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Abstract

The purpose of the research paper is to investigate the impact of Non-Performing Loan (NPL) on Capital Adequacy (CA) of bank in a developing country as Bangladesh. The study is important in the context of Bangladesh as growing non-performing loan is eroding significant portion of bank’s capital as an assumed factor without empirical evidence to show the extent of the impact. The study employs a sample size of 40 consisting of the data of Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) against Non-Performing Loan (NPL) ratio for last 10 years (2008-2017) generated from four categories of bank. Test of hypothesis, correlation, regression analysis and trend analysis have been conducted using SPSS software. The paper provides empirical evidence that non-performing loan has significant impact on capital adequacy of bank. This study will help the policy makers to control to the desired NPL ratio for ensuring CAR prescribed by the prudential regulatory requirement of central bank. This study seems to be the first attempts to address such an issue in the context of Bangladesh.
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1. Introduction

The working capital of bank consists of the deposit of the depositors (90%) and the capital provided by the directors (10%). Non-performing loan means those financial assets from which banks no longer receive interest or installment payments according to schedules. NPL constitutes the problem of economic stagnation. The minimization of NPL is an obligatory condition for improving economic growth.

In Bangladesh, NPL is a major worsening factor for the performance of banks. The issue of NPL has become one of the major problems for more than a decade in the banking sector of Bangladesh. Banks having capital adequacy ratio less than the regulatory minimum requirement are compelled to adjust their balance sheet to comply with the regulatory requirements either by raising more capital by holding assets constant or reducing risk-weighted assets while capital constant(Fries et al. 2001). These adjustments make a beneficial impact on the bank performance and soundness. According to research by Dickson and Marobhe (2012), capital adequacy has a great influence on the
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asset quality where increase in capital ratios sometimes reduced the levels of non-performing loans and increase in non-performing asset was accompanied by an increase in capital ratios (Dickson and Marobhe, 2012).

Existing literatures mostly show the impact of NPL on profitability. Research evidence has been rarely found that has taken into consideration the impact of NPL on capital adequacy in the context of Bangladesh.

To meet up the gaps of existing literatures, the objective of the research paper is to investigate the impact of non-performing loan on the capital adequacy in the banking sector of Bangladesh from the empirical evidence. Besides, some problems have been identified that can be resulted from the impact. At the end of the paper some measures have been recommended to get rid of the problem of NPL.

The paper consists of following four sections. Review of previous literatures has been shown in section 2 which is followed by the research methodology in section 3. Section 4 describes the statistical results and discussions. Finally, section 5 concludes the paper with key findings and recommendations.

2. Review of Literature
Commercial banks expose themselves to the risks of default borrowers due to the nature of their business (Waweru & Kalami, 2009). The loss of loan is a total loss of time, money and effort by a loop of Capital formation-Investment-Recovery (Chowdhury et al. 2002). Hou (2007) argued that NPLs hamper economic growth and reduce the economic efficiency (as cited by Dhar & Bakshi, 2015). Lata (2015) studied that non-performing loan of state owned commercial banks are very high where they hold more than 50 percent of total NPLs of the industry in Bangladesh from FY 2006 to FY 2013. Adhikari (2007) argued that the lack of effective monitoring and supervision of the banks, lack of effective lenders’, weakness of legal infrastructure and lack of effective debt recovery strategies are the usual causes of NPLs. Poor enforcement of laws for settlement of NPLs and insufficient debt recovery measurements have also aggravated the financial malaise (Cited as Lata, 2015). Banks that charge relatively higher interest rates and lend excessively are likely to be incurred higher levels of non-performing loans (Khemraj et al., 2009). Banks’ lending behavior can restrict economic activity, especially in periods of stress when non-performing loans are high (Tracery, 2011; Sinkery & Greenwalt, 1991).

3. Research Methodology
3.1 Sample Size
The initial sample size of this study is 40 consisting of NPL ratio and CAR data of last 10 years generated from four categories of banks namely- State-owned Commercial Bank (SCB), Specialized Bank (SB), Private Commercial Bank (PCB) and Foreign Commercial Bank (FCB).

3.2 Sources of Data
The research paper is based on secondary data only collected from annual reports 2008 to 2017 of Bangladesh Bank. Summary of data has drawn on appendix table-4.
3.3 Data and Description of the Variables
The dependent variable is Capital Adequacy Ratio which is termed as CAR and the independent variable is Non-Performing Loan which is termed as NPL.

3.4 Linear Regression Model
Linear regression model has been developed using SPSS software. The standardized regression model is:

\[ CAR = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 NPL \]  

Where, CAR is the dependent variable which is to be estimated against NPL, \( \alpha_0 \) = intercept which represents the estimated value of CAR when NPL is zero, \( \beta_1 \) = average change in CAR for each percent change in NPL, and NPL is the independent variable that is fixed in advance.

3.5 Test of Hypothesis
In this study, following hypothesis have been developed:
- \( H_0: \) The coefficient of determination in the population is zero.
- \( H_1: \) The coefficient of determination in the population is not zero.

4. Statistical Results and Discussions
Findings of the study have been categorically discussed in the following subsections:

4.1 Results on Regression Analysis
Based on the equation (i) the fitted regression model is:

\[ CAR = 22.456 + (-0.719) \ NPL \]  

According to the table-2 of appendix, the correlation between CAR and NPL has been found negative. According to the above model (ii), if NPL increases by 1 percent then CAR will decrease by 0.719 percent. The value of coefficient of determination, \( R^2 \) is 0.517 or 51.70% which indicates that around 52% of variation in the dependent variable (CAR) can be explained by the independent variable (NPL) in the above mentioned regression model. According to the table-1 of appendix, the value of adjusted \( R^2 \) is 0.504 or 50.40% which suggests that addition of other independent variable may make more contribution to explain the variation in the dependent variable.

From the above mentioned regression model, it has been evidenced that forecasted controlled average NPL ratio is 17.32% and 13.85% to maintain 10% and 12.50% CAR respectively according to BASEL II and BASEL III regulatory requirement. NPL ratio of both PCBs and FCBs are below the average with 5.80% and 7.90% respectively as of 2017. However, the NPL of SCBs and SBs were 26.80% and 23.80% respectively in 2017.

4.2 Results of Test of Hypothesis
It has been found from appendix table 3, the statistical output that the p value is 0.000 which is less than 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. As a result, there is
significant negative relationship between the independent variable named Non Performing Loan (NPL) and dependent variable named Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR).

4.3 Trend Analysis

Figure 01: Trend Analysis of NPL of Last Ten Years (2008-17) in Four Categories of Banks

Above figure provides information about NPL ratio of recent 10 years for four categories of bank namely SCB, SB, PCB and FCB where the SCBs has gradually increasing NPL compared to other categories of bank. NPL is higher in both SCBs and SBs bearing above 20% in last half of the decade. Besides SBs experienced the worst condition with above 25% NPL in most of the years compared to other categories of bank. The NPL of both PCBs and FCBs is also increasing gradually in recent years but it is below 10% showing better condition comparatively.

Figure 02: Trend Analysis of CAR of Last Ten Years (2008-17) in Four Categories of Banks

Data Source: Developed by Authors from Annual Report 2008-2017, Bangladesh Bank
Above graph denotes that SBs have capital adequacy ratio with negative figure among most of the years of recent 10 years which is leading to reverse of required capital as a result of increased level of NPL and other reasons. Besides, SCBs are also having downward capital adequacy ratio in trend following upward movement of NPL ratio. In both of the cases, capital adequacy ratio is below the regulatory requirement of 10% according to BASEL II. It is also clear that PCBs and FCBs maintain adequate capital against the regulatory requirements of BASEL II. Noticeably, FCBs have stronger capital adequacy ratio which is almost double of minimum regulatory requirement of CAR according to both BASEL II and BASEL III.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

It has been evidenced from the study that NPL ratio has statistically significant negative impact on CAR. However, NPL ratio covers only 52% variations in CAR but as a single variable it seems a significant determine of level of CAR. This higher degree of influence can result lower profitability, lower deposit, interest rate, liquidity crisis, higher lending interest rate and bad corporate governance. Hence, banks need to control the NPL ratio with proper credit assessment and recovery measures mainly in state owned commercial banks and specialized banks as capital shortage problem is acute in these two categories of bank. However, controlling NPL ratio for both these categories of banks is urgent need as the trend analysis also shows that NPL ratio and CAR of both these categories of bank are deteriorating rapidly compared to other two categories of bank. It will be more difficult for the banks to maintain required levels of CAR when it will become 12.50% from 10% through full implementation of BASEL III replacing BASEL II in whole banking sector. Hence, banks need to be well prepared to face the challenge in this regard focusing on controlling NPL ratio immediately.
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## APPENDIX

### Table -01

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Change Statistics</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.719a</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>10.83346</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>40.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>df1 1</td>
<td>df2 38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), NPL  
b. Dependent Variable: CAR

### Table -02

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>95.0% Confidence Interval for B</th>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Upper Bound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Zero-order</td>
<td>Partial</td>
<td>Part</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>22.456</td>
<td>2.973</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>16.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NPL</td>
<td>-1.091</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.437</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: CAR

### Table -03

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4774.531</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4774.531</td>
<td>40.681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>4459.828</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9234.359</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: CAR  
b. Predictors: (Constant), NPL

### Table -04

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>NPL (%)</th>
<th>CAR (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SCBs</td>
<td>SBs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>25.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Banking Regulation and Policy Department, Bangladesh Bank.