putri, L. W., & Ningtyas, M. N. (2022). The impact of merger on Bank Syariah Indonesia financial performance. *Imanensi: Jurnal Ekonomi, Manajemen, dan Akuntansi Islam*, 7(2), 1–12.
- Riana, A. V. (2022). The economic and social impact on banking merger: A study on Indonesia state-owned Islamic bank merger. *SUKUK: International Journal of Banking, Finance, Management and Business*, 1(2), 27–43.
- Srairi, S. A. (2019). Transparency and disclosure in Islamic banks: A comparative study of GCC and Southeast Asia. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, 12(2), 262–285.
- Warde, I. (2020). *Islamic finance in the global economy* (3rd ed.). Edinburgh, Scotland: Edinburgh University Press.