OPEN ACCESS

Research Article

Comparative Analysis Performance Bank of PT Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk between 2017 and 2018

Harun Faizal[1] and Viciwati[2*]

[1] Faculty of Economics and Business - Muhammad Husni Thamrin University. Jakarta. Indonesia
[2] Faculty of Economics and Business - Universitas Mercu Buana. Jakarta. Indonesia

*Corresponding Author
Viciwati

Abstract: This study aims are compartaive analysis of performance Bank at PT Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk by implementing the RGEC (Risk Profile, Good Corporate Governance, Earning, Capital) method between in 2017 and 2018 banks through a comparative analysis. The method used in this study is RGEC (Risk Profile, Good Corporate Governance, Earning, and Capital). The result are the performance ratio of Mandiri banks in 2018 and the performance ratio of Mandiri banks in 2017 is not significant difference between the Bank Mandiri Performance Ratio in 2018 and the Bank Mandiri Performance Ratio in 2017.
Keywords: Bank Health and the RGEC Method (Risk Profile, Good Corporate Governance, Earning, Capital).

INTRODUCTION

Bank Mandiri financial statements as of the end of 2016 The net profit of a state-owned bank claiming to be the largest asset-holding bank in Indonesia is only IDR13.8 trillion, eroded 32.1% of the 2015 net profit of IDR 20.3 trillion. Investigate a calibration, apparently the freefall of Mandiri's profit was contributed by the soaring non-performing loans (NPLs) penetrate 4%. The fall in global commodity prices has become an alibi. The reason is, a number of debtors arerelying on natural resources such as coal, has decreased performance.The identification problem continued. It turns out, some of the NPL came from the debtor notcooperative. There are five debtors called the Supreme Audit Agency (BPK) in the "Results Summary Examination of PT Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk semester II 2017 "which has the potential to cause losses up to Rp2.94 trillion (Warta Ekonomi. 2018).

This study aims to analyze comparation of performance bank at PT Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk with RGEC (Risk Profile, Good Corporate Govermance, Earning, and Capital)

Financial Services Authority Circular number 14 / SEOJK.03 / 2017 dated March 17, 2017 concerning Rating of Commercial Bank Soundness in point III.1

Procedure for Assessing the Soundness of Commercial Banks Individually Assessment of Soundness Level of Commercial Banks Individually includes an assessment of risk profile factors , Governance, profitability and capital (Otoritas Jasa Keuangan 2017).

Based on the last reseach are Widyanto (Widyanto, M. L. 2019) that the comparison ofthe performance of DKI Bank and PT BPD Jawa Tengah in 2017 are not significant difference; the comparison of the PT BPD Central Java's performance is not significant difference for 2016 and 2017, but the comparison the The performance of Bank DKI for 2016 and 2017 is significant difference. The implementation of Circular Letter Number 14 / SEOJK.03 / 2017 regional development banks period 2016 (before) and 2017 (after), shows that the assessment of financial performance of PT BPD Central Java are not significant difference, however the assessment of financial DKI Bank's performance is a significant difference. In 2017 after the implementation of Circular Letter Number 14 /SEOJK.03 / 2017 the results show that the comparison of the performance of PT BPD Jawa Tengah and Bank DKI are not significant difference. Rahmaniah and Wibowo (2015) that the year 2011 to 2013 on the third BUS (Islamic Banks) nothing is declared unhealthy and potentially high financial distress, the three buses

experienced a decline in the performance of earnings as measured by ROA and ROE and liquidity ratios that FDR, but the decline no significant effect and does not experience the potential of high financial distress.Rosdiana (2019) The result is not a significant difference between Performance Ratio of Bank HSBC in 2018 and HSBC Performance Ratio of Bank in 2017. Aprilia, *et al.,* (2018) that on the contrary, debt to equity ratio and return on assets not effect significantly on price to book value Helsinawati, *et al.,*(2018). The assessment of financial performance of PT. Bank Bukopin Tbk before and after the application of branchless banking is not difference and not significant, but is not fixed value. Permana D (2017) that strategic clarity in term of align with vision, priority of strategy and scope of strategy have positive significant impact on strategy implementation success in Indonesian Islamic banking. The implications of these findings are further elaborated. Christian. F. J, Tommy. P & Tulung. J (2016) that An healthy bank is a bank that can perform its functions properly. In other words, a healthy bank is a bank that is able to keep and maintain the trust of the community, can do the intermediassi function, it can help smooth the payment as well as lalulitas can be used by the Government in carrying out a wide range of its policies, especially monetary policy

MATERIALS AND METHODS
Bank Health

Bank health is the competence of a capable bank carrying out its activities in accordance with applicable regulations. So Bank health is important for all parties involved and has an interest in the bank (Fitrawati. Saifi. M., & Zahroh. 2016).

RGEC Method (Risk Profile, Good Corporate Governance, Earning, Capital)

Based on Bank Indonesia Regulation No. 13 of 2011 (Bank Indonesia. 2011) Article 6, banks are required to evaluate the soundness of banks individually using a risk approach (Risk-Based Bank Rating) with the scope of the assessment of the following factors:

1. Risk Profile (Risk Profile)
The formula used in calculating risk profiles is:
a. Non Performing Loans (NPL).

Net Performing Loans (NPL) are financing given to third parties (not including credit for other banks). The NPL ratio is calculated by comparing total financing with problems financing. The smaller the NPF ratio the better asset quality (Hadisoewito. S. 2011).

NPL = Non Performing Loan / Total Credit X 100%
(Source: SE No.13 / 24 / DPNP / 2011) (Bank Indonesia, 2011)

b. Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR)

LDR = Total Credit / Third Party Deposit X 100%
(Source: SE No.13 / 24 / DPNP / 2011) (Bank Indonesia, 2011)

2. Good Corporate Governance (GCG)

Good Corporate Governance is a collection of laws, regulations and rules that must be fulfilled, which can encourage resources The company works efficiently, generating economic value in the run sustainable length for shareholders and the public around as a whole (Arafat, W., 2006).

3. Rentability (Earning)
Rentability can be calculated using a formula, namely:

a. Return On Asset (ROA)

ROA = Earnings before Tax / Average Asset Total X 100%
(Source: SE No.13 / 24 / DPNP / 2011) (Bank Indonesia, 2011)

b. Net Interest Margin (NIM)

NIM =   Net or Average Interest Income / Earning Assets X 100%
(Source: SE No.13 / 24 / DPNP / 2011) (Bank Indonesia, 2011)

4. Capital (Capital)
CAR Formula is as follows:

CAR = Risk Weighted Capital / Assets X 100%
(Source: SE No.13 / 24 / DPNP / 2011) (Bank Indonesia, 2011)

Hypothesis
H_1: There are differences in performance bank of PT. Bank Mandiri Tbk between 2017 and 2018.

Object and Time of Research
This research was conducted at of PT. Bank Mandiri Tbk. The research time period is 2017 and

2018. The data from secondary data at www.bankmandiri.co.id and www.ojk.go.id

Research Design
This research is a kind of quantitative descriptive research. The focus of the research in this study is as follows:
➢ Performance bank at PT Bank Mandiri Tbk used the RGEC (Risk Profile, Good Corporate Governance, Earning, Capital) method approach.
➢ The research event study research to examine the information content based on a time series are 2017 and 2018 for PT Bank Mandiri Tbk, so that researchers can see the difference in financial performance of these events using comparative research designs , that is research that aims to

compare performance bank in 2017 and bank performance in 2018.

Data Analysis
Data analysis use average Difference Analysis with t test (Paired Sample t-test)
The hypothesis in this study is as follows
➢ Ho: $\mu_1 - \mu_1 = 0$, means there is no difference of financial performance 2016 with 2017
➢ Ha: $\mu_1 - \mu_1 \neq 0$, means there is differences of financial performance 2016 with 2017

Statistics Test: T test (Paired Sample t Test)
Test Criteria:
➢ If sig > 0.05 then Ho is accepted
➢ If sig < 0.05 then Ho is rejected (Widyanto, M. L. 2019)

RESULTS AND DISCUSION
Financial Performance of Bank Mandiri

PT BANK Mandiri (PERSERO), Tbk

Performance Bank	(In precentage)	
	2018	2017
1. Risk Profile		
a Non Performing Loan (NPL)	0,67	1,06
b. Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR)	96,74	88,11
2. GCG	1	1
3. Earning		
a. Return on Asset (ROA)	3,17	2,72
b. Net Interest Margin (NIM)	5,52	5,63
4. Capital		
a. Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR)	20,96	21,64

Source: Otoritas Jasa Keuangan (2019) (Otoritas, J. K. 2019)

Based on Bank Mandiri's performance data for 2017 and 2018, it was found that there were decreases in 3 Bank Mandiri performance ratios, namely Non Performing Loans (NPL) down -0.39%, Net Interest Margin (NIM) down -0.11% and Capita Adequacy Ratio (CAR) decreased -0.68%, while the 2 performance ratios of Bank Mandiri experienced an increase was the Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR) 8.63% Return on Assets (ROA) 0.45%.

Good corprate govermance of Mandiri Bank
Result of statistic Test
The results of statistis test as follows

GCG of Mandiri Bank between 2018 and 2017 is not difference means very healthy Corporate Governance Perception Index Bank Mandiri has received the title "The Most Trusted" (The Most Trusted Company) for which the 12th time in a row with the highest value compared to other participating companies based on assessment of Corporate Governance & Perception Index (CGPI), namely with a score of 93.86, increased from the score the previous period was 93.32 (Mandiri Bank. 2018).

Table 2, Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2018 (%)	5	.67	96.74	25.4120	40.65116
Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2017 (%)	5	1.06	88.11	23.8320	36.85125
Valid N (listwise)	5				

Based on Mandiri Bank's Descriptive Statistic performance ratio in 2018 a minimum of 0.67%, a maximum value of 96.74%, a mean of 25.4120% and a standard deviation of 40.65116%, while a Mandiri

Bank's performance ratio in 2017 of a minimum of 1.06%, a maximum value of 88.11%, a mean of 23.8320% and a standard deviation 36.85125%.

Table 3. One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

	Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2018 (%)	Performance ratio of Mandiri

			Bank 2017 (%)
N		5	5
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	25.4120	23.8320
	Std. Deviation	40.65116	36.85125
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.344	.324
	Positive	.344	.324
	Negative	-,271	-.268
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		,768	.724
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		,596	.671
a. Test distribution is Normal.			
b. Calculated from data.			

Based on the Kolmogorov-Smirnov One-Sample Mandiri Bank performance test ratio in 2018 of 0.596 > 0.05 means normal distribution data, and Mandiri Bank performance ratio in 2017 of 0.671 > 0.05 means normal distribution data.

Table 4.Paired Samples Statistics

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2018 (%)	25,4120	5	40.65116	18.17975
	Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2017 (%)	23,8320	5	36.85125	16.48038

Based on Mandiri Bank's Paired Samples Statistics performance ratio in 2018 is a mean 25.4120% and a standard deviation of 40.65116% and a standard error of a mean 16.17975%, while Mandiri Bank's performance ratio in 2017 is a mean 23.8320% and a standard deviation of 36.85125% and a standard error of the mean 16.48038%.

Table 5.Paired Samples Correlations

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2018 (%) & Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2017 (%)	5	1.000	.000

Based on Paired Samples Correlations on the Bank Mandiri 2017 performance ratio and Bank Mandiri 2018 performance ratio is 0,000 <0.050 means there is a correlation in the 5 sample Performance ratio

Table 6.Paired Samples Test

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2018 (%) - Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2017 (%)	1,58000	3,96308	1.77234	-3.34081	6,50081	.891	4	.423

Based on Paired Samples test data sig (2-tailed) 0.423 > 0.050 means there is not difference performance bank ratios at Bank Mandiri between performance bank ratio of Bank Mandiri in 2018 and 2017.

Table 7. Ranks

		N	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks
Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2018 (%) - Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2017 (%)	Negative Ranks	3[a]	2.33	7.00
	Positive Ranks	2[b]	4.00	8.00
	Ties	0[c]		
	Total	5		
a. Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2018 (%) < Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2017 (%)				
b. Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2018 (%) > Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2017 (%)				
c. Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2018 (%) = Performance ratio of Mandiri Bank 2017 (%)				

Based on data ranks that from 5 samples that Bank Mandiri 2018 Performance ratio and Bank Mandiri 2017 Performance ratio there are negative ranks 3 ratios, mean ranks 2.33% and sum of ranks 7% and positive ranks 2 ratios, mean ranks 4% and sum of ranks 8% and the explanation is that the decline in Bank Mandiri's 3 performance ratios are Non Performing Loans (NPL) down -0.39%, Net Interest Margin (NIM) down -0.11% and Capital

Adequacy Ratio (CAR) down -0.68%, while 2 Bank Mandiri's performance ratio has increased are the Loan to Deposit Ratio (LDR) 8.63% Return on Assets (ROA) 0.45%.

CONCLUSION

Based on the result and dicussion, so the conclusion is not difference performance bank ratios at Bank Mandiri between performance bank ratio of Bank Mandiri in 2018 Performance ratio and performance bank ratio of Bank Mandiri in 2017.

REFERENCES

1. Warta Ekonomi. (2018). Bank Mandiri: Top of Mind Konglomerat, diunggah Selasa, 05 Juni 2018 09:20 WIB. https://www.wartaekonomi.co.id
2. Otoritas Jasa Keuangan (2017). Surat Edaran Otoritas Jasa Keuangan nomor 14/SEOJK.03/2017 tanggal 17 Maret 2017 tentang Penilaian Tingkat Kesehatan Bank Umum www.ojk.go.id)/id/regulasi/Surat-Edaran-OJK>Pages
3. Widyanto, M. L. (2019). Comparative Analysis Implementation of Circular Letters Financial Services Authority Number 14 / Seojk.03 / 2017 Concerning Assessment of The Soundness Level of Regional Development Banks (Case Study at Bank DKI and BPD Jawa Tenggah, Saudi Journal of Business and Management Studi, 4(4) 297 - 305
4. Rahmaniah, M., & Wibowo, H. (2015). Analisis Potensi Terjadinya Financial Distress Pada Bank Umum Syariah (BUS) di Indonesia, *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Perbankan Syariah*, 3 (1), 1-20
5. Rosdiana. R. (2019). Comparative Analysis of Pt Bank HSBC Indonesia Financial Performance between 2017 and 2018, Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences 4(7) 449-454.
6. Aprilia, R. S.R., Puspitaningtyas, Z., & Prakoso. A. (2018). Pengaruh Current Ration, Total Asset Turnover Dan Debt to Equity Ratio Terhadap Price To Book Value dengan Return on Asset Sebagai Variable Intervering (Studi Pada Perusahaan Sektor Industri Barang Konsumsi di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2013-2017).*Profita: Komunikasi Ilmiah Akuntansi dan Perpajakan*. Prodi Akuntansi Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Mercu Buana 11 (3). Desember 2018. 329-358.
7. Helsinawati, Widyanto, M.L., & Faizal, H. (2018). Impact Analysis: Before and After Branchless Banking Implementation Towards the Bank's Financial Performance (Case Study on PT Bank Bukopin, Tbk), Saudi Journal of Business and Management Studies, 3(6), 670-680.
8. Permana, D. (2017). Toward the Best Model of Strategy Implementation in Indonesian Islamic Banking from the Lens of Strategic Clarity, European Research Studies Journal. 20 (4B), 2017. 3-15
9. Christian. F. J., Tommy. P., & Tulung. J. (2017). Bank Health Analysis Using RGEC Method in BRI and Mandiri Bank, *Jurnal EMBA*, 5 (2), 530-540.
10. Fitrawati. Saifi. M., & Zahroh. (2016). Penerapan Aplikasi RGEC (Risiko Profil, Tata Kelola Perusahaan yang Baik, Penghasilan, Modal) dalam Bank Kinerja Menganalisis Untuk Mengetahui Tingkat Kesehatan Bank (Studi Kasus PT. Bank Tabungan Negara (Persero) Tbk, Pz 2013-2015)). Jurnal Administrasi Bisnis 37 (1), 30.
11. Bank Indonesia. (2011). Peraturan Bank Indonesia Tentang Penilaian Tingkat Kesehatan Bank Bank Umum, dengan nomor regulasi 13/1/PBI/2011 tanggal 5 Januari 2011 www.ojk.go.id)>Documents>pages>Salinan-POJK4-Penilaian-10.pdf
12. Hadisoewito. S. (2011). Prinsip Dasar Kehati-hatian dan Penilaian Bank. Jakarta: Pamato
13. Bank Indonesia, (2011). Surat Edaran Nomor.13 / 24 / DPNP / 2011,www.bi.go.id
14. Arafat, W., (2006). Manajemen Perbankan Indonesia, Teori dan Implementasi. Jakarta: Pustaka LP3ES Indonesia
15. Widyanto, M. L. (2019). Comparative Analysis of PT. Bank Cimb Niaga Tbk Financial Performance Period of 2016 And 2017, Through Implementation of RGEC (Risk Profile, Good Corporate Governance, Earning, Capital) Method. *Saudi Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences.* 4(4), 254-260.
16. Otoritas Jasa Keuangan (2019). Laporan Perbankan PT Bank Mandiri (Persero) Tbk, www.ojk.go.id
17. Mandiri Bank. (2018). outcome Good Coporate Govermance 2018, www.mandiri.ac.id