



Factors Affecting Company Value

Khairul Rahman¹, Mohamad Fany Alfarisi², Masyhuri Hamidi³

^{1,2,3}Master of Management, Faculty of Economics and Business, Andalas University

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received Oct 29, 2022

Revised Nov 05, 2022

Accepted Nov 26, 2022

Keywords:

Firm Value
Managerial Ownership
Liquidity
Profitability
Growth
Capital Structure

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the effect of managerial Ownership Structure, Liquidity, Profitability, Profit Growth and Capital Structure on firm value in manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industrial sectors as well as in the consumer goods sector. The population of this study amounted to 142 companies listed on the IDX and used a sample of 20 companies in the basic and chemical industry sector and 16 companies in the consumer goods sector that have been listed on the IDX for the 2016-2020 period. Sampling in this study using non-probability sampling method using purposive sampling technique. The results of research in the basic and chemical industry sectors obtained that managerial ownership structure has an insignificant negative effect on firm value, Liquidity has a positive and insignificant effect on firm value and profitability, growth earnings and capital structure have a negative and significant effect on firm value in the basic and chemical industry sectors.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Khairul Rahman,
Master of Management,
Faculty of Economic and Business,
Andalas University
Jl. Limau Manis, Kecamatan Pauh, Padang, Kota Padang, Sumatera Barat, Indonesia.
Email: khairulrahman32@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Every company has a goal in building their company to grow. The expansion of the company's value is seen from the market value of its share, because funders can judge the company from the development of the company's portion of costs in exchange for trading shares. The value of the company can reflect how positive or negative the presentation of a company is in monitoring the abundance of its wealth. The value of the company can describe what is owned by the company such as shares.

Shows that the price to book value that has increased is the various industrial sectors, from 2016 to 2018 the price to book value has the same value of 1.23 then from 2018 to 2019 it increased by 0.7 and in 2019 to in 2020 increased by 1.5. While the consumer goods sector from 2016 to 2017 decreased by -0.16 then 2017 to 2018 experienced a significant increase of 3.34 then 2018 to 2019 also increased by 0.25 and in 2019 to 2020 experienced a decrease of -1.48. Investors are certainly not arbitrary in choosing companies to invest their capital. The high value of the company can be reflected in the high cost of financial exchange.

Based on value research that has been done a lot, such as the research conducted by Putu Adhi Saputra & Putu Mahuni, (2018) regarding the effect of ownership structure and environmental performance on firm value, then Irawan & Kusuma, (2019) regarding the effect of capital structure and firm size on firm value, and Sondakh et al., (2019) which examines the effect of capital structure on firm value in property sector companies listed on the IDX (2013-2016 period) then research conducted by Sembiring & Trinawati, (2019) Factors that affect the value of Company. This encourages researchers to discuss research with the title "FACTORS AFFECTING COMPANY VALUE".

RESEARCH METHOD

This research is an explanatory research. In this study, the type of research is quantitative research with the source of data used is secondary data, namely data from company prospectuses and financial statements of companies listed in the Indonesian Stock Exchange in 2016-2020. The sample in this study is manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector as well as basic and chemical industries that issue financial reports in a row for the 2016-2020 period.

This study examines firm value as the dependent variable, the independent variables are liquidity, profitability, profit growth, capital structure and firm size as control variables. The data analysis technique used in this research is descriptive statistical analysis and then the classical assumption test includes normality test, multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test and auto correlation test. Then estimate the panel data regression model. As well as in this study using multiple linear regression analysis models and performing statistical tests in the form of T test, F test, determination test and paired two-sample difference test with the help of the STATA 14 application. Multiple linear regression equations in this study

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Descriptive Result

Descriptive statistical analysis provides an overview of the characteristics of the data from the variables contained in a study. In descriptive statistical analysis, information about statistical data will be obtained such as the mean, standard deviation, minimum and maximum values. From the following table, the results of descriptive statistics for manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industrial sectors are presented as well as descriptive statistical results for manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector listed on the Indonesian stock exchange for the 2016-2020 period.

Table 2. Descriptive Statistics of Basic and Chemical Industry Sector Company

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
PBV	100	1.411891	1.462924	0.19	7.45
KM	100	0.4577443	0.2725958	0.1	0.9651
CR	100	1.9905	1.362124	0.6	6.17
ROA	100	2.4469	4.947057	-12.4	16.56
GROWTH	100	0.315704	3.485546	-15.07688	16.67426
LTDR	100	0.2534695	0.3104001	0.0007988	2.641243
SIZE	100	27.76533	1.258845	25.6895	31.55675

Source: Author's Data Process

The table above is the result of descriptive statistics from companies in the basic and chemical industry manufacturing sector. Meanwhile, the results of descriptive statistics from manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector are as follows:

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics of Consumer Goods Sector Companies

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max
PBV	80	1.8	1.512985	0.03	6.86
KM	80	0.3748086	0.242682	0.03228	0.92
CR	80	2.65775	1.986649	0.62	10.25
ROA	80	3.69325	7.288163	-20.68	18.23
GROWTH	80	0.3070414	2.761765	-5.49162	20.89615
LTDR	80	0.4913672	0.3699482	0.1001803	2.357552
SIZE	80	28.48449	1.739147	25.66354	32.72561

Source: Author's Data Process

Normality test results

The normality test is a test that has the aim of testing whether in the regression model, the independent and dependent variables have a normal distribution or not (Suwardi, 2011). A perfect or good regression model has a normal or close to normal data distribution so as to avoid bias in data analysis. To test whether the data has a normal distribution, the Kolmogrov Smirnov normality test is carried out.

Table 4. Normality Test of Basic and Chemical Industry Sector Companies

Smaller Group	D	P-value
Res :	0.0802	0.276
Cumulative :	-0.0599	0.488
Combine K-S :	0.0802	0.540

Source: Author's Data Process

From the results of the Kolmogrov Smirnov test in the basic and chemical industry sectors, the significance value or P-value is 0.540 which means it is greater than 0.05. Thus, in this study, the data is normally distributed.

Table 5. Normality Test of Consumer Goods Sector Companies

Smaller Group	D	P-value
Res :	0.0474	0.698
Cumulative :	-0.0527	0.641
Combine K-S :	0.0527	0.979

Source: Author's Data Process

Meanwhile, from the results of the Kolmogrov Smirnov test in the consumer goods sector, the significance value or P-value is 0.979, which means it is greater than 0.05. thus in this study the data is normally distributed. However, if this study does not produce a P-value less than 0.05, then this study is declared not normally distributed.

Multicollinearity test results

The multicollinearity test has the aim of testing the correlation between independent variables where in a study using the best model, there should be no indication of a high correlation between the independent variables. Multicollinearity test needs to be done because there are more than one independent variable in this study. This study uses Pearson's correlation coefficients to test multicollinearity conducted with STATA 14 which shows the following results.

Table 6. Pearson Correlation Test for Manufacturing Companies in the Basic and Chemical Industries

	PBV	KM	CR	ROA	GROWTH	LTDER	SIZE
PBV	1.000						
KM	-0.2709	1.000					
CR	-0.0911	-0.0466	1.000				

ROA	0.0691	-0.0821	0.1940	1.000			
GROWTH	-0.0652	-0.1398	0.0643	0.2618	1.000		
LTDR	0.1096	-0.3416	-0.2160	-0.1734	-0.0680	1.000	
SIZE	0.3923	-0.1526	-0.4276	0.1410	0.0182	0.3860	1.000

Source: Author's Data Process

From the table above is the result of multicollinearity test in manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industry sectors. Furthermore, the results of the multicollinearity test in tabular form for manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector are as follows:

Table 7. Pearson Correlation Test for Manufacturing Companies in Consumer Goods Sector Companies

	PBV	KM	CR	ROA	GROWTH	LTDR	SIZE
PBV	1.000						
KM	-0.0889	1.000					
CR	-0.0966	-0.1473	1.000				
ROA	0.6077	-0.1897	0.2176	1.000			
GROWTH	-0.0536	-0.0727	0.1833	0.0268	1.000		
LTDR	0.0028	-0.1509	-0.1616	-	0.1443	1.000	
SIZE	0.4742	-0.0740	-0.1915	0.5312	-0.1137	-0.1170	1.000

Source: Author's Data Process

Table 6 and table 7 show the results of data processing research conducted to test multicollinearity with Pearson Correlation. The existence of a strong correlation between independent variables can determine the output of the correlation number, which if the correlation number exceeds 0.90, it means that multicollinearity is indicated. The results of the Pearson Correlation test in this study indicate that there is no correlation between independent variables which can be concluded that this study is free from indications of multicollinearity.

T Test Result

The t test is a test that shows the effect of one independent variable individually on the dependent variable. To find out the t-test in this study uses statistical numbers or probabilities of variables. Thus it can be seen that if < 0.05 then it is significant or H_a is accepted. The following are the results of the t-test of manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industry sectors listed on the IDX for the 2016-2020 period:

Table 10. T Test result of Basic and Chemical Industry Sector Company

Variable	Koefficient	P> z	Result
KM	-0.676382	0.147	Not Significant
CR	0.074418	0.567	Not Significant
ROA	-0.0427335	0.028	Significant
GROWTH	-0.0044208	0.047	Significant
LTDR	-0.6367449	0.046	Significant
SIZE	0.8127191	0.001	Significant

Source: Author's Data Process

Based on the results of the t or Parisal test above, it can be seen that the Profitability (ROA) variable is small from 0.05, namely 0.028 which means that Profitability has a significant effect on the Firm Value (PBV) variable, then the Growth variable is small from 0.05, namely 0.047 which means Growth has a significant effect on the Firm Value variable (PBV) and the variable Capital Structure (LTDR) is small from 0.05, which is 0.046, which means that the Capital Structure (LTDR) has a significant effect on the Firm Value (PBV) variable and the Firm Size variable is smaller than 0.05, which is 0.001 which means that the size of the company has a significant effect on the variable. Company Value (PBV).

While the Managerial Ownership variable is large from 0.05, which is 0.147, which means that Managerial Ownership does not have a significant effect on the Firm Value (PBV) variable, then the Liquidity variable (CR) is greater than 0.05, which is 0.567, which means that the Liquidity variable has no significant effect on the Firm Value (PBV) variable. While the results of the t-test of manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector listed on the IDX for the 2016-2020 period:

Table 11. T Test result of Consumer Goods Sector Companies

Variable	Koeficient	P> z	Result
KM	2.01618	0.002	Significant
CR	-0.1601267	0.036	Significant
ROA	0.0394833	0.029	Significant
GROWTH	-0.0098397	0.684	Not Significant
LTDR	0.3896019	0.080	Not Significant
SIZE	0.2126458	0.226	Not Significant

Source: Author's Data Process

Paired Sample T Test

The hypothesis test used in this study is a parametric statistical test, namely the Paired Sample T-test because it comes from two interrelated variables. This test is used to determine whether or not there is an average difference between two pairs of sample groups (related).

The value of the company

Based on the table paired t test sample on the PBV variable above, it can be seen that the calculated T value is 1.7354 with a P Value of $\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0845$ at $DF = 166,875$ in this case the P value is greater than 0.05, so the hypothesis decision is H_a is rejected or H_o is accepted ie there is no significant difference in performance between the two sectors studied.

Managerial Ownership Structure

Based on the table paired t test sample on the Ownership Structure variable above, it can be seen that the calculated T value is 2.1563 with a P Value of $\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0324$ at $DF = 175.933$ in this case the P value is smaller than 0.05, so the decision The hypothesis is that H_o is rejected or H_a is accepted, that is, there is a significant difference in performance between the two sectors studied. This is because the basic and chemical industry sectors have a higher ownership structure value than the consumer goods sector so that the proportion of share ownership is more controlled by management, which can influence company policy, thus encouraging management to improve company performance and reduce manager actions in terms of earnings management that can harm the interests of other parties (stakeholders).

Liquidity

Based on the table paired t test sample on the liquidity variable above, it can be seen that the calculated T value is -2.5609 with a P Value of $\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0115$ at $DF = 166,875$ in this case the P value is small than 0.05, so the decision The hypothesis is that H_o is rejected or H_a is accepted, that is, there is a significant difference in performance between the two sectors studied. This is because manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector are more likely to place large funds on the current assets side compared to manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industry sectors. In the consumer goods industry, it is necessary to have capital, especially current assets, because the business requires large amounts of inventory.

Profitability

Based on the table paired t test sample on the Profitability variable above, it can be seen that the calculated T value is -1.3075 with a P Value of $\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.1933$ at $DF = 133,498$ in this case the P value is greater than 0.05 then the decision The hypothesis is that H_a is rejected or H_o is accepted, that is, there is no significant difference in performance between the two sectors studied.

Profit Growth

Based on the table paired t test sample on the Growth variable above, it can be seen that the calculated T value is 0.0186 with a P Value of $\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.9852$ at $DF = 177.988$ in this case the P value is greater than 0.05, so the hypothesis decision is H_a is rejected or H_o is accepted ie there is no significant difference in performance between the two sectors studied.

Capital Structure

Based on the table paired t test sample above on the Capital Structure variable, it can be seen that the calculated T value is 4.6003 with a P Value of $\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0000$ at $DF = 177.988$ in this case the P value is small than 0.05, so the decision The hypothesis is that H_o is rejected or H_a is accepted, that is, there is a significant difference in performance between the two sectors studied. It can be seen that the capital structure of manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector is higher than the basic and chemical industry sectors. This is because the companies listed in the consumer goods sector category have a high level of debt due to the large dependence of the consumer goods industrial sector companies on outsiders.

Firm Size

Based on the table paired t test sample above, it can be seen that the calculated T value is -3.1047 with a P value of $\Pr(|T| > |t|) = 0.0023$ at $DF = 139,541$ in this case the P value is small than 0.05, so the hypothesis decision is H_o rejected or H_a accepted ie there is a significant difference in performance between the two sectors studied. This is because the total assets owned by manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector are greater than the basic and chemical industry sectors because the products of consumer goods industry companies are still needed by the community so that the consumer goods sector companies will continue to grow and develop into large companies.

Discussion

a. The Effect of Managerial Ownership on Firm Value

The results of this study indicate in the basic and chemical industry sectors that the managerial ownership structure has a negative coefficient value of -0.676382 with a significant level of 0.147 which is greater than 0.05. This shows that the managerial ownership structure has a negative and insignificant effect on firm value in manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industrial sectors or in other words H_1 is rejected. This is because managerial ownership has not been able to reduce agency problems in manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industry sectors. The proportion of managerial ownership is not able to equalize the interests of management and shareholders, so that the company's goal of achieving high corporate value cannot be achieved.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Nurkhin et al., (2017) Pakekong et al., (2019) which shows that the managerial ownership structure has no effect on firm value that management performance is not influenced by the involvement of management in terms of share ownership. Management will continue to work according to the wishes of the shareholders even though he does not own a proportion of shares in the company. The results of this study are not in line with research conducted by Apriada & Suardikha, (2016) L. S. Dewi & Abundanti, (2019) Nurwahidah et al., (2019) which states that the Ownership Structure variable has a significant and significant effect on firm value which states that the higher the managerial responsibility for the company, the value of the company will increase.

However, research on manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector found that managerial ownership structure has a positive and significant impact on firm value. In the consumer goods sector, managerial ownership structure has a positive coefficient value of 2.01618 with a significant level of 0.002 which is greater than 0.05. This shows that the managerial ownership structure has a positive and significant effect on firm value in manufacturing companies

in the consumer goods sector or in other words H1 is accepted. This is because the higher the managerial responsibility for the company, the value of the company will increase. The presence of high managerial ownership makes the board generally more diligent in helping investors who are themselves to build company value. Moreover, managerial ownership can help unite the interests of investors and the board, because executives and outside investors share a common goal, thereby reducing corporate clashes that can increase corporate self-esteem.

b. The Effect of Liquidity on Firm Value

The results of research on manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industry sectors show that liquidity as measured by the current ratio has a positive coefficient value of 0.074418 with a significant level of 0.567 which is greater than 0.05. This shows that liquidity has a positive and insignificant effect on firm value in manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industrial sectors or in other words H2 is rejected. This is because the current ratio is a comparison between current assets and current liabilities. If the current assets consist of cash, accounts receivable, the higher the inventory means there are idle funds in the company, which results in the company not being able to optimally utilize its current assets so that it cannot prosper shareholders. In fact, to increase the value of the company, the company must be able to prosper the shareholders.

This research is in line with research Gusti Ayu Diah Novita Yanti & Putu Ayu Darmayant, (2019) Nugraha & Alfarisi (2020) which states that liquidity has no effect on firm value. This is because with the higher level of company liquidity, it will reduce the value of the company, because in the company there are assets or cash that are idle or unused which are not utilized by the company's management optimally in carrying out each of its operational activities. The results of this study are not in line with research conducted by Akbar et al., (2020) Ndruru et al., (2020) Permana & Rahyuda, (2019) which found that liquidity affects firm value because having good liquidity can be said to have good performance by investors. The higher the liquidity, the greater the company's ability to provide funds for dividend payments to shareholders.

However, research on manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector found that liquidity had a negative and significant impact on firm value. In the consumer goods sector, liquidity has a negative coefficient value of -0.1601267 with a significant level of 0.036 which is smaller than 0.05. This shows that liquidity has a negative and significant effect on firm value in manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector or in other words H2 is rejected. This is because high liquidity does not give a positive signal to investors. High liquidity can be an indication that a company has current assets that are idle and unused. Therefore, investors see the increase in liquidity as a negative signal of ineffective management of assets that are too much idle. Vice versa, low liquidity indicates higher fixed assets, and will give a positive signal to investors.

c. The Effect of Profitability on Firm Value

The results of research on manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industry sectors show that Profitability has a negative coefficient value of -0.0427335 with a significant level of 0.028 which is smaller than 0.05. This shows that profitability has a significant negative effect on the value of the basic and chemical industry sector companies or in other words H3 is rejected. This is in line with research conducted by Triagustina et al., (2016) which found that Return on Assets (ROA) had a negative effect on The value of the company. This is due to the management's performance in using the company's assets that have not been managed efficiently and effectively which causes the net profit generated to be small while the assets owned by the company are very large. This study is not in line with research Manoppo & Arie, (2016) Oktrima, (2017) Septriana & Mahaeswari, (2019) which states that profitability has no effect on firm value because if the company earns low profits from sales, it will inhibit investors from investing in the company. company, so the value of the company will decrease.

However, research on manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector found that profitability had a positive and significant impact on firm value. In the consumer goods sector,

profitability has a positive coefficient value of 0.0394833 with a significant level of 0.029 which is smaller than 0.05. This shows that profitability has a positive and significant effect on firm value in manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector or in other words H3 is accepted. This is because high profitability is considered a positive signal for investors who hope that by increasing the company's net profit, the company's management will also increase the dividends that will be distributed to shareholders (investors). High profitability of the company will increase the value of the company because from the perspective of investors, companies that are able to generate high profitability mean that the company is able to manage the capital owned by the company, including the share capital that has been invested by investors properly.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Al-Najjar & Al-Najjar, (2017) Gusti Ayu Diah Novita Yanti & Putu Ayu Darmayant, (2019) Ndruru et al., (2020) Nugraha & Alfarisi, (2020) Ramdhonah et al., (2019) states that profitability has a significant positive effect on company value because profitability is the company's ability to generate profits, this indicates that when profitability increases in the company, it indicates the company's value will also increase, and because investors see the company's financial performance increasing. The results of this study are different from research conducted by Triagustina et al., (2016) which found that Return on Assets (ROA) had a negative effect on firm value. This is due to the management's performance in using the company's assets that have not been managed efficiently and effectively which causes the net profit generated to be small while the assets owned by the company are very large.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Akbar et al., (2020) Permana & Rahyuda, (2019) which states that liquidity has a negative and significant effect on firm value because in terms of resources claimed by the company, it is actually higher. means that there are inactive assets in the company, which causes the company to have no choice to use the existing resources ideally so that the company can not succeed its investors. The results of this study are different from the research conducted by Lumoly et al., (2018) Ndruru et al., (2020) Tripathy & Uzma, (2021) which found that liquidity had a positive and significant effect on firm value. sufficient internal financing is used to pay its obligations. For companies that have good liquidity can be said to have good performance by investors

d. The Effect of Profit Growth on Firm Value

The results of this study indicate that growth in manufacturing companies in the basic and chemical industry sector has a negative coefficient value of -0.0044208 with a significant level of 0.047 which is smaller than 0.05. This shows that growth has a significant negative effect on firm value or in other words H4 is rejected. This happens because the working capital owned by the company is not able to cover its short-term debt which can cause losses to be borne by the company, if this happens continuously it will reduce the company's current assets which will lower the ratio value which will have an impact on the company's current assets. profit growth. Increased corporate profits can be achieved if the company's management can establish a good cooperation with other parties in making financial decisions.

This research is in line with research Likha & Fitria, (2019) which states that negative growth is significant to firm value. However, this study is not in line with research conducted by Desiyanti et al., (2020) Gustian, (2017) Suryani, (2020) which states that growth has a positive and significant effect on firm value. This is because that this is because if the company's profit is high it will increase the value of the company.

However, research on manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector found that profitability had a negative and insignificant effect on firm value. In the consumer goods sector Growth has a negative coefficient value of -0.0098397 with a significant level of 0.684 which is greater than 0.05. This shows that growth has a negative and insignificant effect on firm value in manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector or in other words H4 is rejected. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Apriliana & fidiana, (2018) Sudiani & Darmayanti, (2016) which states that growth does not affect the value of the company this is

because the rapid growth of company profits will result in greater need for funds for expansion. the need for future financing, the greater the company's desire to retain profits. However, the results of this study are not in line with research conducted by Desiyanti et al., (2020) Gustian, (2017) Suryani, (2020) which states that growth has a positive and significant effect on firm value.

e. The Effect of Capital Structure on Firm Value

The results of this study indicate that the Capital Structure as measured by the Long Term Debt Equity to Ratio (LTDR) in the basic and chemical industry seltor manufacturing companies has a negative coefficient value of -0.6367449 with a significant level of 0.046 which is smaller than 0.05. This shows that the Capital Structure has a negative and significant effect on firm value or in other words H5 is not accepted. This is because companies that can obtain debt from outside parties are companies that are believed to have the ability. In addition, the capital structure which emphasizes more on debt reflects that the company is in a growth condition where the company is in a condition that requires large funding for various investments. This condition is considered by investors to be able to provide a loss to the equity of the shareholders so that the share price will decrease which can potentially reduce the value of the company.

The results of this study are in line with research conducted by A. Dewi et al., (2015) Irawan & Kusuma, (2019) Utomo et al., (2017) which states that capital structure has a negative and significant effect on firm value. However, this study is different from research conducted by Gusti Ayu Diah Novita Yanti & Putu Ayu Darmayant, (2019) Ramdhonah et al., (2019) which found that capital structure has a positive and significant effect on firm value because it shows that high bond utilization is seen as a a positive sign for funders.

However, research on manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector found that capital structure had a positive and insignificant effect on firm value. In the consumer goods sector, the capital structure has a positive coefficient value of 0.3896019 with a significant level of 0.080 which is greater than 0.05. This shows that the capital structure has a positive and insignificant effect on firm value in manufacturing companies in the consumer goods sector or in other words H5 is rejected. The results of this study are in line with research conducted by Sondakh et al., (2019) which states that the positive capital structure is not significant to firm value. However, this study is not in line with research conducted by A. Dewi et al., (2015) Irawan & Kusuma, (2019) Utomo et al., (2017) which found that capital structure has a negative and significant effect on firm value.

CONCLUSION

This study aims to analyze the effect of managerial ownership structure, liquidity, profitability, profit growth and capital structure on firm value in the basic and chemical industrial sector and manufacturing sector companies in the consumer goods sector listed on the Indonesian stock exchange for the 2016-2020 period. The test was carried out using multiple regression analysis and panel data with the results of managerial ownership in the basic industrial and chemical sectors being negative and not significant to firm value. Profitability variables in the basic and chemical industry sectors have a negative and significant effect on firm value, but in the consumption sector, profitability has a positive and significant effect on firm value. The growth variable in the basic and chemical industry sector companies has a negative and significant effect on firm value, but in the goods consumption sector it has no significant negative effect on firm value. Based on the limitations contained in this study, there are several suggestions that can be considered, namely for investors, in addition to considering the company values obtained when trying investors also consider investment risks that will affect the company value.

References

- Al-Najjar, B., & Al-Najjar, D. (2017). The impact of external financing on firm value and a corporate governance index: SME evidence. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 24(2), 411-423. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-11-2016-0172>
- Al-Slehat, Z. A. F. (2019). Impact of Financial Leverage, Size and Assets Structure on Firm Value: Evidence from Industrial Sector, Jordan. *International Business Research*, 13(1), 109. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ibr.v13n1p109>
- Apriliana, & fidiana. (2018). PENGARUH GOOD CORPORATE GOVERNANCEDAN PERTUMBUHAN LABA TERHADAP NILAI PERUSAHAAN.
- Asante-Darko, D., Adu Bonsu, B., Famiyeh, S., Kwarteng, A., & Goka, Y. (2018). Governance structures, cash holdings and firm value on the Ghana Stock Exchange. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, 18(4), 671-685. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-07-2017-0148>
- ben Fatma, H., & Chouaibi, J. (2021). Corporate governance and firm value: a study on European financial institutions. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-05-2021-0306>
- Chia, Y. E., Lim, K. P., & Goh, K. L. (2020). Liquidity and firm value in an emerging market: Nonlinearity, political connections and corporate ownership. *North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 52. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.najef.2020.101169>
- Choi, S., Salam, M. A., & Kim, Y. (2020). Foreign currency derivative usage and firm value in Bangladesh: comparative analysis between exporters and non-exporters under exchange rate movements. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-08-2019-0641>
- Connelly, J. T., Limpaphayom, P., & Nagarajan, N. J. (2012). Form versus substance: The effect of ownership structure and corporate governance on firm value in Thailand. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 36(6), 1722-1743. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2012.01.017>
- Gusti Ayu Diah Novita Yanti, i, & Putu Ayu Darmayant, ni. (2019). PENGARUH PROFITABILITAS, UKURAN PERUSAHAAN, STRUKTUR MODAL, DAN LIKUIDITAS TERHADAP NILAI PERUSAHAAN MAKANAN DAN MINUMAN. *E-Jurnal Manajemen*, 8, 2297-2324.
- Ibhagui, O. W., & Olokoyo, F. O. (2018). Leverage and firm performance: New evidence on the role of firm size. *North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, 45, 57-82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.najef.2018.02.002>
- Irawan, D., & Kusuma, N. (2019). PENGARUH STRUKTUR MODAL DAN UKURAN PERUSAHAAN TERHADAP NILAI PERUSAHAAN. *Jurnal Aktual STIE Trisna Negara*, 17(1), 66-81.
- Karim, S., Naeem, M. A., & Ismail, R. B. (2022). Re-configuring ownership structure, board characteristics and firm value nexus in Malaysia: the role of board gender and ethnic diversity. *International Journal of Emerging Markets*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOEM-01-2021-0004>
- Li, Y., Gong, M., Zhang, X. Y., & Koh, L. (2018). The impact of environmental, social, and governance disclosure on firm value: The role of CEO power. *British Accounting Review*, 50(1), 60-75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2017.09.007>
- Likha, M., & Fitria, A. (2019). PENGARUH PERTUMBUHAN LABA, KINERJA KEUANGAN TERHADAP NILAI PERUSAHAAN DIMODERASI CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY.
- Masytari, A., Maisur, & Nazariah. (2019). PENGARUH RASIO KEUANGAN TERHADAP NILAI PERUSAHAAN (PERUSAHAAN MANUFAKTUR SEKTOR INDUSTRI BARANG KONSUMSI YANG TERDAFTAR DI BEI TAHUN 2013-2017). 1(2).
- Mishra, R., & Kapil, S. (2017). Effect of ownership structure and board structure on firm value: evidence from India. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, 17(4), 700-726. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-03-2016-0059>
- Mursalini, W. I., Tafdil, H., & Masyhuri, H. (2017). Analysis of funding, working capital turnover, liquidity and sales growth to profitability. *Advanced Science Letters*, 9, 8341-8346.
- Musallam, S. R. M. (2020). State ownership and firm value: simultaneous analyses approach. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 14(1), 50-61. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JABS-02-2019-0062>
- Nugraha, R. A., & Alfari, M. F. (2020). PENGARUH PROFITABILITAS, LEVERAGE, LIKUIDITAS DAN UKURAN PERUSAHAAN TERHADAP NILAI PERUSAHAAN. *Jurnal Mirai Management*, 5.
- Nurkhin, A., Wahyudin, A., & Fajriah, A. S. A. (2017). Relevansi Struktur Kepemilikan terhadap Profitabilitas dan Nilai Perusahaan Barang Konsumsi. *Jurnal Akuntansi Multiparadigma*. <https://doi.org/10.18202/jamal.2017.04.7038>

- Osazuwa, N. P., & Che-Ahmad, A. (2016). The moderating effect of profitability and leverage on the relationship between eco-efficiency and firm value in publicly traded Malaysian firms. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 12(2), 295–306. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-03-2015-0034>
- Pakekong, M. I., Murni, S., Rate, P. v, & Struktur..., P. (2019). PENGARUH STRUKTUR KEPEMILIKAN, KEBIJAKAN DIVIDEN DAN KEBIJAKAN HUTANG TERHADAP NILAI PERUSAHAAN PADA PERUSAHAAN ASURANSI YANG TERDAFTAR DI BEI PERIODE 2012-2016. *611 Jurnal EMBA*, 7(1), 611–620.
- Ramdhonah, Z., Solikin, I., & Sari, M. (2019). Pengaruh Struktur Modal, Ukuran Perusahaan, Pertumbuhan Perusahaan, Dan Profitabilitas Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan (Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Sektor Pertambangan Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2011-2017). *JURNAL RISET AKUNTANSI DAN KEUANGAN*, 7, 67–82.
- Sembiring, S., & Trinawati, I. (2019). FAKTOR-FAKTOR YANG MEMPENGARUHI NILAI PERUSAHAAN. <http://jurnaltsm.id/index.php/JBA>
- Septriana, I., & Mahaeswari, H. F. (2019). Pengaruh Likuiditas, Firm Size, dan Profitabilitas Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan Pengaruh Likuiditas, Firm Size, dan Profitabilitas Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan (Studi pada Perusahaan Pertambangan yang terdaftar di BEI Periode 2013-2017).
- Sudiani, N. K. A., & Darmayanti, N. P. A. (2016). PENGARUH PROFITABILITAS, LIKUIDITAS, PERTUMBUHAN, DAN INVESTMENT OPPORTUNITY SET TERHADAP NILAI PERUSAHAAN. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Unud*, 4545–4574.
- Suryani, A. (2020a). Analisis Leverage Melalui Pertumbuhan Laba dan Pengaruhnya terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. *J-MAS (Jurnal Manajemen Dan Sains)*, 5(1), 88. <https://doi.org/10.33087/jmas.v5i1.153>
- Sutama, D. R., & Lisa, E. (2018). PENGARUH LEVERAGE DAN PROFITABILITAS TERHADAP NILAI PERUSAHAAN (Studi pada Perusahaan Sektor Manufaktur Food and Beverage yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia).
- Tripathy, A., & Uzma, S. H. (2021). Does debt heterogeneity impact firm value? Evidence from an emerging context. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-06-2020-0179>