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ABSTRACT

Credit is necessarily connected to a notion of profitability and risk. These two elements remain inseparable within the framework of the banking activity. Loan schemes need to be professionally managed so as to influence positively the bank’s performance because without good credit risk management, numerous institutions encounter liquidity and inadequate working capital issues. The study aim was to analyze the impacts of CRM on the performance financially of the banking institutes in Senegal. The design employed in research was the descriptive research design. Secondary data acquired from the BCEAO publications of banks financial statements was used by the researcher. The information collected used multiple regression and descriptive statistics analysis in analysis to come up with the relationship in regard to the direction, magnitude and nature between the variables of study. Multiple regression model was adopted to ascertain the relationship of the dependent variable to multiple independent variables. The research findings established that the association between ROA and asset quality was statistically noteworthy and positive while the relationship between capital adequacy and ROA was negative and statistically significant respectively. The research also found that the relation between liquidity and ROA was positive and insignificant whereas the relationship between management efficiency and ROA was negative and statistically insignificant respectively. The research came to a conclusion that capital adequacy and CRM considerably affects commercial banks financial performance in Senegal and suggested that the commercial banks management in Senegal should come up with effective strategies of management of credit risk to mitigate the impact of credit risk on banks’ financial performance.
CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

For very many years, credit risk constitutes a considerable source of the volatility of companies and financial institutions profit. Credit institutions are exposed to a multitude of risks which can entail their failure and bankruptcy. In Senegal, commercial banks are contributing to the economy of the country significantly with the considerable financial services they offer. The stability and the rapid growth of the Senegalese economy is partially determined by the ability of the banking industry to offer credit to various actors in the local economy value chain (BCEAO, 2016).

Ranson (2012) defines credit risk as total loss recorded on an operation further to the failure of the counterparty. In other words, it is the possibility that the return accrued from an investment is not the same as the return that’s expected. Credit risk is very essential for investors, banks and obligation issuers. It’s subjected at the same time to economic trends, situation of the business sector, political stability and to events related to the life of a company. It decreases in phase of economic expansion, because the considerable earnings by companies during this period reduce their probability of failure. On the contrary, it increases in period of recession, because of the decreasing company earnings. Credit Risk, thus, should be managed to limit risk as it represents banks principle income generating (Sangare, 2017).
Before being able to manage risks, it is imperative to identify them. Various sources of credit risk include risk resulting from the debtor, where it is a case of insolvency and in this case of external risk, the bank is not responsible for the degradation of the situation of the customer. There is also the risk resulting from the creditor, where the problem rests on the distributive policy of the credits of the bank. To limit such risks, the banking industry should have in place very well-capitalized service for a variety their clients, sharing clients’ credit data, stable interest rates, non-performing loan reduction, increasing the bank deposits and ensuring increased loans provision to the borrowers (Basel Committee, 2006).

1.1.1 Credit Risk Management

Managing credit risk revolves around identifying, estimating, monitoring and controlling risks related to loan defaulting (Early, 1996; and Coyle, 2000). Among the essential threats concerning banks is Credit risk. Sometimes, it may be difficult to know the types of borrowers from the good to the bad (Auronen, 2003). Therefore, adverse selection often occurs in loaning. To limit credit risk, banking institutions should carry out due diligence of their clientele also known as “the principle of know your customer” (Basel Committee, 2006).

Credit risk management objective is to reduce at a maximum level the risk adjusted rate of return when banks face a certain credit risk. Commercial banks require a solid credit risk management for their whole portfolio and to oversee risk for credits and transactions. Commercial banks must also consider the connections between risk related to loans and other risks. Viable management of credit risk is an important part of an extensive
management risk approach and it is fundamental for a sustainable efficiency of the banking system.

It’s imperative for commercial banks to invest in a robust system of CRM. Good CRM helps banks to reduce risk and reinforce their capacity to compete in the market (Van Greuning & Iqbal, 2007). Credit risk management empowers banks to proactively oversee loans with a specific end goal to reduce losses and increase satisfactory level of return for stakeholders. Banks utilize different credit risk management strategies generally determined by credit policies, credit scoring frameworks, regulatory system and the ability of the management (Van Greuning & Brajovic, 2004).

To undertake credit risk management obligations and duties, a bank need to understand its financial records, credit and environmental analysis. Banks should hold sound records of their credit performance of their portfolio of risky assets. Thus, any change in guaranteeing strategies and directions can essentially influence negatively their loan loss experience (Kenneth & Thygerson, 1995).

**1.1.2 Financial Performance**

As noted by Chege, (2008), the financial performance of a firm entity is the procedure of assessing the gains of the organization’s activities in value in terms of money. It is the measure of the profit or loss during a given period. The internal factors, for example, asset quality, capital adequacy, management efficiency and liquidity management can vary amongst banks. The external factors are largely out of management’s control and other financial institutions have a higher stake. These incorporate the political stability, the inflation rate, loan interest rates and monetary policies. The literature suggests several
factors susceptible to affecting a bank's financial performance such as the size, the banking risk (Short, 1979; and Bourke 1989).

Using the financial performance of a firm, it is possible to quantify firm's overall financial health per year. The commonly used financial indicators to calculate performance financially include the ROE known as the coefficient of financial profitability, the ROA as coefficient of economic profitability and the NPM (Alexandru et al., 2008).

According to Pooja and Balwinder, (2009), ROA and ROE are the major ratios used in measuring commercial banks financial performance. Kaplan, Norton and Rugelsjoen (2010) proposed the use of balance scorecard in measuring the firm progress. Through use of balance scorecard, performance of a firm is established in four perspectives which include the customer, business context, prospects and development perspectives and financial perspectives.

1.1.3 Credit Risk Management and Financial Performance

The stability and the solvency of the banking system are an indispensable condition for the smooth running of the financial system. Commercial banks and other financial service providers essentially lend money to businesses, people, governments etc., but the most of their profit is originated from customer’s loans (Gallagher, 1989). To ensure positive financial performance, banks should establish and monitor their loan process (Rahman & Mazlan, 2014).

The risk inherent to the banking sector distinguishes itself by its multiplicity and by its multi-sectoral nature which can only be ascertained using multiple indicators. Credit risk
positively influences the banking financial performance and banks manage credit risks by their operations on the derived markets of products where they exchange various instruments (forward financial contracts, options on instruments of debt, swaps of interest rate, etc.) (Lymon & Carles, 1978).

Achou and Tenguh (2008) noted that there exists a notable connection between the financial performance measured using credit risk management (as indicated by loan performance) and ROA. A well-structured credit risk management results in greater bank performance. Without good credit risk management, numerous entities encounter liquidity and inadequate working capital issues.

Pandley (2015) expressed that the credit policy defines an organization’s performance. It implies that when an organization adopts a credit policy, it will empower borrower’s investment revenue maximization in order to improve the financial performance. Therefore, a good credit strategy or policy significantly enhances banks’ financial performance.

1.1.4 Commercial Banks in Senegal

Senegal is a WAEMU member. The West African Economic and Monetary Union is composed of eight countries, has customs agreements between its members and a unique currency, the CFA franc (XOF). The economic union has a market of 112 million consumers. As in many other similar countries in Africa, the financial sector in Senegal is predominated by the banking industry, with commercial banks representing about 90 percent of the sector. Currently 25 of them operate across the country. Government of
Senegal controls a minority shareholding of between 10 to 25% of equity (BCEAO, 2016).

Commercial banks in Senegal operate under the Central Bank of West African Countries (BCEAO) supervision, a regional institution headquartered in Dakar. The banking sector seems to be relatively robust with loans concentration and asset quality generally being the principal risks. Financial soundness indicators show that banks are on an average basis adequately capitalized, profitable, and liquid. Loans in commercial banks in Senegal expose them to a great level of risk. The banks have been encountered to defaulting loans due to significant amount of credit that was given (BCEAO, 2011). In the past, the Senegalese banks have created complex risk management systems. They have developed policies which help in the implementation of advancing loan process and securing credit back via insurance.

1.2 Research Problem

The main goal of banking corporations is to function successfully with a view to maintaining security, stability as well as improving in terms of growth and expansion. Regardless of the fact that commercial banks maintain their credit risks within preferred levels, volatility of their portfolio at-risk ratios create bigger challenges (Manchon, 2011). The sources of these challenges include increased competition in the market, product diversification of long-term structures, expansion, move to individual lending, and efforts to intensify the outreach. Credit risk management practices should aid banks to lower their vulnerability to credit risks and boost their capability to bid in the market with other well-established global financial institutions and other financial institutions.
like SACCOs and MFIs in their countries (Nouy, 2013). Loan schemes need to be professionally managed so as to influence positively the bank’s performance because without good credit risk management, numerous institutions encounter liquidity and inadequate working capital issues (El-Gazzar & Pastena, 2010).

Since more and more commercial banks are being licensed to operate in Senegal as part of the financial inclusion and policy development initiatives of the BCEAO, keen attention to credit risk management is needed in to their liquidity and stability (Noumanath, 2014). The Senegalese banking sector faces challenges especially high non-performing loans and fluctuating interest rates. Therefore, Senegalese banks must manage risks related to credit in order to reduce exposure to credit risk and a decreasing level of returns that will negatively impact their financial performance (IMF, 2017). Patrick and Christina (2013) stated that credit risk for the most time emerges from non-performing loan portfolio in Senegal. The government or private owned banks in Senegal face five main risks namely currency risk, lending risk, internal compliance risk, asset/liability risk as well as risks related to money laundering with credit risk being the most pronounced. The current overall financial performance of Senegalese has stagnated over the last five years, asset quality generally being the principal risks (BCEAO, 2017).

Globally, Ahmad and Ariff (2007) and Brahim and Mansouri (2009) noted that in a number of European and Asian developed economies and Morocco respectively there was recurrent defaults in repayment of loans and increasing credit risk owing to global crisis of the 2009 financial sector which precipitated into closure of banks. Ledgerwood et al., (2013) established that the asset quality formerly known as portfolio quality is still a key measure of financial performance and stability for commercial banks in USA.
According to Altman et al., (2002) the effectiveness of credit risk management of banks largely dictates their success as these organizations create earnings from interests achieved on credits. The increasing non-performing loans deny the banks the much-needed revenue from the interest charged on loans compromising their financial performance and increasing credit risk. This further weaken the stability, viability and survival of the commercial banks, hence the wide-reaching banking crises in Europe and Asia (Anandarajan & Anandarajan, 2010 and Lobez, 2016).

A number of local studies on banks regulation and their capacity of failure prevention exists. For instance, Patrick and Christina K, (2013) found that out of the Senegalese banks which failed during the period of 1984 - 2002, 50% collapsed mainly due to poor quality of lending. This was attributable to recklessness in their lending activities and immense pressure especially in government-controlled banks to lend to politically connected individuals and institutions. Ndungu, (2013) found that sound asset and liability management had a noteworthy effect on Kenyan banks profitability. The highlighted global and local empirical studies lack to focus on the most current data as they were done over five years ago. Given the banking system is highly fluid and dynamic; these previous studies require to be updated by a more current study. Therefore, the research tries to evaluate the impacts of management of credit risk on commercial banks financial performance in Senegal. It will try to solve the research question, what is the influence of credit risk management on commercial banks’ financial performance in Senegal?
1.3 Research Objective

This research objective is to determine the impact of credit risk management on the commercial banks’ financial performance in Senegal.

1.4 Value of the Study

The research may add to a greater knowledge and perception of the role of CRM in enhancing financial performance. For the theoretical part, the study may give an extensive framework to the study of CRM new approaches and financial performance, hence valuable for future scholars.

Regulators and policy makers may find the study helpful in their effort of improving the banking industry. It may be of great significance to the banks that are under this study and additionally to other financial institutions for the appraisal of their policies in credit management and the review of their transactions for greater results regarding credit facilities.

The study may help the banks in Senegal to better manage credit risk vis a vis their financial performance. The study findings therefore may empower administration in various banks in Senegal to know how to get organized to have a good management of the credit risk and to clearly state the relationship enclosed by banks financial performance and credit risk. It may help in reducing deficits and maximize gains as well as to formulate better techniques for managing risks.
CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Introduction

This part shows findings of other researchers on the study subject, the factors and methodologies they utilized and in addition their discoveries and suggestions. We looked at the theories that considered every variable related to the subject and including measures of credit risk and financial performance.

2.2 Theoretical review

The theoretical review intends to explain the theories relevant to credit risk management and financial performance. Liquidity risk theory, moral hazard theory and portfolio theory were found to help in underpinning the study.

2.2.1 Liquidity Risk Theory

This theory as proposed by Melton, (1974) argues that liquidity risk is the definitive indicator that leads to the high increase of credit risks in addition to market risks and can cause widespread collapses of financial institutions. The unmatched crisis in the United States mortgage market in 2007 was a classic example of liquidity risk. Acerbi and Scandolo (2007) depicts that any financial organization must be able to identify and rank liquidity risks. Liquidity requirements in financial institutions along with the liquidity resources on hand to convene these requirements rely extensively on the institutions
dealings, product portfolio, cash flows report as well as their balance sheet makeup.

Therefore, it is required for any financial organization to assess its position in regards to liquidity to dodge a declining effect on its earnings and capital. The theory is found significant to the research as it helps quantify the risk in regards to liquidity arising from loans that don’t perform and portfolios at risk consequentially affecting the stability financially and performance of banks. This theory also aids in identifying the relevant changes in revenue and capital affecting the overall stability of the banks.

2.2.3 The Moral Hazard Theory

The theory was proposed by Arrow (1971). Within the framework of the banking relation, we observe certain degree of asymmetry of information between the creditor and the debtor. The borrower has a position superior to that of the bank because they know all the inside information at the request of loan. The banker therefore should collect relevant data to determine the motivations of the customer. Further to it, the credit institution has to emit an objective judgment to define if the project of the applicant of loan is solvent (Krugman, 2009).

The customer can sometimes forget or hide compromising information which are not favorable to the granting of a loan. If the banker failed to disclose all the information on the project and the situation, it would deny the client the credit they seek. However, these events can occur even if the banker remains very vigilant. The customer can decide to finance a very risky but sometimes very remunerative investment with a bank. Therefore,
commercial banks ought to have strong risk management rules to control the way they advance loan to their various customers (Colasse, 2010).

2.2.3 Portfolio Theory

The theory as proposed by Markowitz (1952) rest on the premise that risk-averse investors usually build portfolios so as to fully realize predicted return with a certain level of risk and with high attention that risk is a key part of high reward. The risk of an asset corresponds to the dispersal of the profitability around the average or expected profitability. The variance or its root called square standard deviation establishes a measure of risk according to Markowitz (1959). The management of a portfolio is a behavior of arbitration between the yield and the risk for various rival portfolios. For a given profitability, the best portfolio is the one with less risk. It is necessary to underline that when the market is efficient, the profitability is proportional to the risk.

Markowitz (1959) clarifies and formalizes the fundamental dilemma of the modern finance: obtain a low but certain profitability or agree to take a risk to increase this profitability, the hope of profitability being raised. This selection mode allows to have minimum risk for a chosen yield level.

Organizations perceive how credit concentrations can have an adverse effect on financial performance. Subsequently, various banks are effectively putting in place quantitative ways of credit risk controls. This sector is additionally improving toward putting various means of measuring credit risk when consequent portfolio exists. Banks also are utilizing other products to efficiently transfer risk while caring about their relationship with the customers (Kairu, 2009).
2.3 Determinants of Financial Performance

The performance of the banking industry financially and their determiners become an important stake within various revolutions context which impose the restructuring of the financial system which weaken numerous financial institutions. Indeed, the banking system deserve a particular attention, because the banking problems which arise can generate important systematic risks, which will have repercussions not only on the local economic environment, but also in the other countries and it’s due to the increasing financial markets integration (Haslam, 1968).

Determinants of financial performance of a credit institution can be partitioned into internal and external variables. Studies have demonstrated that factors of a bank influence commercial banks performance. External factors which may impact performance include the interest rate, inflation and the economic growth. These variables are not under the direct control of the management. (Short, 1979). The internal factors can be defined as the elements that bank's management policy, objectives and decisions can influence. Internal factors incorporate management efficiency, bank size, capital adequacy and risk management capacity (Athanasoglou et al., 2005).

2.3.1 Capital Adequacy

Several empirical studies revealed that Capital Adequacy exercises stimulating reaction on banks’ financial performance (Bashir, 2000). It’s also a determinant of a bank’s financial health. It demonstrates the capacity to bear with operational deficits. It characterizes the capacity to go into new businesses.
Capital Adequacy Ratio dictates bank risk behavior. It is a determinant of the bank financial health and the capacity to eliminate risk. CAR helps in securing the various clients and guarantees the strength and capability of the financial system. The ratio is obtained by total equity over total asset. It represents a fundamental ratio for capital strength as capital allows absorbing easily the deficits and thus helps banks protect itself of insolvency. Besides, the less the capital of a bank is important, the more it will be exposed to bankruptcy in case of important losses.

2.3.2 Bank Size

Size’s impacts on financial performance, is difficult to ascertain. Some researches acknowledge that the size of a bank is a determinant of positive performance, (Bec, 2006; Pasiouras, 2007). Others think that the size has a negative impact (Kasman, 2010; and Jonghe, 2010). Finally, a last group considers that the impact is not significant (Goddard, 2004; and Micco, 2007). For large companies, the size empowers them to bargain more adequately, oversee prices and make prices that are higher for a specific commodity (Agu, 1992). In several studies on finance, bank’s total asset is considered as a proxy of size.

2.3.3 Non-performing Loan Ratio

The NPL were mainly used as measure of assets quality of credit firms and have mostly been related to the presence of a risk of bankruptcy. NPLR is considered as a statistically significant leading indicator of the insolvency (Lanine & Vennet, 2006). NPLR that’s lower is linked to a rate of deposit and risk that’s lower. Most of the banking institutions often have an important level of doubtful debts doubtful before the period of distress. The non-performing loans are among the main originators of economic stagnation (Nkusu,
Management of banks risk allocation depends on risk diversification to lower the amount of NPL.

Muasya (2000) researched the impact on the banking sector performance in Kenya by non-performing loans and found NPLs affected negatively the banking sector profitability as measured by forecasted GPD growth factor. Shrestha (2015) found a negative interrelationship between the amount of NPL and stock price using data from Nepali commercial banks in India.

2.3.4 Management Efficiency

Good management is the most vital foundation for the quality and development of any financial institution since indicators of Management quality are fundamentally particular to individual institutions. Management Efficiency is one of the key aspects determinants of profitability. In addition, functional proficiency in dealing with the working costs is another measurement for administration efficiency. Some of the financial ratios regarding the financial statements go as an intermediary for administration proficiency (Beck, Chen & Song, 2012).

2.3.5 External Factors

The external factors are majorly not under the management control, but they have an effect on financial performance. The macroeconomic stability policy, the Interest Rate and the political instability are the most external factors that command banks performance. Gross Domestic Product and Inflation are other macroeconomic factors that also affect bank performance (Athanasoglou et al., 2005).
Vanroose (2008) studied macroeconomic factors in Sub-Saharan countries and the findings confirmed that the density of the population greatly determines the financial performance of the specific financial institutions operating there. And from the previous discussions on this paper, these huge numbers in terms of population are the same clientele for these financial institutions in the developing countries.

2.4 Empirical Studies

This topic shows studies about the relation between financial performance and credit risk both locally and globally. Several researchers have researched on the study subject.

For instance, Awoyemi studied credit risk efficiency impacts on the performance of Nigerian commercial banks (2014). Indicators used to assess profitability, ROA and ROE and NPL as the indicators for credit risk management. Annual reports and accounts between 2005 and 2011 of 7 selected banks were examined. The results highlighted that management of credit risk positively affects banks performance financially.

Brahim and Mansouri (2009) studied the influence of credit risk management on commercial banks profitability in Morocco. An analysis of a sample of five principal banks between 1993 and 2006 were used. He studied the financial statements of those banks. The findings showed that the banks’ profitability measured by resorting to the two complementary indicators ROE and ROA is significantly connected to credit risk management.

Moreover, Mainta (2014) appraised the correlation amongst financial performance and management of credit risk of BOA bank in Benin. His research focused on analyzing the
BOA financial statements during the years 2002-2012. He found that a critical and positive relation exists amidst sound credit risk management and profitability.

Valsamakis et al., (2005) carried out a research on the risk to income related to the borrowers' defaults in refunding of loans. His goal was to confirm if non-refund of loan could induce credit risk. The findings show that credit risk encloses the failure in benefit due to failure to gather expected interest income and in addition the loss of principal because of credit defaults.

Eng and Nabar (2007) investigated on firm performance and management of credit risk. The results confirmed that important relation between credit risk and GRL (loan growth). The result explains that a rise in loan growth results in a credit risk decrease. A possible reason for GRL to be negatively related to credit risk was that when banks increase their lending pursuant to high demand of credit, they tighten their credit standards and keep loans under control, which reduce banks' credit risk exposure. In contrast, when banks have a large proportion of funds available for lending, they relax their credit standards. As a result, the probability of adverse selection and moral hazard activities increase contributes to an increase in problem loans.

Afriyie (2011) studied Ghana bank’s profitability and credit risk for the time 2006 - 2010. The results revealed that credit risk management and profitability are significantly related. However, it exists different elements which can have an effect on banks performance financially especially in rural areas. In rural areas there are factors such as low level of income, accessibility of the formal financial and also lack of information or
awareness. Most of the banks that perform well have their head office in urban areas and research could have given better results if all the banks were represented.

Kithinji (2010) examined the impacts of management of credit risk on the profit of Kenyan commercial banks. She calculated the management of credit risk using the advances and loans on total assets ratio and advances ratio and NPL to total loans. The research discovered that the main component of profits of commercial banks does not relate to the non-performing loans and volume of credit. This signifies that apart from credit and non-performing loans there exists other factors that affect banks’ profitability. His study’s findings show the essence to put into consideration other aspects that could have an influence on banks financial performance.

Noumanath (2014) studied how commercial banks financial performance was affected by management of credit risk in Senegal. In his research, he examined the credit risk management systems adopted by Ecobank Senegal and found that not only credit risk management empower the bank financial performance but also enable optimization of the economic resources and a better reputation of the bank in the industry. The study used a descriptive research design including secondary data attained from published financial reports and the multiple regression model was applied.

Ousmane (2008) studied credit risk management and bank performance in Senegal and discovered that around 90% of the UEMOA banks adopted credit management policies as a base for credit assessment. He used descriptive research design with secondary data obtained from the annual BCEAO reports and the analytical model was the multiple regression models which show positive signs of the coefficient that suggests that NPL
was very significant. The study revealed that the major risk in the banking sector was credit risk and therefore many of the banks put an important emphasis on their credit risk practices.

In his study on CAR and bank performance in Kenya, Odongo (2012) found out that capital adequacy announcement leads to underperformance of stocks in the market as they had negative cumulative abnormal return values especially in the post announcement dates. The study used secondary data for 2008 to 2012 and multiple regression for analysis.

Muasya evaluated the non-performing loans impact on the Kenyan banks performance (2009). The research used a descriptive research design; the population target of interest was 42 Kenyan commercial banks. Both the collected secondary and primary data through questionnaires from the credit managers and annual financial reports were considered. According to the results NPLs negatively affected banking sector profitability as measured by forecasted GPD growth factor. It also found a negative relationship among the amount of NPL and stock price using data from Kenyan commercial banks.

Mutua (2014) examined the relationship between Kenyan commercial banks financial performance and credit risk management using regression model that included together secondary and primary data obtained from questionnaires and other secondary means such as published financial reports. The findings were that risk identification, risk analysis, NPLs and loans advances contributed significantly to Kenyan commercial banks financial performance.
Rahman and Mazlan (2014) studied Bangladesh’s causes of sustainability financially of MFIs. Through multiple regression, the study measured financial self-sustainability against gross loan portfolio of the MFIs. The study established that many MFIs sustain themselves financially to function in Bangladesh. Al-shakrchy (2017) reviewed the management of credit risk effects on profitability of banks in Sweden. The goal of the research was to find out the main issues arising from the bank lending activities that have serious impact on the banking industry and the financial instability. Furthermore, the research explored whether credit exposure manage procedures were changed during financial crisis. The study established that successful practices of credit risk management in Swedish banks were likely to improve the availability of bank credit.

Ho and Yusoff (2009) studied Malaysian selected banks application of CRM. The study found that diversity in the types of services, risks prevention, and staff capacity strengthening were most practiced CRM practices. The study used primary data in credit risk management strategy and revealed its significant contribution in the area of finance in Malaysia. Effective CRMs is a necessary aspect of the general system of management of risk. It’s essential for eventually the survival of all banking establishments.

Hassan et al., (2007) did a comparative study of Management of Credit Risk for UAE banks both foreign and nationally. The research confirmed that key risk that UAE banks faced were currency, credit and operating risk. Banks in UAE were found to be good in risk managing, identification and assessment which are among the variables that are most significant in practices of risk management. In addition, it is found evidence of a notable distinction between the foreign and national banks CRM.
2.5 Conceptual Framework

The conceptual framework showed below exposes the interaction between commercial banks financial performance in Senegal as a variable that is dependent and is going to be measured using ROA and management of credit risk as a variable that is independent. The CRM of the commercial banks in Senegal will be measured using the following constructs: capital adequacy ratio, management efficiency, liquidity and asset quality. Asset quality measured using Non-Performing Loan Ratio indicates banks risk of bankruptcy. High capital adequacy implies banks higher capability to cope with unexpected deficits and vice versa. A lower NPLR implies higher asset quality and is related to a lower risk. Good management efficiency has a definite effect on banks financial performance. Liquidity given by the ratio of total loans to total deposits shows the ability of a bank in assets’ increase and meets obligations as they fall due. The higher the ratio above the statutory minimum requirement, it positively influences financial performance of banks.

![Conceptual Framework Diagram]

**Figure 2.1: Conceptual Framework**

Source: Author (2018)
2.6 Summary of Literature Review

The study reviewed several studies among them Awoyemi (2014) on credit risk efficiency in Brahim, Mansouri and Nigeria in regards to performance of banks (2009) on management of credit risk in regards to Morocco’s bank’s profitability. The research also reviewed Mainta (2014) study on performance and management of credit risk of BOA bank in Benin and also Afriyie (2011) on Ghana’s banks profitability and credit risk. Further, the study reviewed the research by Kithinji (2010) on management of credit risk and profit of Kenyan commercial banks and Muasya (2009) on Kenyan banks performance and non-performing loans. This studies and many other however have been carried out in other countries and not in Senegal. This creates a contextual and empirical gap, which this research seeks to deal with by carrying out studies on the effect on Senegal’s bank performance by credit risk management.
CHAPTER THREE

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Introduction

This section highlights the approach that was put into us. It includes the analysis of data, the collection of data, the target population and the research design.

3.2 Research Design

Descriptive research design was employed in the research. It is suitable where a research is trying to explain and define particular group characteristics and to estimate the proportion of people in the group who possess particular characteristics, hence helping in generalizations and making predictions (Cooper & Schindler, 2011). The design is also appropriate in describing the phenomenon without manipulation of variables which is the aim of the study (Kothari, 2004). In spite of the fact that this study begun with the description of financial performance of banks and CRM, the definitive objective is to ascertain if they are related.

3.3 Target Population

The population targeted in the research was the twenty-five (25) licensed commercial banks in Senegal as shown on Appendix 1. From these recorded banks, only one is owned by the government.
3.4 Sample Design

The sample size was ten (10) selected from the twenty-five banks registered in Senegal. The criteria used were that the banks must have been registered for doing business in Senegal at least before 2013 and exclusively listed as commercial banks.

Therefore, only ten banks met these criteria for the period of 2013 to 2017 as from 2014 it has been noted a certain proliferation of banks in Senegal. According to their business sector and their coverage, there is a certain classification of the identified 25 banks in Senegal which include the commercial banks, the development banks and the decentralized financial systems, BCEAO (2013).

3.5 Data Collection

The research employed data from secondary sources. It is to be gathered from the yearly and financial reports of the 10 banks from where ROA will be deduced. The financial statements will include the after-tax profit, total asset and value of loans outstanding.

The researcher obtained the secondary data from the published financial statements from 2013 to 2017 of the selected 10 banks. Secondary data was used because it is factual and can be verified from the published reports.

3.6 Data Analysis

The data analysis was done through multiple regression analysis and descriptive statistics to ascertain the character and magnitude of the connection among the study variables. SPSS and Excel were employed to analyze information collected.
3.6.1 Analytical Model

A multiple regression model was adopted to ascertain the relation among the variables. The main dependent variable, financial performance indicator was ROA. The ROA indicates banks’ efficiency in using its assets to create revenue flow. The research employed published financial yearly reports of the banks under section (Appendix II). ROA was used as a comparative measure of an entity’s previous ROA or the ROA of similar financial institutions.

In this research, this model will be used:

\[ Y_t = \alpha + \beta_1 X_{1it} + \beta_2 X_{2it} + \beta_3 X_{3it} + \beta_4 X_{4it} + C_0 \]

Where:

- \( Y \) = Financial Performance of Bank i at time t as communicated by ROA
- \( \alpha \) = constant
- \( X_{1it} \) = Asset Quality of bank i at time t
- \( X_{2it} \) = Capital Adequacy of bank i at time t
- \( X_{3it} \) = Management Efficiency of Bank i at time t
- \( X_{4it} \) = Liquidity of Bank i at time t
- \( \beta_i \) = Regression coefficients
- \( C_0 \) = error term

The study variables were operationalized and measured as indicated in the table 3.1 below.
Table 3.1 Variables measurement and operationalization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Symbol of the variable</th>
<th>Name of the variable</th>
<th>Measurement Ratios</th>
<th>Banks identity &amp; year</th>
<th>Number of Bank i</th>
<th>time t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Financial Performance</td>
<td>Return on Assets = Net income / Total Assets</td>
<td>Bank i at time t</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2013-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_{1i}t</td>
<td>Asset Quality</td>
<td>gross NPLs/ gross loans advanced</td>
<td>Bank i at time t</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2013-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_{2i}t</td>
<td>Capital Adequacy ratio</td>
<td>Total Capital / Total Risk-Weighted assets</td>
<td>Bank i at time t</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2013-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_{3i}t</td>
<td>Management Efficiency</td>
<td>Total Operating Expenses / Total Operating Income</td>
<td>Bank i at time t</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2013-2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X_{4i}t</td>
<td>Liquidity</td>
<td>Total Loans / Total Deposits</td>
<td>Bank i at time t</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2013-2017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.6.2 Diagnostic Tests

The study assessed for multicolinearity test, normality test, heteroscedasticity, linearity and autocorrelation. To assess for multicolinearity, correlations between the study variables were calculated and the variance inflation factors (VIF) while normality was tested using kurtosis and skewness, and the Shapiro Wilk test whereas autocorrelations was assessed using Durbin Watson statistics. Linearity was assessed by plotting a scatter graph while heteroscedasticity was assessed using a standardized residual plot.

3.6.3 Tests of Significance

A test of the model’s overall significance will be done by use of the F-test as well as the T-test for significance for the coefficients at 0.05 significance level and 0.95 confidence level. Adjusted R-squared was applied to establish the variation in the variables that are dependent when the variables that are independent change.
CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction

The research sought to analyze the impacts of management of credit risk on commercial banks financial performance in Senegal. The independent variables, for which information was derived from the financial statements published through BCEAO database and databases of the respective banks, was credit risk management. The financial performance for period 2013-2017 was the dependent variable.

4.2 Descriptive Statistics

The study sampled 10 commercial banks in Senegal; which had been in operation from 2013 to 2018 and managed to obtain complete data from all the 10 commercial banks hence a response rate of 100%. The descriptive results are show by table 4.1

Table 4.1 Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROA (ratio)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>.12880</td>
<td>.050976</td>
<td>-.034</td>
<td>-.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset quality (ratio)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.210</td>
<td>.10840</td>
<td>.037053</td>
<td>.242</td>
<td>-.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital adequacy (ratio)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>.750</td>
<td>.21140</td>
<td>.219173</td>
<td>.996</td>
<td>-.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity(ratio)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.560</td>
<td>1.210</td>
<td>.80780</td>
<td>.158504</td>
<td>.791</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management efficiency(ratio)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>0.980</td>
<td>.76700</td>
<td>.178511</td>
<td>-1.347</td>
<td>1.367</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings
The descriptive findings on table 4.1 imply that ROA had an average value of 0.12880 and maximum and minimum values of 0.240 and 0.030 which indicates that the average ROA for the 10 commercial banks was 0.1288 and the maximum value of 0.030 indicates that no bank had made losses for the considered study period. The average value of assets quality was 0.10840 with maximum and minimum values of 0.210 and 0.050 which indicates that the average non-performing loans value of to total loans was 0.10840 respectively. The average value for capital adequacy was 0.21140 while the minimum and maximum values were 0.020 and 0.750 hence an indication that average capital adequacy for the banks over the considered research period was 21.14% respectively.

The mean value for liquidity ratio was 0.80780 with the minimum and maximum values being 0.560 and 1.210 hence an indication that the average value of liquidity for the banks was 0.80780 which indicates that the banks were highly liquid hence they can meet their obligations when they fall due. The mean value of management efficiency was 0.76700 with maximum and minimum values of 0.980 and 0.260 in that order hence an indication that the average value of expenses to interest income was 0.767 correspondingly. The skewness and kurtosis values show that all the value lie between -2 and +2 hence and indication that the data was normally distributed.

**4.3 Diagnostic Tests**

The study assessed for multicollinearity, homogeneity of variances, linearity, normality and autocorrelation whose results are shown under the model summary. The test results were as follows
4.3.1 Test for Multicollinearity

The study assessed for multicollinearity using the variance inflation factors as shown by table 4.2

Table 4.2: Test for Multicollinearity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Asset quality</td>
<td>.814</td>
<td>1.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital adequacy</td>
<td>.908</td>
<td>1.101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity</td>
<td>.880</td>
<td>1.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management efficiency</td>
<td>.790</td>
<td>1.267</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Research Findings

The multicollinearity results on table 4.1 show a lack of multicollinearity among the research variables. This is shown by the VIF values which are less than 10 and the tolerance values which were more than 0.2. This shows that the study does not violate the assumption of multicollinearity.

4.3.2 Test for Homogeneity of Variances

A standardized residual plot was used to assess for the homogeneity of variances as shown by figure 4.1
The homogeneity of variances findings on figure 4.1 indicates that the data was homoscedastic. This is shown by the plotted point on the residual plot which converge at a specific point and follows a defined pattern. Thus, in the study the assumption of homoscedasticity has not been violated.

**4.3.3 Linearity Test**

Linearity was assessed through a normal p-p plot as shown by figure 4.2.
The results on figure 4.2 indicate that the plotted data points fit on the line of the best fit. This indicates that the assumption of linearity has not violated in the research.

**4.3.4 Normality Test**

The study assessed for normality using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov and the Shapiro-Wilk tests as shown in table 4.3.
Table 4.3: Normality Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov*</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset quality</td>
<td>.163</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital adequacy</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management efficiency</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*. This is a lower bound of the true significance.
a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

Source: Research Findings

The normality test findings on table 4.3 show that the variables are normally distributed. This indicated by the p values in both the Shapiro-Wilk and the Kolmogorov-Smirnov tests which are less than 0.05. In the study, thus the assumption of normality has not been violated.

4.4 Correlation Analysis

The study undertook correlation analysis to assess the nature and strength of the relationships among the variables of the research. Table 4.4 shows the results

Table 4.4: Correlation Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROA</th>
<th>Asset quality</th>
<th>Capital adequacy</th>
<th>Liquidity</th>
<th>Management efficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset quality</td>
<td>.381**</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital adequacy</td>
<td>-.462**</td>
<td>-.238</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity</td>
<td>.148</td>
<td>.072</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management efficiency</td>
<td>-.009</td>
<td>.372**</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.291*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Source: Research Findings
The correlation findings on table 4.4 indicates that the correlation between asset quality and ROA was weak and positive \( (r=0.381) \) while the correlation between capital adequacy and ROA was weak and negative \( (r=-0.462) \) respectively. The correlation between liquidity and ROA was weak and positive \( (r=0.148) \) while the correlation between management efficiency and ROA was weak and negative \( (r=-0.009) \) respectively. The correlation values indicate that the all the correlations are less than 0.7 thus an indication that there was a no multicollinearity among the variables of the research.

4.5 Regression Analysis

The study employed regression analysis to establish the relations amongst the dependent and independent variables. The results of the regression model includethe coefficient’s summary, variance analysis and the model summary.

4.5.1 Model Summary

Table 4.5: Model Summary

<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>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.574a</td>
<td>.329</td>
<td>.269</td>
<td>.043570</td>
<td>1.589</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Management efficiency, Capital adequacy, Liquidity, Asset quality

b. Dependent Variable: ROA

Source: Research Findings
The findings of model summary on table 4.5 show that the r square value (coefficient of determination) was 0.329. This shows that 32.9% of the variation in ROA is described by the study variables that are independent (management efficiency, capital adequacy, liquidity, asset quality) while 67.1% is explained by other factors which the study did not consider. The Durbin statistics value of 1.589 lies between the recommended ranges of 1.5 and 2.5, which means autocorrelation between the variables, did not exist.

4.5.2 Analysis of Variance

Table 4.6: ANOVA

<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>Regression</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>5.518</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ROA

b. Predictors: (Constant), Management efficiency, Capital adequacy, Liquidity, Asset quality

Source: Research Findings

The findings of ANOVA on table 4.6 show that the F statistics value was 5.518 which is statistically significant as shown by the p value of 0.001<0.05. This is an indication that the regression equation is of significance and a good predictor of the relations of the study variables.
4.5.3 Regression Coefficients

Table 4.7: Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asset quality</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>2.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital adequacy</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>-.373</td>
<td>-2.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquidity</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.110</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management efficiency</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>-.211</td>
<td>-1.538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ROA

Source: Research Findings

Table 4.7 indicates that the relation amongst ROA and asset quality was positive (B=0.499) and of significance statistically (P value: 0.010<0.05) while the relation amongst capital adequacy and ROA was negative (-0.087) and of significance statistically (P value: 0.006<0.05) respectively. Then again, the relationship between liquidity and ROA was positive (B=0.035) and statistically insignificant (P value = 0.404>0.05) whereas the relation amongst management efficiency and ROA was negative (B=-0.060) and statistically insignificant (P value= 0.132>0.05) respectively.

4.6 Discussion of the Findings

The research results found existence of a positive and noteworthy relationship amongst assets quality and ROA of commercial banks in Senegal. These findings imply that credit risk management substantial affects commercial banks financial performance in Senegal. The results are in agreement with the findings in the study by Awoyemi (2014) who
evaluated the credit risk efficiency impacts on Nigerian commercial banks
performance. Noumanath (2014) established that not only credit risk management
empower the bank financial performance but also enable optimization of the economic
resources and a better reputation of the bank in the industry. Brahim and Mansouri (2009)
showed that the banks’ profitability measured by resorting to the two complementary
indicators ROE and ROA is significantly connected to credit risk management. Ousmane
(2008) revealed that the major risk in the banking sector is credit risk and therefore many
of the banks put an important emphasis on their credit risk practices.

The study results revealed a relationship that was both significant and negative amongst
capital adequacy and ROA of commercial banks in Senegal. This is an indication that
capital adequacy significantly influences commercial banks financial performance in
Senegal. A research by Bashir (2000) reported that CAR help in securing the various
clients and guarantee the strength and capability of the financial system. Odongo (2012)
found out that capital adequacy announcement leads to underperformance of stocks in the
market as they had negative cumulative abnormal return values especially in the post
announcement dates. Bashir (2000) posits that a determinant of a bank’s financial health
is capital adequacy. It demonstrates the capacity to bear with operational deficits. It
characterizes the capacity to go into new businesses.

Additionally, the finding of the research established that the connection amidst commercial
banks ROA and liquidity in Senegal was positive and not significant. This means that
liquidity management doesn’t significantly affect commercial banks financial
performance in Senegal. Mainta (2014) found that a critical and positive relation exists
amidst sound liquidity risk management and profitability. A study by Ngumo, Kioko and
Shikumo (2017) revealed that liquidity management had insignificant positive affiliations with the performance of the listed Kenyan commercial banks while management of credit risk had an insignificant negative relationship.

Finally, the research discovered that the commercial banks’ connection amongst management efficiency and ROA in Senegal was negative and insignificant. The findings therefore show a lack of a significant association amongst commercial bank’s management efficiency and financial performance in Senegal. Beck, Chen and Song (2012) posit that good management is the most vital foundation for the quality and development of any financial institution since indicators of Management quality are fundamentally particular to individual institutions. Management Efficiency is one of the key aspects determinants of profitability. In addition, functional proficiency in dealing with the working costs is another measurement for administration efficiency.
CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSION, RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Introduction

This section provides the study summary, conclusion and recommendations. The research focused on the effect of credit risk management on the financial performance of commercial banks in Senegal.

5.2 Summary

This research sought to determine the effect of credit risk management on commercial banks financial performance in Senegal. To achieve this objective, the study used a descriptive research design. The study sampled ten (10) selected from the twenty-five banks registered in Senegal. The criteria used was that the banks must have been registered for doing business in Senegal at least before 2013 and exclusively listed as commercial banks. The research employed the use of secondary data from 2013 to 2017 of the selected 10 banks. The analysis of data was through multiple regression analysis and descriptive statistics use to ascertain the character and magnitude of the connection amongst the study variables.

The descriptive findings established that ROA had an average value of 0.12880 and maximum and minimum values of 0.240 and 0.030 and that the average value of assets quality was 0.10840 with maximum and minimum values of 0.210 and 0.050 in that order. The results revealed that the average value for capital adequacy was 0.21140 while the minimum and maximum values were 0.020 and 0.750 and that mean value for
liquidity ratio was 0.80780 with the maximum and minimum values being 1.210 and 0.56 in that order. The value of the mean of management efficiency was 0.76700 with maximum and minimum values of 0.980 and 0.260 in that order.

The correlation results revealed that the correlation between asset quality and ROA was weak and positive \((r=0.381)\) while the correlation between capital adequacy and ROA was weak and negative \((r=-0.462)\) respectively. The results also established that the correlation between liquidity and ROA was weak and positive \((r=0.148)\) while the correlation between management efficiency and ROA was weak and negative \((r=-0.009)\) respectively.

The regression results established that 32.9\% of ROA variation was described by the study variables that were independent (management efficiency, capital adequacy, liquidity, asset quality). The result also found that the F statistics value was 5.518 which was statistically significant as shown by the p value of 0.001<0.05 hence an indication that the regression equation was not insignificant and a good predictor of the relation of the variables of the study. The coefficient findings established that the link amongst asset quality and ROA was of significance statistically and not negative while the relationship between capital adequacy and ROA was negative and statistically significant respectively. The research also found that the connection amongst liquidity and ROA was not negative and statistically insignificant whereas the relationship between management efficiency and ROA was negative and statistically insignificant respectively.
5.3 Conclusion

The first goal of the research was to establish the effect of management of credit risk and commercial banks performance financially. The finding revealed a noteworthy and a not negative association amongst assets quality and ROA of commercial banks in Senegal. The study based on the finding concluded that management of credit risk significantly influences commercial banks financial performance in Senegal.

The second goal assessed how capital adequacy affects commercial banks financial performance. The results revealed a significant and not positive association between commercial bank’s capital adequacy and ROA in Senegal. The study therefore concluded that capital adequacy significantly affects commercial banks financial performance in Senegal.

The third aim of this research was to investigate how liquidity influences performance financially of commercial banks in Senegal. The finding showed that the association amid ROA and liquidity of the commercial banks in Senegal was positive and not significant. The study based on the finding concluded that liquidity management does not significantly influence the commercial banks financial performance in Senegal.

The final aim of the research was to assess the impacts on financial performance in Senegal as a result of management efficiency. The research found that commercial banks relationship amid ROA and management efficiency in Senegal was negative and insignificant. The study thus came to a conclusion there lacked a significant link amid management efficiency and commercial banks financial performance in Senegal.
5.4 Recommendations

The findings on the relationship between financial performance and management of credit risk led to the conclusion that management of credit risk significantly affects the commercial banks financial performance in Senegal. The research therefore recommends that the management of commercial banks in Senegal should set up effective strategies on management of credit risk to mitigate the effects on performance of commercial banks as a result of credit risks. Setting up of operational management of credit risk by the organization is an essential part of an extensive method to management of risk and it is fundamental for a sustainable system of banking that’s efficient.

The results of how capital adequacy affects commercial banks financial performance revealed that capital adequacy significantly influences commercial banks financial performance in Senegal. The research based on this finding recommends that the management of commercial banks in Senegal has to make sure capital levels that are adequate are present as capital adequacy helps in securing the various clients and guarantee the strength and capability of the financial system.

The findings on impact of liquidity on commercial banks financial performance led to the conclusion that management of liquidity does not have an influence that is significant in commercial banks financial performance in Senegal. The research however endorses that the commercial banks management in Senegal has to make sure liquidity that’s enough is present in the banks. This is because liquidity that is inadequate ensures a bank gets the ability to meet is current duties when they increase and optimal liquidity reduces liquidity risk.
Lastly, the findings on the effect of efficiency management on performance of a bank led to the conclusion that a significant relation amid commercial banks management efficiency and performance financially in Senegal did not exist. The research however suggests that commercial banks management should properly manage their operating expenses as proper management of costs is the most vital foundation for the quality and development of any financial institution.

5.5 Limitations of the Study

The research was restricted to the banking sector in Senegal and focusing on the bigger banking institutions in the country and the challenges they were facing. The used data was picked from those banks whose available information was public via internet or their website. The study also took a sample of 10 commercial banks which had been operation for the considered research period of 5 years.

In BCEAO Annual Reports, consolidated financial statements were recorded to the nearest one billion CFA. This might have somewhat limited the accuracy of the data used in the study. Besides, current study objective and that of the BCEAO reports were different. The BCEAO reports therefore did not provide enough details on credit risk management.

Thirdly, this study covered only five years data from 2013 to 2017. To get consistent results series data collected for a longer period is required. The availability of the data was a difficult process as the BCEAO reports were reported in French. The translation process to English was tedious and time consuming. Additionally, the findings were limited to the considered research period.
Thirdly, the study’s purpose used a model that was quite simplified and might not have captured every important aspect that relates to banks management of credit risk. The use of descriptive research design also has inherent limitations. The study also used secondary data which was historical in nature and secondary ignores qualitative aspects which affect firm performance.

5.6 Areas for Further Studies

The research found that the considered study variables (management efficiency, capital adequacy, liquidity, asset quality) affected only 32.9% of the variation in performance financially of commercial banks in Senegal. This shows other variables both qualitative and quantitative factors thus suggest an addition research of the qualitative and quantitative determinants of commercial banks financial performance in Senegal.

The study context was Senegal’s commercial banks and the data was only obtained from 10 commercial banks which had complete data. The study therefore recommends a similar study using primary data to capture the views of the organization senior management on how credit risk affects financial performance. The study further recommends a similar study on Sub-Saharan Africa for contrasting and to allow rationalization of the results. The research recommends that more researches to be conducted in regard to the impact of management of credit risk through CAMEL indicators on the other financial institutions such as MFIs financial performance. This is to establish whether the CAMEL method can be used as a management of credit risk proxy on the other Senegal’s financial organizations.
More research should be carried out on the practices of management of risk employed by Senegal's commercial banks whereby the research aims to examine practices of management of risk awareness inside the banking division. The research can include data composed by use of both secondary and primary sources with aim to employ primary source data being to find out the level to which commercial banks have carried out dissimilar practices of management of risk by use of a questionnaire; while the goal to employ data that is from secondary sources will be to connect the Capital Adequacy Ratio (CAR) that is risk weighted to the dissimilar commercial banks financial indicators employed to establish soundness of the bank financially.

More research should be carried out to discover if credit reference bureau development in Senegal can go step by step in lowering the risk posed in credit by loaning and to examine the costs in insurance cut linked with these firms’ profitability cutbacks and loans. Further studies can also be conducted in the impacts of management of credit risk on performance financially of other financial organizations in Senegal other than commercial banks. This is because; they operate using a different set of policies and rules in their operations.
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Appendix I: Licensed Commercial Banks in Senegal

1. Bank of Africa Sénégal
2. Banque Atlantique Sénégal (BA-SA)
3. Banque de Dakar (BDK)
4. Banque Régionale de Solidarité
5. Banque de l'Habitat du Sénégal
6. Société Générale de Banques au Sénégal (SGBS)
7. Ecobank Sénégal
8. Banque Sénégal-Tunisienne
9. BGFI Bank (BGFI)
10. Crédit Lyonnais Sénégal
11. Caisse Nationale de Crédit Agricole du Sénégal (CNCAS)
12. Crédit Mutuel du Sénégal (CMS)
13. Citibank Sénégal
14. Compagnie Bancaire de l'Afrique Occidentale (CBAO)
15. Banque Islamique du Sénégal (BIS)
16. Banque des Institutions Mutualistes d'Afrique de l'Ouest (BIMAO)
17. Banque Sahélienne pour l'Investissement et le Commerce (BSIC)
18. Banque Internationale pour le Commerce et l'Industrie du Sénégal (BICIS)
19. United Bank for Africa (UBA)
20. Banque Régionale des Marchés (BRM)
21. First Nigerian Bank Senegal (FNB)
22. Credit International Sénégal (CI-SA)
23. Compagnie Ouest-Africaine de Crédit-Bail (Locafrique)
24. Orabank
25. Diamond Bank

Source: Banque Centrale des Etats de l’Afrique de l’ouest (BCEAO), 2017
Appendix II: Licensed Commercial Banks in Senegal before 2013

1. Banque Atlantique Sénégal (BAS)
2. Bank of Africa Sénégal (BOA)
3. Banque Régionale de Solidarité (BRS)
4. Banque de l'Habitat du Sénégal (BHS)
5. Société Générale de Banques au Sénégal (SGBS)
6. Banque Internationale pour le Commerce et l'Industrie du Sénégal (BICIS)
7. Ecobank Sénégal
8. Citibank Sénégal
9. Compagnie Bancaire de l'Afrique Occidentale (CBAO)
10. Caisse Nationale de Crédit Agricole du Sénégal (CNCAS)


('000 000’ FCFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a/b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>81,000</td>
<td>1,578,768</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>108,300</td>
<td>1,940,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>45,214</td>
<td>875,584</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>78,214</td>
<td>1,131,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICIS</td>
<td>56,125</td>
<td>789,366</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>78,010</td>
<td>845,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOA</td>
<td>114,136</td>
<td>875,322</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>152,354</td>
<td>966,311</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>32,154</td>
<td>421,369</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>48,254</td>
<td>512,695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBAO</td>
<td>47,564</td>
<td>325,695</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>52,981</td>
<td>453,981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIBANK</td>
<td>62,134</td>
<td>412,671</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>69,210</td>
<td>499,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCAS</td>
<td>44,231</td>
<td>356,145</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>52,341</td>
<td>390,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOBANK</td>
<td>56,023</td>
<td>433,120</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>63,178</td>
<td>481,945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBS</td>
<td>72,034</td>
<td>512,321</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>75,321</td>
<td>576,154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = gross non-performing loans (NPLs);
b = gross loans advanced;
Asset Quality = a/b = (gross NPLs/ gross loans advanced)

Source = BCEAO annual reports

(‘000 000’ FCFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>2013 a</th>
<th>2013 b</th>
<th>a/b</th>
<th>2014 a</th>
<th>2014 b</th>
<th>a/b</th>
<th>2015 a</th>
<th>2015 b</th>
<th>a/b</th>
<th>2016 a</th>
<th>2016 b</th>
<th>a/b</th>
<th>2017 a</th>
<th>2017 b</th>
<th>a/b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>11457</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>13255</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>20103</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>21116</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>22129</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>114050</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>129704</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>145358</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>161012</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>176666</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICIS</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>201799</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>197953</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>155511</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>132367</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>109875</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOA</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>41660</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>53568</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>62319</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>264443</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>12000</td>
<td>273194</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10727</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>14037</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>9376</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>10798</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>5000</td>
<td>12220</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBAO</td>
<td>11450</td>
<td>323668</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>11450</td>
<td>348643</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>11450</td>
<td>353697</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>11450</td>
<td>358652</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>11450</td>
<td>363607</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIBANK</td>
<td>17549</td>
<td>26933</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>17549</td>
<td>27032</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>17549</td>
<td>28740</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>17549</td>
<td>30875</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>17549</td>
<td>33010</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCAS</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>91774</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>101015</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>113107</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>125694</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>138281</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOBANK</td>
<td>16777</td>
<td>120036</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>16777</td>
<td>167016</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>16777</td>
<td>180569</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>16777</td>
<td>194122</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>16777</td>
<td>207675</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBS</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>370991</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>351448</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>399547</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>447646</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>10000</td>
<td>495745</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = Total Capital;  
b = Total Risk weighted assets;  
a/b = Total Capital / Total Risk weighted assets = CAR  
Source = BCEAO annual reports

(‘000 000’ FCFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a/b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>11457</td>
<td>15169</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>13084</td>
<td>19302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>108345</td>
<td>166242</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>114993</td>
<td>176583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICIS</td>
<td>195377</td>
<td>257442</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>211100</td>
<td>267223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOA</td>
<td>94677</td>
<td>121534</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>110323</td>
<td>124472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>16932</td>
<td>20828</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>18432</td>
<td>19193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBAO</td>
<td>320582</td>
<td>499813</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>402791</td>
<td>529021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOBANK</td>
<td>156773</td>
<td>254214</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>183812</td>
<td>283683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBS</td>
<td>549651</td>
<td>450713</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>537666</td>
<td>474082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIBANK</td>
<td>97421</td>
<td>160365</td>
<td>0.6075</td>
<td>15370</td>
<td>175201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCAS</td>
<td>97305</td>
<td>123564</td>
<td>0.7875</td>
<td>100104</td>
<td>125365</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \text{Liquidity Ratios} = \frac{a}{b} = \frac{\text{Total Loans}}{\text{Total Deposits}} \)

Source = BCEAO annual reports

(‘000 000’ FCFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a/b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>3183</td>
<td>5382</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>6414</td>
<td>6944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>4771</td>
<td>17897</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>4820</td>
<td>18405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICIS</td>
<td>32454</td>
<td>35868</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>31569</td>
<td>36182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOA</td>
<td>12450</td>
<td>14814</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>14595</td>
<td>17245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>3787</td>
<td>4576</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>4858</td>
<td>6287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBAO</td>
<td>54810</td>
<td>63935</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>65290</td>
<td>76111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIBANK</td>
<td>3744</td>
<td>4886</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>4099</td>
<td>5136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBS</td>
<td>76084</td>
<td>78241</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>77880</td>
<td>82143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOBANK</td>
<td>2813</td>
<td>4054</td>
<td>0.694</td>
<td>4389</td>
<td>6013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCAS</td>
<td>51271</td>
<td>62987</td>
<td>0.814</td>
<td>64707</td>
<td>76126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ a = \text{Total Operating Expenses}; \]
\[ b = \text{Total Operating Income}; \]
\[ \text{Management Efficiency} = \frac{a}{b} = \frac{\text{Total Operating Expenses}}{\text{Total Operating Income}} \]
\[ \text{Source} = \text{BCEAO annual reports} \]

(‘000 000’ FCFA)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Banks</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>a/b</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAS</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>26.83</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>31.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BHS</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>21.79</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>24.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BICIS</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>22.79</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>29.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOA</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>25.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRS</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>20.75</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBAO</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>21.71</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>25.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITIBANK</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>24.71</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>27.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNCAS</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>15.71</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>18.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECOBANK</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>18.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBS</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>21.58</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>24.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = net income (in Billions);
b = total assets (in Billions);
ROA = a/b = (net income / total assets)
Source = BCEAO annual reports