Analysis of Bank Soundness Levels: Review Report of PT. Bank Bukopin in 2016-2020 Period

Halida Sasmita[1†], Setya Ega Susanto[2], Muh. Djabir. D[3]

[1,2,3] Institut Bisnis dan Keuangan Nitro, Makassar, Indonesia.

Abstract

This research aims to analyze the soundness level of the bank at PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk in 2016-2020. The research method used in this research is the CAMEL method, which includes Capital, Asset, Management, Earnings, and Liquidity. CAMEL is a tool for analyzing the finances of a bank and assessing bank management established by Bank Indonesia to determine the soundness level of the bank concerned. CAMEL consists of Capital, Asset, Management, Earnings, and Liquidity. In this study, the Capital aspect uses the CAR (Capital Adequacy Ratio) ratio, and the Asset Quality aspect is measured using the NPL (Non-Performing Loans) ratio; the Management Aspect in this study is proxied by using the NPM (Net Profit Margin), while the Earning aspect uses two ratios. Namely, ROA (Return On Asset) and BOPO (Operational Costs to Operating Income) and the Liquidity Aspect is measured using LDR (Loan To Deposit Ratio). The bank soundness level analysis results show that the Capital ratio (Capital) owned by PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk is categorized in the HEALTHY group because it has met the standards set by Bank Indonesia. For the ratio of Asset Quality (Asset Quality) owned by PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk is also categorized in the HEALTHY group because of Bank Indonesia regulations. Then, management that is proxied by using NPM (Net Profit Margin) is also organized in the HEALTHY group because it follows Bank Indonesia regulations. For earning ratios and liquidity ratios (liquidity) owned by PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk is categorized in the HEALTHY group because the calculation results for 2016-2020 have met the standards set by Bank Indonesia.

1. Introduction

Such difficult economic conditions, rapid regulation, increasingly intense competition, and various other trends in the banking industry are reasons for the need for bank management to solid be able to face and anticipate all situations (Padoa-Schioppa, 2003; Singer, 2007). The concepts and techniques the bank uses and develops so quickly become out of date and must be updated immediately. In the face of increasing complexity in decision making, many bank management considered it a burden and very troublesome; on the other hand,

---

[†] Corresponding author. Halida Sasmita
Email address: mhitamita68@gmail.com

,

other banks even made it a condition for assessing the performance of bank management (Alexandru & Romanescu, 2008; Pastor et al., 2006; Williams & Nguyen, 2005). Development in all fields requires significant funds and investments. In this case, the role of financial institutions is essential and strategic so that community participation in financing development can be increased. Financial institutions are business entities whose assets are primarily in financial assets or claims compared to non-financial support. Communities and companies as economic actors cannot be separated from financial institutions' activities in terms of obtaining funds and investing funds. In the current era of globalization, the role of financial institutions that is most prominent and often used by the public and companies, in general, is the role of banking financial institutions (Berger et al., 1995; Berger & Udell, 2002; Kidwell et al., 2016).

The banking sector has a vital role in developing the national economy. Whether the banking conditions are good or not can also impact the economy as a whole. Thus, efforts to strengthen the federal banking sector are essential factors in improving the national economy (Arfah et al., 2020; Arifin & Aditya, 2019). The banking industry has undergone significant changes in recent years. The industry has become more competitive due to the deregulation of regulations. Currently, banks have flexibility in the services they offer, the locations in which they operate, and the rates they pay for deposits of depositors. Some aspects that are often considered by the public before using a bank's services are measuring the bank's soundness by looking at the bank's financial statements. To ensure that bank capital is always healthy and supported by healthy asset quality. The soundness level of a bank is the result of a qualitative assessment of various aspects that affect the condition or performance of a bank through multiple factors of capital, asset quality, management, profitability, and liquidity (capital, asset quality, management, earnings, and liquidity / CAMEL) (Amaluis & Utami, 2019; Misra & Aspal, 2012; Saif-Alyousfi et al., 2017). The assessment is carried out through quantitative and qualitative evaluations after considering elements of judgment based on the materiality and significance of the assessment factors and the influence of other factors (PBI No. 6/10/2004).

Daryanto et al. (2018) regarding the comparison of CAMEL and RGEC analysis in assessing the soundness level of banks in government-owned sharia business units (Case study of PT. Bank Negara Indonesia, Tbk Year 2012-2013) results that the Assessment of the Soundness of Bank Negara Indonesia Syariah using the CAMELS method and The RGEC shows that the bank's soundness predicate is following the standards set by Bank Indonesia, for the period March 2012 to December 2013. On average, Sharia State Bank Indonesia received the HEALTH predicate, so that the performance of Bank Negara Indonesia Syariah must be maintained by maintaining a healthy level bank. Bank Negara Indonesia Syariah can increase assets, capital management, and operating income so that the quality of bank profits can be maintained or even improved. Lestari (2009) regarding the analysis of the health level of state banks using the CAMELS method and discriminant analysis for the 2007-2008 period resulted in 2 banks with three periods that received the unhealthy predicate, namely PT Bank Tabungan Negara in 2008 and PT BPD West Nusa Tenggara. in 2007 and 2008. According to the discriminant function, one bank originating from the BPD, after a discriminant analysis, the average ratio was owned belonging to the BUMN group, namely PT. BPD West Nusa Tenggara in 2007. By researching the same bank, namely PT. Bank Tabungan Negara, Fitria & Sari (2012) conducted a study with the title analysis of bank soundness at PT. Bank Tabungan Negara (Persero) Tbk by taking different years, namely 2010 and 2011. The results of the study of the bank's soundness level show that the ratio capital owned by PT Bank Tabungan Negara (Persero) Tbk is categorized in the HEALTHY group because it has met the standards set by PT Bank Tabungan Negara (Persero) Tbk. has been determined by Bank Indonesia. For the ratio Asset Quality owned by PT Bank Tabungan Negara (Persero) Tbk, it is also categorized in the HEALTHY group because it follows Bank Indonesia regulations so that PT Bank Tabungan Negara (Persero) Tbk has a slight chance of experiencing non-performing loans. Then for management, which is proxied by using Net Profit Margin, is also categorized in the HEALTHY group because it follows Bank Indonesia regulations. For the ratio Earning (Rentability) ratio Liquidity (Liquidity) owned by PT Bank Tabungan Negara (Persero) Tbk is categorized in the Healthy group because the calculation results for 2010 and 2011 have met the standards set by Bank Indonesia. Based on previous research, this research focuses on PT. Bank Bukopin Tbk as the research object. PT. Bank Bukopin Tbk is a bank middle class private Indonesia with 5% share ownership, PT. Bosowa Corporindo (Controller) 30%, Indonesian Bulog Employee Cooperative (KOPELINDO) 18.09%, and the Republic of Indonesia 11.43%. Based on the background described above, this study's problems can be formulated as follows: Was the

soundness level of Bank Bukopin during the 2010-2014 period in good condition following the provisions of Bank Indonesia using CAMEL.

2. Research Method

The object in this study is PT. Bank Bukopin Tbk, which is registered at the Capital Market Information Center (PIPM) as a representative of PT. The Indonesia Stock Exchange, which is located at Jl. Dr. Sam Ratulangi No. 124 Makassar. While the time used to research the completion of this thesis preparation is approximately two months, starting from December 2019 to January 2020. For this research to run as planned, several types and sources of data are needed: Quantitative data is data in the form of numbers taken from data related to the discussion. The data used were obtained from the annual published financial reports of PT. Bank Bukopin Tbk, Period 2016-2020. Secondary data, namely research data obtained indirectly or through intermediary media (obtained and disabled by other parties). The source of this research data was obtained through the BEI official website, namely www.IDX.co.id and other related websites, and studying literature related to research problems, both print and electronic media. In this study, data collection was carried out using two methods: (1) Observation, namely research conducted by making direct observations of the financial statements (objects) under study. (2) Documentation is done by collecting documents related to the data in this study. This research uses a descriptive analysis method, which explains the assessment of the soundness of the bank using the CAMEL method.

a. The *Capital* ratio used to assess whether a bank has sufficient capital using CAR is formulated as follows:

$$CAR = \frac{Bank\ Capital}{Risk\ Weighted\ Assets\ (RWA)}\ \text{x}\ 100\ \%$$

b. The *Assets Quality* ratio is used to measure the quality of bank assets and measure the ability of banks to protect the risk of credit failure by debtors. The percentage used can be formulated as follows:

c.

$$NPL = \frac{Non\ Performing\ Loans}{Total\ Credit}\ x\ 100\%$$

d. The *Net Proft Margin* ratio used to assess the soundness of a bank in the management aspect using NPM is formulated as follows:

$$NPM = \frac{Net\ Profit}{Operating\ Income}\ \text{x}\ 100\ \%$$

e. The *Profitability* ratio describes the company's ability to earn a profit through all available capabilities and resources. The percentage used is formulated as follows:

$$ROA = \frac{Profit\ Before\ Tax}{Total\ Assets}\ \text{x}\ 100\ \%$$

$$BOPO = \frac{Operating\ Costs}{Operating\ income}\ \text{x}\ 100\ \%$$

f. The *Liquidity* ratio used to assess whether a bank can meet obligations that are immediately collected using the LDR is formulated as follows:

$$LDR = \frac{Total\ Credit}{Total\ Third - Party\ Funds}\ \text{x}\ 100\ \%$$

3. Result and Discussion
3.1. Result

This study uses secondary data in the form of financial statements of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk for the period 2010-2014 using CAMEL analysis consisting of capital factors, earning asset quality, management, earnings, and liquidity. Furthermore, the results of the CAMEL analysis are obtained as follows:

3.1.1.   Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR)

Capital adequacy rate or Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) is a capital ratio that shows the ability of banks to provide funds for business development and accommodate the possibility of risk of losses from the bank's operations. The greater the ratio, the better the capital position. A minimum stipulation of 8% for the provision of minimum capital by BI for commercial banks following the regulations by the Bank for International Settlements (BIS), which is less than 8%, will be subject to sanctions by Bank Indonesia, in the form of an inadequate health assessment of the bank and also given. Sanctions in the framework of bank guidance and supervision. The capital adequacy ratio (CAR) can be formulated as follows:

$$CAR = \frac{Bank\ Capital}{Risk\ Weighted\ Assets\ (RWA)} \times 100\ \%$$

Source: Dendawijaya (2005)

Table 1. Total Assets Weighted by Risk PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk Period 2016 Per Quarter

Year	RWA			Total Weighted Assets
	Credit Risk	Operational Risk	Market Risk	
Mar-16	16.074.678	76.964	26.766	16.178.408
Jun-16	17.835.555	997.549	36.460	18.869.564
Sep-16	19.219.792	1.924.089	41.094	21.184.975
Des-16	20.082.231	2.042.188	4.926	22.129.345

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (data processed)

The table above shows total Assets Weighted by Risk for 2016. Furthermore, total Assets Weighted by Risk for 2017-2020 can be seen in the Annex to the Financial Statements of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk.

Table 2. Calculation of the CAR ratio of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk Year 2016 Per Quarter

Year	Capital	RWA	CAR
Mar-16	2.591.296	16.178.408	16,02 %
Jun-16	2.499.742	18.869.564	13,25 %
Sep-16	2.578.735	21.184.975	12,17 %
Des-16	2.668.385	22.129.345	12,06 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Report (data processed)

The table above shows the CAR ratio for 2016. Furthermore, the CAR ratio for 2017-2020 can be seen in the Appendix to the Financial Report of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk. From the research results obtained an overview of the development of the capital adequacy ratio (CAR) at PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk as follows:

Table 3. CAR development of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk Period 2016-2020 Per Quarter

Year	Quarter I	Quarter II	Quarter III	Quarter IV
2016	16,02 %	13,25 %	12,17 %	12,06 %
2017	16,73 %	14,75 %	13,54 %	12,71 %
2018	18,29 %	16,26 %	16,25 %	16,34 %
2019	16,96 %	15,71 %	15,38 %	15,12 %
2020	16,18 %	15,10 %	14,49 %	14,21 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (processed data).

The results from table 1-3 processing show the development of the CAR of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk in the period 2016-2020 tended to experience fluctuations or increases and decreases from year to year. Judging from the table above, a very high decline occurred in the fourth quarter of 2010, namely 12.06%, while the highest increase occurred in the first quarter of 2018, namely 18.26%. Even though it has fluctuated, this does not make PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk is not healthy because its CAR is still within the limit set by Bank Indonesia, which is > 8%.

3.1.2. Asset Quality

Non-performing loans are repayments that are late compared to the planned schedule, even if they are not returned. Non-performing loans are measured using Non-Performing Loans (NPL), namely the ratio of non-performing loans (loans categorized as substandard, doubtful, and loss) to total loans extended. The smaller the NPL, the smaller the credit risk borne by the bank. For the bank's value to this ratio to be good, Bank Indonesia has set the criteria for an NPL ratio of less than 5%. The amount of the NPL ratio can be calculated using the formula:

$$NPL = \frac{\text{Non Performing Loans}}{\text{Total Credit}} \, x \, 100\%$$

Source: Manurung & Rahardja (2004)

Table 4. Calculation of the NPL ratio of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk Year 2016 Per Quarter

Year	Non-Performing Loans			Total Non-Performing Loans	Total Loans	NPL
	Substandard	Doubtful	Loss			
Mar-16	39.735	85.001	568.218	692.954	23.346.095	2,97 %
Jun-16	63.767	191.560	939.479	1.194.806	29.553.899	4,04 %
Sep-16	87.254	78.727	1.105.875	1.271.856	25.799.816	4,93 %
Des-16	144.420	54.637	1.193.541	1.392.598	28.562.645	4,88 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's financial statements (data processed)

The table above shows the NPL ratio for 2016. Furthermore, the NPL ratio for 2017-2020 can be seen in the Appendix to the Financial Report of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk. From the research results obtained an overview of the development of the ratio of non-performing loans (NPL) at PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk as follows:

Table 5. Developments in NPL of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk for the 2016-2020 Period Per Quarter

Year	Quarter I	Quarter II	Quarter III	Quarter IV
2016	2,97 %	4,04 %	4,93 %	4,88 %
2017	5,43 %	4,55 %	5,63 %	4,69 %
2018	5,74 %	4,45 %	5,10 %	4,27 %
2019	3,68 %	3,92 %	3,37 %	3,16 %
2020	3,46 %	2,21 %	3,98 %	3,59 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (processed data)

The results of the above table processing show the development of Non-Performing Loans (NPL) of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk during the 2017-2020 period. This growth in the NPL ratio experienced fluctuations or increases and decreases from year to year. From the table above, it can be seen that the lowest and most ideal position was in 2020, especially the second quarter with a figure of 2.21%. Furthermore, the worst peak with the increasing number of non-performing loans was in the first quarter of 2018, touching the figure of 5.74%, which means that the bank is still in an unhealthy state because it has exceeded the limit of Bank Indonesia regulations, which is < 5%. However, in the last few years, to be exact, starting from the third quarter of 2018, Bank Bukopin began to suppress the decline in the NPL ratio, which was already below Bank Indonesia regulations.

3.1.3. Management

Net profit margin (NPM) reflects the level of effectiveness achieved by the bank's business operations related to the outcome of various policies and decisions that the bank has implemented in the current period. Bastian and Suhardjono (2006: 299) Net Profit Margin compares net income and operating income. The greater the NPM, the more productive the company's performance will be. This ratio shows how much the percentage of net income is obtained. The greater this ratio, the better the company's ability to earn high profits. The relationship between net profit after tax and operating income shows the ability of management to steer the company successfully enough to leave a certain margin as reasonable compensation for the owner who has provided his capital for risk. The NPM rate can be said to be good if it is> 5%. Management aspects that are proxied by net profit margin are formulated as follows:

$$NPM = \frac{\text{Net Profit}}{\text{Operating Income}} \text{ x 100 \%}$$

Source: Dendawijaya (2005)

Table 6. Calculation of the NPM ratio of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk Year 2016 Per Quarter

Year	Net Profit	Operating Income	NPM
Mar-16	112.847	402.900	28,01 %
Jun-16	226.600	835.913	27,11 %
Sep-16	335.943	1.243.929	27,01 %
Des-16	492.599	1.716.615	28,70 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (processed data)

The table above shows the NPM ratio for 2016. Furthermore, the 2017-2020 NPM ratio can be seen in the Appendix to the Financial Report of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk. From the research results obtained an overview of the development of the ratio of net profit margin (NPM) at PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk as follows:

Table 7. Development of NPM PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk Period 2010-2014 Per Quarter

Year	Quarter I	Quarter II	Quarter III	Quarter IV
2010	74,27 %	74,75 %	72,27 %	77,87 %
2011	75,85 %	78,89 %	74,76 %	79,47 %
2012	77,13 %	78,11 %	78,17 %	78,53 %
2013	77,23 %	80,79 %	79,60 %	80,00 %
2014	77,85 %	81,49 %	83,27 %	76,76 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (data processed)

The results of the above table processing show the development of the Net Profit Margin (NPM) of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk in the period 2016-2020 tended to experience fluctuations or increases and decreases from year to year. Judging from the table above, the decline occurred in the third quarter of 2016, namely 27.01%, while the highest increase occurred in 2018 in the second quarter, namely 44.63%. Despite fluctuating, Bank Bukopin was able to generate high operating income so that it would be able to contribute to the increase in net profit.

3.1.4. Earnings
a) Return on Assets (ROA)

Return on Assets is used to measure the ability of bank management to obtain profits (profit before tax) resulting from the total assets of the bank concerned. The greater the ROA, the greater the level of profit achieved by the bank so that the possibility of a bank in a problematic condition is getting smaller. The amount of ROA value can be calculated with the following formula:

$$ROA = \frac{Profit\ Before\ Tax}{\text{Total Assets}} \text{ x 100 \%}$$

Table 8. Calculation of the ROA ratio of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk Year 2016 Per Quarter

Year	Profit Before Tax	Total Asset	ROA
Mar-16	146.754	37.893.576	0,39 %
Jun-16	302.133	41.580.931	0,73 %
Sep-16	454.001	41.552.972	1,09 %
Des-16	661.955	45.907.650	1,44 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (data processed)

The table above shows the ROA ratio for 2016. Furthermore, the ROA ratio for 2012-2020 can be seen in the Appendix to the Financial Statements of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk. From the research results obtained an overview of the development of the ratio of Return on Assets (ROA) at PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk as follows:

Table 9. Development of ROA of PT.period 2016-2020 Per Quarter

Year	Quarter I	Quarter II	Quarter III	Quarter IV
2016	0,39 %	0,73 %	1,09 %	1,44 %
2017	0,41 %	0,82 %	1,22 %	1,68 %
2018	0,42 %	0,87 %	1,33 %	1,64 %
2019	0,40 %	0,93 %	1,41 %	1,75 %
2020	0,45 %	0,94 %	1,14 %	1,24 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (data processed)

The results of the above table processing show the development of Return on Assets of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk in the period 2016-2020 tended to experience fluctuations or increases and decreases from year to year. Judging from the table above shows that the bank's productive position in generating profits was in the fourth quarter of 2018, which was 1.75%. Meanwhile, the lowest part was in the first quarter of 2016, namely 0.39%. Even though it has fluctuated, this does not make PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk became unhealthy because its ROA was still within the limit set by Bank Indonesia, which was > 1%.

b) BOPO (Operational Cost Per Operating Income)
BOPO is used to measure the ability of bank management to control operating costs against operating income. The smaller this ratio means, the more efficient the operational expenses incurred by the bank concerned so that the possibility of a bank in a problematic condition is getting smaller. Bank Indonesia determines that the BOPO ratio is < 85%; if it exceeds 85%, then the bank is categorized as inefficient. The amount of the BOPO can value calculated using the formula:

$$BOPO = \frac{\text{Operating Costs}}{\text{Operating lncome}} \text{ x 100 \%}$$

Source: Dendawijaya (2005)

Table 10. Calculation of the BOPO ratio of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk Year 2016 Per Quarter

Year	Operating Costs	Operating Income	BOPO
Mar-16	250.967	402.900	62,29 %
Jun-16	532.759	835.913	63,73 %
Sep-16	779.108	1.243.929	62,63 %
Des-16	1.083.990	1.716.615	63,15 %

Source: Financial Statements of Bank Bukopin (the processed data)

The table above shows the ratio of ROA for the year 2016. Furthermore, the ROA ratio in 2017-2020 can be found in Appendix Financial Statements PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk. From the research results, it is obtained an overview of the development of the ratio of Operational Costs to Operational Income (BOPO) at PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk as follows:

Table 11. Development of BOPO of PT.period 2016-2020 Per Quarter

Year	Quarter I	Quarter II	Quarter III	Quarter IV
2016	62,29 %	63,73 %	62,63 %	63,15 %
2017	55,49 %	54,77 %	59,70 %	54,81 %
2018	54,17 %	53,45 %	54,63 %	55,69 %
2019	49,43 %	44,76 %	46,91 %	50,42 %
2020	47,61 %	47,17 %	53,48 %	61,14 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (data processed)

The results of the above table processing show the development of Operational Costs per Operating Income (BOPO) of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk in the period 2016-2020 tended to experience fluctuations or increases and decreases from year to year. Bank Bukopin strives to keep pressing BOPO at a lower ratio. It can be seen that in 2013 the second quarter was the ideal position, namely 44.76%, and the highest position was in the second quarter of 2016, which was 63.73%. Despite fluctuations, Bank Bukopin continues to reduce operating costs so as not to be in a problematic condition.

c) *Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR)*

Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR) is the ratio between the total loan amount and the funds provided by the bank. The higher this ratio, the lower the liquidity capacity of the bank concerned so that the possibility of a bank in a problematic condition will be even greater. The amount of LDR can be calculated using the following formula:

$$LDR = \frac{Total\ Credit}{Total\ Third - Party\ Funds}\ x\ 100\ \%$$

Source: Dendawijaya (2005)

Table 12. Total Third-Party Funds PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk Year 2016 Per Quarter

Year	Third-party funds			Total deposits
	Demand deposits	Savings	Time Deposits	
Mar-16	7.604.028	6.116.438	18.191.500	31.911.966
Jun-16	8.794.080	6.506.568	21.498.605	36.799.253
Sep-16	8.744.427	7.023.849	19.607.498	35.375.774
Des-16	9.336.286	8.966.453	21.452.917	39.755.656

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (processed data)

The table above shows the total Third Advisory Fund (TPF) for the year 2016. Furthermore, the total TPF for 2017-2020 can be seen in the Appendix to the Financial Report of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk.

Table 13. Calculation of the LDR ratio of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk Year 2016 Per Quarter

Year	Total Loans	Total DPK	LDR
Mar-16	23.346.095	31.911.966	73,16 %
Jun-16	29.553.899	36.799.253	80,31 %
Sep-16	25.799.816	35.375.774	72,93 %
Des-16	28.562.645	39.755.656	71,85 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (processed data)

The table above shows the LDR ratio for 2016. Furthermore, the LDR ratio for 2017-2020 can be seen in the Appendix to the Financial Report of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk. From the research results obtained an over-view of the development of the Loan To Deposit Ratio (LDR) at PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk as follows:

Table 14. Developments in LDR of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk 2016-2020 Period Per Quarter

Year	Quarter I	Quarter II	Quarter III	Quarter IV
2016	73,16 %	80,31 %	72,93 %	71,85 %
2017	58,58 %	70,77 %	82,55 %	85,01 %
2018	75,21 %	96,06 %	82,63 %	83,81 %
2019	76,68 %	78,22 %	87,28 %	85,80 %
2020	81,45 %	82,18 %	77,11 %	83,89 %

Source: Bank Bukopin's Financial Statements (processed data)

The results of the above table processing show the development of the Loan To Deposit Ratio (LDR) of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk in the period 2016-2020 tended to experience fluctuations or increases and decreases from year to year. Judging from the table above, an ideal position was in the first quarter of 2011, which was 58.58%, but then experienced a high increase in the second quarter of 2012, 96.06%. Even though it has fluctuated, this does not make PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk has become unhealthy because its LDR rate is still within the limit set by Bank Indonesia, which is < 115%.

3.2 Discussion

Based on the results of the analysis described above, the overall discussion of the results of this study is as follows:

1. *Capital Ratio*

Figures Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk in 2016-2020 experienced fluctuations. When viewed from the CAR ratio of Bank Bukopin during the 2016-2020 study period, it was above the minimum limit set by Bank Indonesia, which is> 8%. The high capital adequacy ratio from the minimum limit set by Bank Indonesia illustrates that the banking sector is in adequate condition and a CAR that shows a good performance of a bank so that for the assessment of the health of Bank Bukopin's CAR in 2016-2020 it is in the Healthy category. Following Dendawijaya (2005) said, if the CAR ratio exceeds 8%, the bank can maintain its capital adequacy and identify all risks that will affect the amount of bank capital. Banks can finance operational activities and provide a sizeable contribution to profitability. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Fitria & Sari (2012), who researched the analysis of bank soundness at PT. State Savings Bank (Persero) Tbk for the period 2016-2017. The results show that the CAR ratio of PT. BTN is categorized in the HEALTHY group because it has met the standards set by Bank Indonesia, namely> 8%. Likewise, research conducted by Daryanto et al. (2018), who researched the comparison of CAMEL and RGEC, analyzes in assessing the soundness of banks in government-owned sharia business units (Case study of PT. Bank Negara Indonesia, Tbk, 2012-2013) categorized in the HEALTHY group and (Karim, 2018; Usman et al., 2019) who researched the analysis of the soundness level of state banks using the CAMEL method and discriminant analysis for the period 2007-2008, was categorized in the HEALTHY group.

2. *Asset*

Non-Performing Loans Ratio (NPL) of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk from Ratio, has changed every year. In 2010, there was an increase until 2017. Then it decreased from 2018 to 2020. The rise in NPL in 2017 was caused by bank management, who was too easy to provide credit because there were no clear standards regarding the feasibility of the credit request submitted. Management is also inadequate with the number of experienced executives and credit department staff. As well as the weakness of the bank's ability to detect the possibility of non-performing loans. The decline in non-performing loans (NPL) was due to the annual increase in total credit compared to non-performing loans, which did not change significantly every year. Credit growth also greatly affects profitability, where credit repayments can contribute to interest income for the company. High credit growth is also part of the bank's strategy to maintain profit levels. Although in 2017, the NPL of Bank Bukopin exceeded Bank Indonesia, which was > 5%, this was due to the increase in non-performing loans, which increased considerably compared to the total loans extended. Still, Bank Bukopin succeeded in reducing its NPL ratio for the next period. So that for the assessment of the soundness level of Bank Bukopin's NPL in 2010-2014 was in the Healthy category. Following Manurung & Rahardja (2004) said that the higher this ratio, the

bigger a bank is in a problematic condition. The bank faces credit failure by debtors; on the contrary, the smaller this ratio, the smaller the credit risk. The bank bore him. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Daryanto et al. (2018), who researched the comparison of CAMEL and RGEC analyzes in assessing the soundness of banks in government-owned Islamic business units (Case study of PT. Bank Negara Indonesia, Tbk 2010-2013) which was proxied. NPA (Net Performing Asset) BNI Syariah using the CAMELS and RGEC methods shows that the bank's soundness predicate follows the standards set by Bank Indonesia, namely <5%. The same results were also obtained by Fitria & Sari (2012), who conducted a study on the comparison of CAMEL and RGEC analyzes in assessing the soundness level of banks in government-owned Islamic business units (Case study of PT. Bank Negara Indonesia, Tbk, 2012-2013) which was proxied using KAP. Categorized in the HEALTHY group and (Karim 2018; Usman et al., 2019), who researched the analysis of the health level of state banks using the CAMEL method and discriminant analysis for the 2007-2008 period, proxied by KAP, were categorized in the HEALTHY group.

3. Management

The ratio figure of Net Profit Margin (NPM) of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk from 2016-2020 has changed every year. In 2016, there was an increase until 2019, then decreased in 2014. This shows that Bukopin bank was able to generate net profit, which increased during 2016-2019, where operating income rose significantly to generate a maximum net profit. Even though in 2020, there was a decrease as indicated by a reduction in the NPM ratio, which was caused by a decline in net income where operating expenses increased relatively high so that it affected net income for the year. Overall, the NPM figure has exceeded more than 5%, so that the assessment of the health level of Bukopin's NPM in 2016-2020 is in the Healthy category. Following what Bastian and Suhardjono (2006) said, the NPM ratio is significant for operations managers because it reflects the strategy adopted by the company and its ability to control operating expenses. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Sari (2012), who researched the analysis of bank soundness at PT. State Savings Bank (Persero) Tbk for the period 2016-2011. The results show that the NPM ratio of PT. BTN is categorized in the HEALTHY group because it has met the standards set by Bank Indonesia, namely> 5%.

4. Earning Ratios

The figures of Return on Assets (ROA) of PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk experience fluctuations every year. In 2016, there was an increase until 2019 and a decrease in 2020. This is because profit before tax has decreased very drastically when compared to the previous period. The average ROA ratio in 2016-2020 was 1.02%, which shows that the ROA of Bank Bukopin is in a healthy condition. Following what Dendawijaya (2003) said, the greater the ROA, the greater the level of profit achieved by the bank so that the possibility of a bank in a problematic condition is getting smaller. In other words, the higher this ratio, the better the productivity of assets in obtaining net profits. This, in turn, will increase the company's attractiveness to investors. Viewed as a whole, from 2016-2020, the OEOI ratio fluctuated and was categorized as healthy because operational costs and operating income had increased proportionately, indicating that the OEOI ratio was still within the maximum limit set by Bank Indonesia, namely <85%. As stated by Dendawijaya (2009), banks can control operating costs on operating income. The smaller the BOPO ratio, the more efficient the operational costs are, which means that the bank's financial performance and profitability (ROA) will increase. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Sari (2012), who researched the analysis of bank soundness at PT. State Savings Bank (Persero) Tbk for the period 2010-2011. The results show that the ROA and BOPO ratio of PT. BTN is categorized in the HEALTHY group because it has met the standards set by Bank Indonesia, namely ROA > 1% and BOPO < 85%.

5. Liquidity Ratio

From 2016-2020 the LDR ratio experienced an increase because the increase in third-party funds was proportional to the increase in total credit. This indicates that banks channel more funds to lending, but banks pay less attention to the risk of credit failure. However, this did not make Bank Bukopin's condition unhealthy because its LDR was still within the stipulated limit set by Bank Indonesia, which was <115%. So that the assessment of the health level of the Bukopin LDR in 2010-2014 was in the Healthy category. Following what

Dendawijaya (2003: 116-124) said, the LDR illustrates how far the bank's ability to pay back withdrawals made by depositors by relying on credit provided as a source of liquidity. The higher the LDR ratio, the lower the liquidity capacity of the bank concerned. This is because the amount of funds needed to finance credit is getting bigger. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Sari (2012), who researched the analysis of bank soundness at PT. State Savings Bank (Persero) Tbk for the period 2010-2011. The results show that the LDR ratio of PT. BTN is categorized in the HEALTHY group because it has met the standards set by Bank Indonesia, namely <115%. The same results were also obtained by Utami (2015), who conducted a study on comparing CAMEL and RGEC analyses in assessing banks' soundness level in government-owned Islamic business units (Case study of PT. Bank Negara Indonesia, Tbk, 2012-2013) proxied using FDR. (Financing Deposit Ratio) is categorized in a healthy condition. However, it is different from research conducted by (Karim 2018; Usman et al., 2019), who researched the analysis of the soundness level of state banks using the CAMEL method and discriminant analysis for the 2007-2008 period. In this study, in 2008, the LDR figure of Bank BTN soared relatively high, namely more significant than 115%, and included in the Unhealthy category. This is due to the decreasing liquidity capacity of banks and too large credit providers, so that it is not balanced with the total third-party funds collected by the bank.

4.   Conclusions

Based on the results of research and discussion of Bank Soundness Level Analysis at PT. Bank Bukopin, Tbk for the period 2010-2014, it can be concluded that the health level of Bank Bukopin during the 2010-2014 period was in a HEALTHY condition according to CAMEL where Capital proxied by CAR is categorized as Healthy, Assets proxied by NPL (Non-Performing Loans) are classified as Healthy, Management which is proxied by NPM (Net Profit Margin) is organized as Healthy, Earnings which is proxied by ROA (Return On Asset) and BOPO (Operating Cost Per Operating Income) is categorized as Healthy and Liquidity which is proxied by LDR (Loan To Deposit Ratio) is classified as Healthy.

References

Alexandru, C., & Romanescu, M. L. (2008). *The assessment of banking performances-Indicators of Performance in Bank Area*. University Library of Munich, Germany.

Amaluis, D., & Utami, H. Y. (2019). CAMEL Ratio: An Approach To Measuring The Health Of Financial Institutions. *Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan Ekonomi (JIPE)*, *9*(1), 55–60.

Arfah, A., Olilingo, F. Z., Syaifuddin, S., Dahliah, D., Nurmiati, N., & Putra, A. H. P. K. (2020). Economics During Global Recession: Sharia-Economics as a Post COVID-19 Agenda. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics, and Business*, *7*(11), 1077–1085.

Arifin, M. Y., & Aditya, H. P. K. P. (2019). Perekonomian Nasional Dalam Perspektif Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 Negara Republik Indonesia. *Celebes Equilibrum Journal*, *1*(1), 26–31.

Berger, A. N., Herring, R. J., & Szegö, G. P. (1995). The role of capital in financial institutions. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, *19*(3–4), 393–430.

Berger, A. N., & Udell, G. F. (2002). Small business credit availability and relationship lending: The importance of bank organisational structure. *The Economic Journal*, *112*(477), F32–F53.

Daryanto, W. M., Utami, A. S., & Rakhmawati, T. S. (2018). Banking health assessment of commercial banks in Indonesia using RGEC methods: A comparative study. *International Journal of Business Studies*, *2*(3), 122–132.

Dendawijaya, L. (2005). *Manajemen perbankan*.

Fitria, N., & Sari, R. L. (2012). Analisis Kebijakan Pemberian Kredit Dan Pengaruh Non Performing Loan Terhadap Loan To Deposit Ratio Pada Pt. Bank Rakyat Indonesia (Persero), Tbk Cabang Rantau, Aceh Tamiang.(Periode 2007-2011). *Ekonomi Dan Keuangan*, *1*(1).

Karim, A. (2018). The Analysis of Sharia Banks Soundness Level Using Rgec Method. *Economics and Business Solutions Journal*, *2*(1), 1–12.

Kidwell, D. S., Blackwell, D. W., Sias, R. W., & Whidbee, D. A. (2016). *Financial institutions, markets, and money*. John Wiley & Sons.

Manurung, M., & Rahardja, P. (2004). Uang, perbankan, dan ekonomi moneter. *Kajian Kontekstual Indonesia). Jakarta:*

Lembaga Penerbit FE-UI. Munawir.

Misra, D. S. K., & Aspal, P. (2012). A camel model analysis of state bank group. *Proceedings of 19th International Business Research Conference*.

Padoa-Schioppa, T. (2003). Central banks and financial stability: exploring the land in between. *The Transformation of the European Financial System*, *25*, 269–310.

Pastor, J. T., Lovell, C. A. K., & Tulkens, H. (2006). Evaluating the financial performance of bank branches. *Annals of Operations Research*, *145*(1), 321–337.

Saif-Alyousfi, A. Y. H., Saha, A., & Md-Rus, R. (2017). Profitability of Saudi commercial banks: A comparative evaluation between domestic and foreign banks using capital adequacy, asset quality, management quality, earning ability and liquidity parameters. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, *7*(2), 477–484.

Singer, D. A. (2007). *Regulating capital: Setting standards for the international financial system*. Cornell University Press.

Usman, B., Lestari, H. S., & Puspa, T. (2019). Determinants of capital adequacy ratio on banking industry: Evidence in Indonesia Stock Exchange. *Jurnal Keuangan Dan Perbankan*, *23*(3), 443–453.

Williams, J., & Nguyen, N. (2005). Financial liberalisation, crisis, and restructuring: A comparative study of bank performance and bank governance in South East Asia. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, *29*(8–9), 2119–2154.