



Comparative Analysis of the Health Level of State-Owned Banks with Private Banks

Dwi Ayu Wulan Iswari¹, Sugiharti Binastuti²

^{1,2}Gunadarma University, Faculty of Economics, Management

*Correspondence: nurmardanidwi@gmail.com

Article Info

Article history:

Received: 8 Agustus 2024

Accepted: 11 November 2024

Published: 1 Desember 2024

Abstract

This research employs the Risk-Based Bank Rating (RBBR) approach to assess the financial health of state-owned and private banks. The significance of this study lies in the increasing necessity for a comprehensive evaluation methodology to assess bank performance in a competitive financial market. The research objectives are twofold: firstly, to compare the health levels of state-owned and private banks and secondly, to identify any significant differences. The methods used include the analysis of risk profile, GCG, earnings, and capital during the 2020-2023 period. The findings show that there are no significant differences between state-owned and private banks based on these criteria. These results highlight the competitiveness of both bank types and provide insights into their performance stability in the banking sector.

Keywords : The health level of the bank, Risk Profile, Good Corporate Governance, Earnings, Capital

INTRODUCTION

The A study by Belliwati Kosim and Reggi Agustian Pratama (2021) found that Indonesian individuals place more trust in state-owned banks when it comes to storing their financial assets. According to *Financial.bisnis.com*, the total assets of state-owned banks in Indonesia reached 4,251.74 trillion rupiah in 2021, increasing to 4,728.43 trillion rupiah in 2022. In contrast, the total assets of private banks in Indonesia were 4,163.95 trillion rupiah in 2021 and 4,465.11 trillion rupiah in 2022. This assumption is based on the premise that state-owned banks are safer than private banks due to their substantial state capital, which allows the government to absorb consumer losses. While some private banks have performed well, the perceived superiority of state-owned banks is still influenced by their larger total assets. Currently, state-owned and private banks are engaged in intense competition, necessitating the importance of transparent financial reports to assist the public in making informed decisions.

The Indonesian economy has experienced fluctuations during the period from 2020 to 2023, due to challenges posed by the global pandemic and unstable economic conditions (Databoks, 2023). These challenges have led to a deterioration in the performance and health of both public and private banks. One of the most notable effects is the increase in non-performing loans and a decline in public confidence. This has resulted in a credit crisis, with lending declining despite efforts to maintain control. This condition has also affected banking activities, which have declined due to increased risk. Both conventional state-owned banks and national private banks have experienced a decline in health due to sluggish community activities (Giga Azayaka Tatanka Putra and Ahmad Idris, 2023). In light of the ongoing pandemic, it is recommended that the banking sector maintain its health standards.

Bank Indonesia is responsible for the regulation and supervision of banking operations, including the assessment of the soundness of banks. In this capacity, Bank Indonesia has issued OJK Regulation Number 3/POJK.03/2022, which provides a method for assessing bank soundness through RBBR (Risk-Based Bank Rating).

A risk profile is a description of the type and amount of risk faced by a bank based on its business activities and assets. The bank determines its risk profile in order to measure operational vulnerability to risk. Determining the risk profile is important for risk management strategies to maintain stability and stakeholder confidence. As demonstrated by Ali and Arini (2024), the assessment of the risk of bad credit is of paramount importance for a bank's financial statements (net performing loan) and liquidity risk, as it determines the level of a bank's ability to cover its current obligations (loan to deposit ratio). The effective management of credit and liquidity risks is of critical importance for the profitability of banks and the maintenance of public confidence in the banking system. These risks, when properly managed, can contribute to the stability of the financial system and the sustainable growth of the economy. The findings of the research conducted by Rahman (2022) indicate that there is no discernible distinction between credit risk and liquidity risk in banks categorized as BUKU IV (BRI, BNI, Mandiri, BCA, CIMB Niaga).

Good corporate governance (GCG) is a crucial factor in the health of companies, including banks. The implementation of GCG aims to create robust and transparent management practices to enhance sustainable performance. For banks, GCG minimizes intermediation risk and maintains the trust of customers and stakeholders.

Research by Zhafira and Lutfi (2023) indicates that GCG assessment is a vital aspect of the quality of bank management. This is because the implementation of adequate GCG can improve the health of companies and their ability to compete in a healthy and conducive manner. The results of research by Syachrani and Sugiharti (2021) indicate that there are no differences in the quality of bank management as assessed by self-report at state-owned banks and private banks in Indonesia.

Earnings are an important indicator of the health of a bank. Rentability shows the bank's capacity to generate profit from its business operations. Based on research by Syachrani and Sugiharti (2021), rentability assessment is very important using the ROA ratio. ROA (Return on Assets) illustrates how effective the bank is in using assets to generate profits. Research by Seger Santoso, Farah Qalbia, and Benardi (2023) indicates that the NIM (Net Interest Margin Ratio) ratio is a useful indicator of a company's ability to generate net interest income from interest-bearing assets. Both ROA and NIM are of concern to regulators, investors, and the public in assessing the health of banks in terms of operating performance and future prospects for banks to generate optimal profits. The findings of the study conducted by Kosim and Reggi (2021) indicate that there is no discernible difference between the ROA and NIM ratios of state-owned banks and private banks listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange.

The capital held by a bank is of great importance in maintaining stability and customer confidence. This capital is the main source of funds that can be used to absorb losses that may arise from the provision of credit by the bank. Based on the research conducted by Darman, Maulana, and Tope (2021), it is crucial to assess the bank's capital capacity to support risky activities using the CAR (Capital Adequacy Ratio) ratio. The findings of Syachrani and Sugiharti's (2021) research indicate that there is no discernible difference in the capital ratio between state-owned and privately held banks in Indonesia.

The preceding context suggests an area of potential interest to researchers, namely a comparative analysis of the health level of state-owned banks with private banks using the risk-based bank rating approach for the period 2020-2023.

Based on the background above, the problem can be formulated as follows: (a) What is the health level of state-owned banks Banks and Private Banks for the period 2020-2023? (b) Is there a difference in the level of bank health between state-owned banks banks and private banks with the RBBR approach in terms of Risk Profile, Good Corporate Governance, Earnings, Capital?

This research offers theoretical benefits as a reference for students regarding the assessment of bank health with the RBBR approach, independent T test, and Mann-Whitney U test. Practically, this research is expected to enhance the insight of researchers and assist banks in increasing customer loyalty through the information obtained.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs quantitative data in the form of annual financial reports for the period spanning from 2020 to 2023. The data source utilized is secondary data collected from the official websites of each bank. The data collection method employed is the documentation method. The data analysis method employed is quantitative descriptive analysis, normality testing, independent t-tests, and Mann-Whitney U tests. The subjects of this study were two state-owned banks, namely PT Bank Mandiri Tbk and PT Bank Rakyat Indonesia Tbk, and two private banks, namely PT Bank Central Asia Tbk and PT Bank CIMB Niaga Tbk. The

research object is the level of bank health in terms of risk profile (credit risk/NPL and liquidity risk/LDR), good corporate governance (GCG), earnings (ROA and NIM), and capital (CAR). The sampling method employed was non-probability sampling with a purposive sampling technique, with the following criteria:

1. State-owned banks and private banks listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX).
2. State-owned banks and private banks with conventional bank types and which occupy the top two positions based on total assets in 2024.
3. The annual financial reports of each bank are to be published on the website of the respective bank for the years 2020 to 2023.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION [Constantia, 12, normal], space 1

1. Analysis of problem findings

Risk Profile

Non Performing Loan (NPL)

Table 1. State-owned Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on NPL Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	NPL	Health Ranking	Description
Mandiri	2020-2023	2,23	2	Healthy
BRI	2020-2023	2,90	2	Healthy

Table 1 indicates that the average performance of Bank Mandiri's credit risk in recent years is 2.23%, which places it at level 2 within the healthy category. The NPL ratio of Bank Mandiri remains well below the minimum regulatory requirement of 5%. This suggests that Bank Mandiri is effectively managing credit risk by strengthening risk management and improving asset quality, which has a positive impact on the bank's health rating. While the average NPL of Bank BRI from 2020 to 2023 amounted to 2.90% and was at level 2 (healthy). The NPL ratio of Bank Mandiri remains well below the minimum regulatory requirement of 5%, this reflects that Bank BRI has a good ability to manage its non-performing loans. This indicates that during this period, Bank BRI remained in a healthy condition. This reflects the well-maintained performance and financial stability of Bank BRI.

Table 2. Private Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on NPL Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	NPL	Health Ranking	Description
BCA	2020-2023	1,87	1	Highly Healthy
CIMB Niaga	2020-2023	2,92	2	Healthy

Table 2 indicates that the average NPL for Bank BCA during the 2020-2023 period was 1.87%. This performance is considered Highly Healthy in managing NPL. The NPL ratio of Bank BCA remains well below the minimum regulatory requirement of 2%. Bank BCA maintained a low NPL rate, demonstrating effective risk management capabilities and a healthy credit rating. The overall in Bank CIMB Niaga's NPL rate from 2020 to 2023 indicates effective credit risk management, this can be observed based on the bank's average of 2.92% within the healthy category, which has contributed to enhanced financial performance and stakeholder confidence. The NPL

ratio of Bank CIMB Niaga remains well below the minimum regulatory requirement of 5%.

Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR)

Table 3. State-owned Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on LDR Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	LDR	Health Ranking	Description
Mandiri	2020-2023	76,46	2	Healthy
BRI	2020-2023	88,90	3	Fairly Healthy

Table 3 indicates that the LDR ratio of Bank Mandiri exhibited a notable increase from 2020 to 2023. This suggests that Mandiri Bank effectively managed its liquidity during this period. The average LDR ratio was 76.46%, and the health rating was within the "healthy" category. The average ratio of Bank Mandiri remains well below the minimum regulatory requirement of 75%. Meanwhile, average LDR for Bank BRI from 2020 to 2023 was 88.90% with a health level of "Fairly Healthy". This figure demonstrates that Bank BRI is capable of effectively managing non-performing loans, despite facing various challenges, particularly the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic. Nevertheless, Bank BRI was still able to maintain a fairly good health rating during the period. The average ratio of Bank BRI is still well under the minimum regulatory requirement of 85%.

Table 4. Private Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on LDR Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	LDR	Health Ranking	Description
BCA	2020-2023	69,30	1	Highly Healthy
CIMB Niaga	2020-2023	84,12	2	Healthy

Table 4 indicates that the average LDR ratio is 69.30%, which is within the "Highly Healthy" category. The LDR ratio of BCA remains below the regulatory minimum of 85%. In terms of channeling third-party funds in the form of credit, Bank BCA is considered to have adequate capabilities. This enables it to support economic growth and make a positive contribution to society. Furthermore, this condition also reflects public trust in Bank BCA as one of the leading financial institutions in Indonesia. Meanwhile, the average LDR of CIMB Niaga Bank during the 2020–2023 period was 84.12%, with a rating of 2 (Healthy). The LDR ratio of CIMB Niaga remains above the minimum regulatory requirement of 85%. This indicates that the bank is striving to achieve equilibrium between lending and liquidity management strategies.

Good Corporate Governance (GCG)

Table 5. State-owned Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on GCG Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	Health Ranking	Description
Mandiri	2020-2023	1	Highly Healthy
BRI	2020-2023	2	Healthy

Table 5 indicates that Bank Mandiri has consistently maintained a Highly Healthy rating from 2020 to 2023. This demonstrates that in addition to stable financial performance, adequate capital, and robust risk management, Bank Mandiri

also adheres to sound corporate governance practices. This is evidenced by several awards received by Bank Mandiri, including the Most Trusted Companies award from the Indonesian Institute for Corporate Governance (IICG) and the ASEAN Asset Class ranking in the ASEAN Corporate Governance Scorecard (ACGS) by the ASEAN Capital Market Forum (ACMF). Meanwhile, the favourable health rating achieved by Bank BRI for the 2020-2023 period serves as a testament to the institution's aptitude in risk management, financial stability, and the delivery of quality customer service. This is evidenced by the awards obtained, including the Asean Corporate Governance Scorecard (ACGS) with the category of Top 3 PLC in Indonesian and ASEAN Asset Class 2023, as well as the Indonesia Good Corporate Governance Award: The Most Trusted Companies 2023.

Table 6. Private Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on GCG Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	Health Ranking	Description
BCA	2020-2023	1	Highly Healthy
CIMB Niaga	2020-2023	2	Healthy

Table 6 indicates that Bank BCA has consistently maintained a Highly Healthy rating from 2020 to 2023. This sustained performance reflects Bank BCA's capacity to consistently implement effective governance and sustainable business strategies. This is evidenced by the awards obtained by BRI, including the 14th IICD Corporate Governance Conference & Award, where it was named "Best Overall," and the Asian Banker Leadership Achievement Award, where it was recognized for excellence. Meanwhile, the healthy rating achieved by Bank CIMB Niaga for four consecutive years reflects that the bank has consistently demonstrated a commitment to implementing effective governance and meeting the standards set by the banking supervisory authority. The TOP GRC Award 2023 Platinum Star Trophy – 5 Star Predicate, obtained for 5 consecutive years, serves to reinforce the confidence of stakeholders in Bank CIMB Niaga as a healthy and trusted financial institution.

Earnings

Return on Assets (ROA)

Table 7. State-owned Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on ROA Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	ROA	Health Ranking	Description
Mandiri	2020-2023	2,19	1	Highly Healthy
BRI	2020-2023	3,01	1	Highly Healthy

Table 7 indicates that Bank Mandiri has exhibited a consistent increase over the past four years. The observed rise in ROA, coupled with the bank's "Highly Healthy" condition, with an average value of 2.19%. Bank Mandiri's ROA ratio exceeds the minimum regulatory requirement of 1.5%, indicating that Bank Mandiri has a robust ability to manage its assets and generate optimal profits. Meanwhile, Bank BRI in the last four years (2020–2023) has increased with an average value of 3.01% and can be said to be Highly Healthy. Bank BRI has a ROA above the 1.5 percent regulatory minimum. This can be an indicator that Bank BRI has an effective business strategy, strong management, and the ability to adapt to market changes.

Table 8. Private Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on ROA Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	ROA	Health Ranking	Description
BCA	2020-2023	3,78	1	Highly Healthy
CIMB Niaga	2020-2023	1,90	1	Highly Healthy

Table 8 indicates that during the four-year period from 2020 to 2023, the average return on assets (ROA) of Bank BCA was 3.78%, with a rating that is considered to be Highly Healthy. BCA's ROA exceeds the regulatory minimum of 1.5%. This suggests that Bank BCA was able to manage its assets in an effective and efficient manner, thereby generating greater profits. Conversely, the financial performance of CIMB Niaga Bank over the past four years has demonstrated a consistent increase in ROA values, accompanied by a "Highly Healthy" health rating with an average value of 1.90%. CIMB Niaga's ROA is above the regulatory minimum of 1.5%. This reflects the bank's ability to effectively manage its assets and generate optimal profits.

Net Interest Margin (NIM)

Table 9. State-owned Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on NIM Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	NIM	Health Ranking	Description
Mandiri	2020-2023	4,31	1	Highly Healthy
BRI	2020-2023	6,94	1	Highly Healthy

Table 9 indicates that Bank Mandiri's net interest margin (NIM) has a Highly Healthy rating, with an average value of 4.31% from 2020 to 2023. Bank Mandiri was above the regulatory minimum of 3%. This indicates that the bank is able to manage its assets and liabilities effectively, thereby maintaining high profitability and public trust. Meanwhile, Bank BRI's performance from 2020 to 2023 shows consistent and stable performance, with an average of 6.94% and a Highly Healthy category. Bank BRI was above the regulatory minimum of 3%. This is an indication of Bank BRI's ability to effectively manage assets, liabilities and risks.

Table 10. Private Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on NIM Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	NIM	Health Ranking	Description
BCA	2020-2023	5,73	1	Highly Healthy
CIMB Niaga	2020-2023	3,77	1	Highly Healthy

Table 10 indicates that the average NIM ratio of Bank BCA during the 2020–2023 period was 5.73% and a health rating of “Highly Healthy”. BCA's NIM ratio remains above the regulatory minimum of 3%. This demonstrates that the bank has robust management, effective business strategies, and the capacity to adapt to changing market conditions. Meanwhile, Bank CIMB Niaga's performance in the period 2020–2023 can be considered very good. An increase in NIM and a health rating of “Highly Healthy”, with an average value of 3.77%. The NIM ratio of Bank CIMB Niaga continues to be higher than the minimum regulatory requirement of 3%. This shows that the bank is able to manage risks well, maintain financial stability, and provide quality services to customers.

Capital

Table 11. State-owned Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on CAR Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	CAR	Health Ranking	Description
Mandiri	2020-2023	20,11	1	Highly Healthy
BRI	2020-2023	25,29	1	Highly Healthy

Table 4.11 indicates that Bank Mandiri's capital adequacy performance during the 2020–2023 period is Highly Healthy. The average value of 20.11% reflects a commendable level of capital adequacy ratio maintenance. Bank Mandiri's CAR remains above the regulatory minimum of 12%. Bank Mandiri's continued efforts to maintain a high CAR level are evident, as this contributes to financial stability and stakeholder trust. Meanwhile, BRI's financial performance, as reflected in the average value of the CAR ratio of 25.29% with a Highly Healthy category during the 2020–2023 period. The CAR ratio of Bank BRI continues to be higher than the minimum regulatory requirement of 12%. This indicates that the bank has a robust capacity to manage risk and maintain adequate capital to support its business growth.

Table 12. Private Bank Health Ratio and Predicate on CAR Ratio

Name of Bank	Period	CAR	Health Ranking	Description
BCA	2020-2023	27,50	1	Highly Healthy
CIMB Niaga	2020-2023	22,70	1	Highly Healthy

Table 4.12 indicates that Bank BCA's performance in terms of capital adequacy ratio (CAR) during the 2020–2023 period is Highly Healthy. The bank's CAR remained consistently high and stable, with an average value of 27.50. BCA's CAR remains above the regulatory minimum of 12%. This demonstrates its capacity to effectively manage risk and maintain financial stability. While CIMB Niaga's average financial performance over the last four years is 22.70%, with a Highly Healthy category, CIMB Niaga's CAR ratio remains above the regulatory minimum of 12%. This is an indication that the bank has a strong management team and a sound risk management capability.

Difference Test Analysis

Data Normality Test

Table 13. Data Normality Test

Ratio	Group of Banks	Sig.	Description
NPL	State-owned banks	,031	Abnormal
	Private Bank	,065	Normal
LDR	State-owned banks	,782	Normal
	Private Bank	,487	Normal
GCG	State-owned banks	,001	Abnormal
	Private Bank	,001	
ROA	State-owned banks	,873	Normal
	Private Bank	,906	Normal
NIM	State-owned banks	,100	Normal
	Private Bank	,088	Normal
CAR	State-owned banks	,098	Normal
	Private Bank	,246	Normal

Source: SPSS 29 Output Results, 2024

Data normality tests determine whether confounding variables or residuals in the regression model are normally distributed. In this study, using the Shapiro-Wilk test, data are said to be normally distributed if the probability value is greater than 0.5; if the probability value is less than 0.5, the data are not normally distributed. Table 4.13 shows that four of the six ratios examined are normally distributed. These ratios are LDR, ROA, NIM, and CAR, as evidenced by a resulting significance value greater than 0.05. Consequently, these variables will be further analyzed using the independent T-test. On the other hand, the other two variables, namely LDR and GCG, were found to be non-normally distributed. This can be seen from the significance value, which is less than 0.05. Therefore, the Mann-Whitney U test is used to test these variables.

Uji Independent T Test

Table 14. Uji Independent T Test

		Independent Samples Test									
		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				95% Confidence Interval of the Difference			
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper	
LDR	Equal variances assumed	.611	.447	1,404	14	.182	5,97000	4,25267	-3,15106	15,09106	
	Equal variances not assumed			1,404	13,545	.183	5,97000	4,25267	-3,17988	15,11988	
ROA	Equal variances assumed	.742	.403	-.465	14	.649	-.24125	.51921	-1,35485	.87235	
	Equal variances not assumed			-.465	13,403	.650	-.24125	.51921	-1,35953	.87703	
NIM	Equal variances assumed	4,116	.062	1,363	14	.194	.87625	.64288	-.50258	2,25508	
	Equal variances not assumed			1,363	12,959	.196	.87625	.64288	-.51305	2,26555	
CAR	Equal variances assumed	1,049	.323	-1,552	14	.143	-2,40125	1,54692	-5,71907	.91657	
	Equal variances not assumed			-1,552	13,445	.144	-2,40125	1,54692	-5,73197	.92847	

Source: SPSS 29 Output Results, 2024

The Equality of Variance Test and the equality of means are two methods employed to ascertain whether there is a similarity or difference in the level of bank health.

Variance Equality Test

The probability value (SIG) on Levene's Test for Equality of Variances, in conjunction with the reference number 0.05, indicates that the four variables have a probability for the Levene test above 0.05. These variables are LDR (0.447), ROA (0.403), NIM (0.062), and CAR (0.323). The subsequent testing procedure is the t-test.

Table 15. Average ratio of state-owned and private banks

Ratio	Group of Banks	Average
LDR	State-owned Bank	82,67
	Private Bank	76,70
ROA	State-owned Bank	2,60
	Private Bank	2,84
NIM	State-owned Bank	5,62
	Private Bank	4,75
CAR	State-owned Bank	22,69

Ratio	Group of Banks	Average
	Private Bank	25,09

Source: SPSS 29 Output Results, 2024

The equality of means

The results of the equality of means on the four variables, namely LDR, ROA, NIM, and CAR using the two-tailed significance value of greater than 0.05, indicate that there is no statistically significant difference between the variables in question.

a. For LDR, the number is 0.182. Given that the number is above 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no discernible difference in the average LDR between state-owned banks banks and private banks. The average LDR of the state-owned banks is in the healthy category with 82.67%, while that of the private banks is 76.70%, which is also in the healthy category. This finding is consistent with the research conducted by Oktapinanda Putra (2022), which states that there is no significant difference in the level of health between state-owned banks and private banks based on the LDR ratio.

b. For ROA, the number is 0.649. As the number is above 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no statistically significant difference in the average ROA between state-owned banks banks and private banks. The average ROA of state-owned banks is in the Highly Healthy category, which is 2.60%, while for private banks it is 2.84%, also in the Highly Healthy category. This finding is consistent with the research conducted by Syachrani and Sugiharti (2021), which states that there are no differences in the health levels of state-owned banks and private banks listed on the IDX for the period 2015-2019.

c. For NIM, the number is 0.194. Given that the number is above 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no discernible difference in the average NIM in state-owned banks Banks and Private Banks. The average NIM of state-owned banks is in the very healthy category, which is 5.62%, while that of private banks is 4.75%, which is also in the very healthy category. This result is consistent with previous research conducted by Kosim and Reggi (2022), which states that there is no difference in the health level of state-owned banks and private banks listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange.

d. For CAR, the number is 0.143. As the number is above 0.05, it can be concluded that there is no discernible difference in the average CAR between state-owned banks and private banks. The average CAR of state-owned banks is in the very healthy category, which is 22.69%, while that of private banks is 25.09%, which is also in the very healthy category. This result is in line with the previous study conducted by Syachrani and Sugiharti (2021), which states that there is no difference between the health levels of State-owned Bank and Private Banks listed in the IDX for the period 2015-2019.

Mann-Whitney U test

Table 16. Mann-Whitney U test

Test Statistics ^a		
	NPL	GCG
Mann-Whitney U	26,000	32,000
Wilcoxon W	62,000	68,000
Z	-,630	,000
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)	,529	1,000
Exact Sig. [2*(1-tailed Sig.)]	,574 ^b	1,000 ^b
a. Grouping Variable: Kelompok		
b. Not corrected for ties.		

Sumber: Hasil Output SPSS 29, 2024

Based on Table 4.16, it can be seen that:

2. The Mann-Whitney U test shows that for the NPL (Non-Performing Loan) variable, the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) is 0.529. This value is greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the NPL value between state-owned banks and private banks. This finding is consistent with previous research conducted by Putra (2022), which found no significant difference in NPLs between national banks and private banks.
3. For the GCG (Good Corporate Governance) variable, the Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) is 1.000. This value is also greater than 0.05, so it can be concluded that there is no significant difference in the value of GCG between State-owned Banks and Private Banks. This finding is consistent with previous research conducted by Putra (2022), which states that there is no significant difference in GCG between national banks and private banks.

CONCLUSION

The health levels of State-owned Banks (Bank Mandiri and Bank BRI) and Private Banks (Bank CIMB Niaga and Bank BCA) based on the RBBR approach for the 2020-2023 period can be concluded and the suggestions provided in relation to this research are as follows: Assessment of risk profile using two methods, namely NPL and LDR. In the 2020-2023 period, the overall NPL and LDR of State-owned Banks and Private Banks were classified as "healthy" (level 2). The assessment of good corporate governance (GCG) in the 2020-2023 period as a whole yielded a similar result for State-owned Banks and Private Banks, with both classified as "healthy" (level 2). In the period from 2020 to 2023, the overall ROA and NIM of state-owned banks (State-owned Banks) and private banks received the predicate "Highly Healthy" (level 1). The capital assessment employs the CAR method. In the aforementioned period, the state-owned banks received the predicate "Highly Healthy" (level 1), while the private banks received the predicate "Highly Healthy" (level 1). The results of the various tests conducted indicate that there is no discernible difference in the health levels of State-owned Banks and private banks during the 2020-2023 period, as measured by risk profile, good corporate governance, earnings, and capital.

The suggestions provided in relation to this research are as follows: With regard to the assessment of NPL, LDR, GCG, ROA, NIM and CAR, it is imperative that bank management maintain or improve the predicate of bank health in both healthy and very healthy conditions. In particular, for Bank BRI, it is recommended that management increase the LDR ratio to be equivalent to Bank Mandiri in a healthy LDR condition. It is also anticipated that future research will be capable of incorporating risks beyond those pertaining to credit and liquidity, and will encompass a more expansive selection of banking institutions, utilising the most recent data set.

REFERENCES

- Ahdiat, A. (2023, December 13). *Proyeksi bank dunia: Pertumbuhan ekonomi Indonesia melambat pada 2024*. Diakses April 1, 2024, dari <https://databoks.katadata.co.id/datapublish/2023/12/13/proyeksi-bank-dunia-pertumbuhan-ekonomi-indonesia-melambat-pada-2024>
- Ali, A. H., & Fadilah, A. N. (2024). Analisis tingkat kesehatan bank BUMN di daftar Bursa Efek Indonesia dengan metode RGEC (risk profile, good corporate governance, earnings, capital) periode 2021-2022. *Mazinda: Jurnal Akuntansi, Keuangan, dan Bisnis*, 2(1), 40-55.
- Amelia, R., Lestari, I., & Nasib. (2019). *Keuangan dan perbankan*. Bandung: CV. Sadari (Anggota IKAPI JABAR).
- Darman, Maulana, M. A., & Tope, P. (2021). Analisis perbandingan tingkat kesehatan bank BUMN dan bank BUMS di Indonesia. *J-MKLI (Jurnal Manajemen dan Kearifan Lokal Indonesia)*, 4(2), 92.
- Hery. (2021). *Dasar-dasar perbankan*. Jakarta: Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Hery. (2023). *Analisis laporan keuangan: Intergrated and comperhesive edition*. Jakarta: Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Ikatan Akuntan Indonesia. (2020). *Pernyataan standar akuntansi keuangan*. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.
- Irawati, D. (2021). *Struktur dan dinamika industri perbankan Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: Bintang Pustaka Madani.

Irfani, A. S. (2020). *Manajemen keuangan dan bisnis: Teori dan aplikasi*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Ismanto, H., Widiastuti, A., Muharam, H., Pangestuti, I. R., & Rofiq, F. (2019). *Perbankan dan literasi keuangan*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.

Kasmir. (2022). *Analisis laporan keuangan (Edisi Revisi)*. Depok: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Kimmel, P. D., Weygandt, J. J., & Kieso, D. E. (2021). *Accounting: Tools for business decision making*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Kosim, B., & Pratama, R. A. (2021). Tingkat kesehatan bank BUMN dan bank swasta yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 11(1), 81.

Otoritas Jasa Keuangan. (2016). *Peraturan Otoritas Jasa Keuangan Nomor 4/POJK.03/2016 tentang penilaian tingkat kesehatan bank umum*. Jakarta: Otoritas Jasa Keuangan.

Otoritas Jasa Keuangan. (2018). *Peraturan Otoritas Jasa Keuangan Nomor 11/POJK.03/2018 tentang kewajiban penyediaan modal minimum bank umum*. Jakarta: Otoritas Jasa Keuangan.

Otoritas Jasa Keuangan. (2022). *Peraturan Otoritas Jasa Keuangan Nomor 3/POJK.03/2022 tentang penilaian tingkat kesehatan bank umum*. Jakarta: Otoritas Jasa Keuangan.

Putera, A. P. (2020). *Hukum perbankan: Analisis mengenai prinsip, produk, risiko dan manajemen risiko dalam perbankan*. Surabaya: Scopindo Media Pustaka.

Putra, G. A. T., & Idris, A. (2023). Perbandingan tingkat kesehatan bank BUMN dan BUMS nasional berdasarkan metode RGEC tahun 2017-2021. *Intellektika: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa*, 1(5), 63-81.

Putra, O. (2022). Studi komparatif tingkat kesehatan bank nasional dan bank swasta di Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Terapan dan Keuangan*, 11(01), 91-104.

Rahman, M. A. (2022). Metode RGEC menjadi tolak ukur tingkat kesehatan bank. *Ar-Ribhu*, 3(1), 104-116.

Santoso, S., Qalbia, F., & Benardi, B. (2023). Dampak pandemi Covid 19 terhadap kinerja keuangan bank umum di Indonesia. *ASSET: Jurnal Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 6(1).

Syachrani, A., & Binastuti, S. (2021). Analisis perbandingan tingkat kesehatan bank BUMN dan bank swasta di Indonesia berdasarkan metode RGEC periode 2015-2019. *Jurnal Ilmiah Raflesia Akuntansi*, 7(1), 58-65.

Zhafira, A. D., & Ardhani, L. (2023). Analisis tingkat kesehatan bank menggunakan metode RGEC pada bank umum swasta nasional periode 2020-2021. *Jurnal Ilmiah Akuntansi Peradaban*, 9(1), 1-24.