



International Journal of Economic Research

ISSN : 0972-9380

available at <http://www.serialsjournals.com>

© Serials Publications Pvt. Ltd.

Volume 14 • Number 15 (Part 4) • 2017

The Effect of Capital Structure on Firm Value with the Mediation of R&D as the Intervening Variable

Mahirun Latifudin¹, Sugeng Wahyudi² and Harjum Muharam³

¹Student ist Phd Diponegoro University, Department of Management Pekalongan University. Email: mahirun@yahoo.com

^{2,3}Department of Management Diponegoro University. Email: sug_w@yahoo.com, hardjum@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Conceptually, this research aimed to develop a theoretical approach as a mean to improve company value. The effort done were involving capital structure, investment opportunity set, sales growth, company size, and business risk, also proposing a research and development as an intervening variable so that to build a grand theoretical model. The population of this research was manufacture companies, and non-finance companies registered in Indonesia Stock Exchange during observation period from 2017 to 2013. Path analysis was used as a mean of analysis helped by AMOS program. The main finding was R&D intensity which is the mediation between the effect of debt to equity ratio and capital expenditure to book value of assets to tobins'q value. Debt to equity ratio and capital expenditure to book value of assets were the sample of this study which influenced indirectly the improvement of tobins'q valye through R&D intensity. The result showed R&D intensity and size of the firm gave positive and significant effect on tobins'q value while debt to equity ratio, capital expenditure to book value of assets, and earning volatility did not give significant effect to tobins'q value. Meanwhile, debt to equity ratio and capital expenditure to book value of assets gave positive and significant effect on R&D intensity, and sales growth and size of the firm did not influence the R&D intensity.

Keywords: Firm value, firm size, sales growth, Investment opportunity set, capital structure, business risk, research and development.

1. INTRODUCTION

Agency theory describes the relationship between management and stakeholders (agent and principal), a manager must decide the best thing to improve the wealth of stakeholders. The decision is to maximize the resources (utility) of the firm. The decision of funding through capital structure can reduce the agency

conflict because free cash flow of the firm is sent to the account of debt payment. Capital structure is an important factor of the firm to produce assets, run the operational things, and improve the development of the firm (Thippayana, 2014).

The value of the firm is the sum of debt and equity based on market value (Weston and Copeland, 1992). The raise of firm value is an achievement that is suitable with the desire of the owners, because it leads to the raise of wealth of the owners, and it is the manager's duty as the agent who is trusted by the owners to run the firm. A manager's decision influences the optimal result in order to improve the firm value. Therefore, a manager must be able to decide effectively to raise the firm value.

The optimization of a firm value can be reached by running the function of financial management, where one decision taken will influence others and firm value (Fama and French, 1998). The management includes the solving of important decisions taken by the firm; such as, funding decision, investment decision, and dividend policy. If the purpose is to maximize the firm value, the firm must choose the *debt equity ratio* resulting the maximum firm value. This maximum value must provide big profit to the stakeholders.

The financial decision is one of the important and integral parts of financial management in every firm. A good decision must consider the scope of capital structure, capitalization, and capital cost. Capital structure is a significant thing for management because it affects the mix of debt and equity of the firm which influences the return of stakeholders and risk. So, deciding the debt combination and equity plays main role in the part of firm value and stock market value. The mix of debt and equity of the firm can be measured by leverage (Paramasivan and Subramanian, 2009). Based on the theory of *trade-off* (Fama and Miller, 1972; Myers, 1977, 2001; De Angelo and Masulis, 1980; and Jensen, 1986) the choice of firm funding reflects the effort of the manager to balance the tax-shield from bigger debt by improving the possibility of financial distress cost. The use of debt is another mechanism used for reducing or controlling the agency conflict (Jensen and Meckling, 1976). The capital structure of a firm describes the way in which a firm raised capital needed to establish and expand its business activities. It is a mixture of various types of equity and debt capital a firm maintained resulting from the firms financing decisions. In one way or another, business activity must be financed. In all aspects of capital investment decision, the capital structure decision is the vital one since the profitability of an enterprise is directly affected by such decision (Claude, 2016)

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

Normatively, the aim of financial management in to improve the firm value, reflected by the stock market value (Fama, 1978; Wright and Ferris, 1997; Walker 2000; and Qureshi, 2006). Improving the firm value means maximizing the rich or prosperity of the stakeholders. The management of finance is related to an important decision taken by firm and a combination from funding decision, investment decision, and dividend policy of maximizing firm value (Mbodja and Mukhrejee, 1994). Investment Opportunity Set (IOS) is the availability of alternative investment in the future for the firm. IOS is the current value of firm's choices to make investment in the future (Chung and Charoenwong, 1991). Investment decision is defined as a combination from owned assets (*assets in place*) and choices of investment in the future with positive net present value (Myers, 1977). IOS gives wider clue where firm value depends on the expenses in the future. So the prospect of the firm can be estimated from *Investment Opportunity Set* (IOS).

The strategy of firm value setting is focused on the risk and uncertainty (Michalski, 2008). Risk can be defined as the possibility of bad result or unwanted loss (Imam and Malik 2007). According to Brigham and Houston (2006) there are two risk dimension; financial risk and business risk. Business risk is an uncertainty faced by the firm in running the business. Earning volatility depicts the height of business risk and the level of firm's bankruptcy. The profit of firm that is related to earning volatility cannot be separated from the size of the firm. A big firm has more accurate estimation on profit, it is because it has various business lines and wider market. Besides, big companies have more resources to improve the firm value because they have better access to external information sources than those of small ones (Hagerman and Ruland, 1979). Ota (2003) showed that a manager from big companies have strong commitment on profit estimation. Dastgir et. al., (2007) explained that big companies have greater control on market situation, so they can face the competition resulting in less affected by economic fluctuation. Mudambi and Swift (2011) explained that big firm, R&D expenses and the level of firm's development have strong relationship, while for a small firm the relationship is weak. Griliches and Klette (2000) presented the quality of firm's development level model where the investment of R&D and sistochastic innovation is the machine of growth. Qiao et. al., (2014) in the research showed that the existence of R&D and technology have positive and significant effect to the innovation of SMEs. The most important finding is that innovation at SME gives positive effect on firm's performance. Zhu and Huang (2012) described the innovation technology and R&D are the core of business strategy of a firm to compete in market. The research done was to test the relationship between investment and the intensity of R&D and the firm's performance in China to show result that companies with intensive investment on R&D would have higher finance performance than the previous year. Chun et. al., (2014) emphasizes the importance of R&D investment to support the long-term development of the firm. Li (2011) stated that there is a strong relationship between financial constraint, R&D intensity, and stock return. R&D intensity can predict and operate stock return of the firm to the positive direction.

2.1. Hypotheses for Capital Structure and Firm Value

Ross et. al., (2010) describe the purpose of the management to maximize the value of capital market and obligation market, so the firm can determine the maximum total amount which becomes the value of the firm. Jensen and Meckling (1976), also describe that manager's decision to determine the capital structure is to keep the balance of obligation with the firm's own money, and minimize the effect given by those to the value of the firm. Bayless and Diltz (1994) and Deangelo and Masulis (1980) explain that in the *static trade off theory*, the optimal capital structure happens because of the process of trade-off between *tax shield of leverage cost of financial distress and agency cost of leverage*. The decision of funding taken by the firm influences the firm performance positively (Claude, 2016). The similar result but with emphasis on there is maximum level so the capital structure can improve the value of the firm (Nieh et. al., 2008). Meanwhile, Ruan et. al., (2011) showed that the ownership of managerial influences the capital structure and finally the firm value. Berger and Di Patti (2006) proved that both high leverage of a firm and low equity level have significant effect to improve the firm's performance economically and statistically.

H1: Debt to equity ratio has a positive impact on tobins'q.

2.2. Hypotheses for Investment Opportunity Set and Firm Value

Myers (1977) explained that firm value is not determined by the debt proportion but it is determined by the combination from investment opportunity set and placed asset. IOS is determined by the choice where

the business line is based on the competitive excellence, so the value of the firm is determined by the expenses arranged by the management in the future, which are the investment that is seen to give greater profit (Gaver and Gaver, 1993; and Smith and Watts, 1992). Yuliani et. al., (2012) got the result that there is direct positive and significant effect to firm value. The raise of investment will increase the value of the firm. Wright and Ferris (1997) who did the research in Africa defined that investment decision through divestment affects the firm value.

H2: Capital expenditure to book value of assets has a positive impact on tobins'q.

2.3. Hypotheses for Sales Growth and Firm Value

Lang et. al., (1996) explained that the growth of a firm has negative relationship with leverage but it has positive one with firm value (Tobins'q), while in a firm with high chance of growth, the debt ratio has negative relationship with the firm value. Therefore, the effect of debt on firm value really depends on the chance of growth. However, Lee (2013) clearly found out that there is positive effect given by company growth to profitability. Furthermore, Lee explained that the environment of the company has strong effect on the relationship between company growth and profit. The development of technology is also an important factor to increase the company value (Chen and Chang, 2010).

H3: Growth sales has a positive impact on tobins'q.

2.4. Hypotheses for Firm Size and Firm Value

Putu et. al., (2014) found that firm size has positive and significant effect on firm value in manufacture sector in Indonesia. Moeljadi (2014) stated that big firm can increase the value of manufacture firm, that is why it generally is a big firm. Gedajlovic and Shapiro (1998) stated that the relationship between firm size and profitability is positive. Khodamipour et. al., (2013) in his research found that there is not any significant relationship between stock risk and firm size with stock return and between firm size and firm value. The review showed that there is significant and direct relationship between market value and liquidity volume and there is also positive and significant relationship between liquidity volume and stock return. This also supported by h Mule et. al., (2015) who showed that firm size does not have any significant effect statistically on market value of the firm. Their study showed that firm size does not have any effects on performance. Nguyen et. al., (2015) explained that in Australia, firm size does not give significant effect on firm value.

H4: Firm size has a positive impact on tobins'q.

2.5. Hypotheses for Business Risk and Firm Value

High business risk affects the firm ability to increase the profit and finally will affect the firm value. Sari and Hutagaol (2009) also found that business risk has positive effect on firm value. Garner et. al., (2002) explained that volatility from cash flow firm operation gives positive effect on the firm growth.

H5: Earning volatility has a positive impact on tobins'q.

2.6. Hypotheses for R&D and Firm Value

Gharbi et. al., (2013) emphasize the importance of investment in R&D for a firm, because R&D becomes one of those policies that are able to overcome asymmetric information, and in the end the relationship

between investment in R&D and profit volatility for stakeholders is very high and positive. This is considered rational because investment in R&D pushes the manufacture firms to develop new products to compete in developing countries (Eng and Ozdemir, 2013). Garner et. al., (2002) showed that the speed of firm innovation proxy by R&D investment is the determiner and important factor of firm value. Qiao et. al., (2014) found that innovation in SME has positive effect on firm performance. Hashi and Stojcic (2013) tested the effect if innovation on firm performance and found that there is positive relationship between innovation and productivity. Investment in innovation is an absolute thing to win the competition, and in big firms investment in innovation will be more than in small firms. While based on Santos et. al., (2014) the investment in innovation done by the firms does not explain how it works significantly.

H6: R&D Intensity has a positive impact on tobins'q.

2.7. Hypotheses for Capital Structure and R&D

Thippayana (2014) in his review found that capital structure is an important factor for a firm to produce assets, to operate the firm, and to improve the growth in the future that leads to maximize the firm value. The leverage improvement can improve the firm size but can reduce the profitability significantly. Other study done by Kale and Shahrur (2007) found that firm leverage has negative relationship with the intensity of R&D from suppliers and customers.

H7: Debt to equity ratio has a positive impact on R&D Intensity.

2.8. Hypotheses for Investment Opportunity Set and R&D

Investment decision taken by firms can be applied in many fields; one of them is technology. The dynamic and competitive business environment that always evolves demands firms to always follow the development of technology and apply it in productivity activity at firms. Yildiz et. al., (2013) tested the relationship between innovation performance and technology investment that gives the result of strong relationship in technopolis firms in METU (*Middle East Technical University*) and *Hacettepe University* in Turkey. In multinational company, investment in R&D in parent company will give motivation used as base of investment in foreign market as a multinational firm and later will expand the firm size. Investment in technology for foreign market and continuous R&D in parent company is a strategy done by multinational company to penetrate the market (Huang, 2013).

H8: Capital expenditure to book value of assets has a positive impact on R&D Intensity.

2.9. Hypotheses for Growth Sales and R&D

Goedhuys and Veugelers (2011) explained that innovation strategy in the form of internal development or external acquisition has effect on the success of a process and product innovation. This thing then explores the importance of process and product innovation in terms of firm growth. The success of innovation is mainly through the purchase of machines and equipment. Innovative performance is the main booster of firm growth, especially combination from products and innovation process that significantly raise the firm growth.

H9: Growth sales has a positive impact on R&D Intensity.

2.10. Hypotheses for Firm Zize and R&D

Knott and Vieregger (2016) found that firm size influences the choice of R&D strategy. This theory stated that R&D strategy is preferred by big firms, and firm size will improve the R&D process done by the firms. Arias-aranda et. al., (2000) found positive relationship between firm size and innovation at firms in Spain. Baldwin (1999), in his research, found that big firms are more innovative than smaller ones because big firms has easier access to funding, so they can spread the consistent innovation fund to bigger volume of sales, the advantages got from economics of scale, and the complementary value between research and development with other activities at firms. Nakajo (1995) stated in his research that the factor influencing R&D expenses is the firm size.

H10: Firm size has a positive impact on R&D Intensity.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section is devoted to discuss the data sources, sampling design and the empirical model tested in this study.

3.1. Data Collection and Sources

The type of data used is quantitative ones gathered from; (1) *Indonesian Capital Marker Directory* (ICMD), published in 2008-2014; (2) Annual report. Based on time dimension and order of time, this research is a cross-sectional and time series or known as data panel (data pooled). The sample firms are those which have R&D expenses, including *research and development* (R&D) cost, education and training, and human resources development. The data of the firms used as population are 294 firms in 7 years, consisting of 176 manufacture firms and 176 non-finance firms gathered by purposive sampling. The use of single imputation method is chosen to prevent any data loss.

Table 1
Research Data Collection Process

The number of manufacture firms expensing R&D based on PSAK 19							
	23	23	24	24	25	29	28
The number of manufacture firms qualified as samples (single imputation method)							
	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
The numbers of manufacture firms used as data of research							
	15	19	16	18	17	15	14
The number of non-finance firms registered in Indonesia Stock Exchange.							
	184	195	199	219	238	255	274
The number of non-finance firms expensing R&D based on PSAK 19							
	13	13	12	19	21	21	19
The number of non-finance firms qualified as samples (single imputation method)							
	23	23	23	23	23	23	23
The numbers of non-finance firms used as data of research							
	16	12	12	14	15	19	17
The number of firms used as data research (observtion)							
	31	31	28	32	32	34	31

Authors' tabulation

Table 1 showed the process of qualified samples gathering and the result is there are 49 firms consist of 26 manufacture firms and 23 non-finance firms, with 119 observations.

Table 2 showed the distribution of data research in all sectors in Indonesia Stock Exchange.

Table 2
Sample distribution

Panel A : Sample distribution across industries by observation over seven years								
Basic Industry and Chemicals	Miscellaneous Industry	Consumer Goods Industry	Agriculture	Mining	Property, Real Estate and Building Construction	Infrastructure, Utilities & Transportation	Trade, Services & Investment	Total
7	6	13	1	3	7	3	9	49

Authors' tabulation.

3.2. Empirical Model and Variables Measurement

The research was focused on the empirical test of variables integration related to the firm value involving capital structure, investment opportunity set, sales growth, firm size, and business risk mediated by research and development. The model of empirical study presented in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Empirical model

Both sub structure formed in Figure 1 are; **First**, sub structure shows the causal relationship between variables DER, CAPBVA, GS, and LNTA with Variable R&D; **Second**, sub-structure stated causal relationship of variables DER, CAPBVA, GS, LNTA, EVOL and R&D with TOBINS'Q variable. In other words, based on both sub-structures, there are 2 structural equations formed:

$$TOBINSQ = \beta_{1TOBINS'Q}DER + \beta_{2TOBINS'Q}CAPBVA + \beta_{3TOBINS'Q}GS + \beta_{4TOBINS'Q}LNTA + \beta_{5TOBINS'Q}EVOL + \beta_{5TOBINS'Q}R\&D + \epsilon_1 \quad (1.1)$$

$$R\&D = \beta_{1R\&D}DER + \beta_{2R\&D}CAPBVA + \beta_{3R\&D}GS + \beta_{4R\&D}LNTA + \epsilon_1 \quad (1.2)$$

Tobin's q is an indicator of firm value showing the performance of management in managing the firm's assets to measure the performance of the firm from the side of potential market value of a firm (Lindenberg and Ross, 1981; and Dushnitsky and Lenox, 2006). Research and development uses the measurement from the intensity of R&D where total expenses of R&D divided by total assets of the firm (Li, 2011; Zhu and

Huang, 2012; and Chun et. al., 2014). *Debt to Equity Ratio* is an effort to show, in other format, relative proportion of lenders claim on ownership right, and used as measurement of debt role as an indicator of capital structure (Ravid, 1988; Adedeji, 1998; Fama and French, 2000; Cuong and Canh, 2012; and Cheng et. al., 2010). Factual approach chosen for investment opportunity set was *capital expenditure to book value of assets ratio* (Assih et. al., 2006; and Yuliani et. al., 2012). The sales growth is the ratio of sales change divided by previous year sales (Dunne and Hughes, 1994). The measurement of business risk variables used *earning volatility* (Homaifar et. al., 1994; and Johnson, 1997). The firm size in this study was measured with natural logarithm of total assets (Dastgir, 2007; King and Santor, 2008; Chen and Chen, 2011; Berzkalne and Zelgalve, 2011; Loi and Khan, 2012; and Fosu, 2013).

Table 3
Summary of the variables

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Name of the variable</i>	<i>Operationalization</i>	<i>Expected sign</i>
Tobins'q	Firm Value	Market value of total stock circulating and debts divided by total assets	
R&D Intensity	Research and Development	Total expenses of R&D divided by total assets.	+
DER	Capital Structure	The ratio of total debts owned by firms to total equity.	+
GS	Growth sales	The change of total sales divided by sales.	+
CAPBVA	Investment opportunity set	The change of total assets divided by total assets.	+
EVOL	Business risk	The change of <i>earnings before interest, tax, and depreciation</i> divided by total assets value in book.	+
LNTA	Firm size	Natural logarithm of TA	+

A descriptive statistics for variables are shown in Table 3. On average, the tobins'q data in Indonesia reach 1.49 with the highest tobins'q value is 4.85 and the lowest is 0.29. While for DER, the average is 1.01 x with the highest DER is 3.03 x and the lowest is 0.08 x.

Table 4
Descriptive statistics

<i>Variable</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>Standard deviation</i>	<i>Minimum</i>	<i>Maximum</i>
TOBINSQ	1.499006	0.8999588	0.2912	4.8533
DER	1.006325	0.7001456	0.0810	3.0271
EVOL	3.794602	5.1920571	-13.4975	18.1464
LNTA	14.763499	1.6609435	10.5584	18.6672
RnD	0.231130	.2037244	0.0008	0.7749
CAPBVA	3.063263	6.7309224	-21.7516	29.8685
GS	16.924727	21.2053275	-47.0025	80.3425

Table 4 shows Pearson correlation matrix and Vector Inflation Factor (VIF) among the variables. The results indicate that all variables are far from being correlated. The maximum correlation coefficient is 47.10% between firm size (LNTA) and tobins'q which indicates positive and significant correlation. While the lowest correlation is 0.60% between R&D and tobins'q which indicates positive and no significant correlation.

Table 4
Pearson correlation matrix

VARIABLES	TOBINSQ	DER	EVOL	LNTA	CAPBVA	RnD	GS
TOBINSQ	1						
DER	-.307**	1					
EVOL	.264**	-.161*	1				
LNTA	.471**	-.054	.286**	1			
CAPBVA	.214**	-.080	.071	.262**	1		
RnD	.006	.155*	-.109	-.245**	.024	1	
GS	.055	.078	.261**	.196**	.255**	-.227**	1

4. EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

Initially, we estimate the path analysis using AMOS. The results are reported in Table 5.

Table 5
Output Path Analysis

			Estimate	S.E.	C.R.	P	Label
RnD	< ---	LNTA	-.231	.008	-3,505	***	par_12
RnD	< ---	CAPBVA	.159	.002	2,373	.018	par_13
RnD	< ---	DER	.173	.018	2,734	.006	par_14
RnD	< ---	GS	-.236	.001	-3,581	***	par_20
TOBINSQ	< ---	CAPBVA	.066	.008	1,102	.270	par_4
TOBINSQ	< ---	GS	-.018	.003	-.287	.774	par_5
TOBINSQ	< ---	LNTA	.452	.033	7,396	***	par_6
TOBINSQ	< ---	RnD	.167	.262	2,807	.005	par_7
TOBINSQ	< ---	DER	-.285	.074	-4,955	***	par_11
TOBINSQ	< ---	EVOL	.107	.010	1,782	.075	par_19

From Table 5, there are two standardized structural equation formed;

$$\text{TOBINS'Q} = 0,167\text{R\&D} - 0,285\text{DER} + 0,066\text{CAPBVA} - 0,018\text{GS} + 0,452\text{LNTA} + 0,107\text{EVOL} \quad (1.3)$$

P (0,005) (0,000) (0,270) (0,774) (0,000) (0,075)

Cr (2,807) (-4,955) (1,102) (-0,287) (7,396) (1,782)

$$\text{R\&D} = 0,173\text{DER} + 0,159\text{CAPBVA} - 0,236\text{GS} - 0,229\text{LNTA} \quad (1.4)$$

P (0,006) (0,018) (0,000) (0,000)

Cr (2,734) (2,373) (-3,581) (-3,505)

Based on the structural equation 1.3, the test result of hypothesis, 'the influence of debt to equity ratio to tobins'q is negative and significantly influence'. Debt to equity ratio which became samples in this research has influence of improving firm value if the debt to equity ratio decreases. This result supports the one done by Modigliani and Miller (1958); Chung et. al., (2013); Zeitun, R. and Tian, G. G. (2007); and Cheng, et. al., (2010). But it is inconsistent with researches done by Claude (2016); Nieh et. al., (2008); Ruan et. al., (2011); and Berger and Di Patti (2006).

The influence of *capital expenditure to book value of assets* to tobins'q is positive but no significant effect. So, *capital expenditure to book value of assets* has less meaning to improve tobins'q value of firm. This study is inconsistent with Myers (1977); Gaver and Gaver (1993); and Smith and Watts (1992), stated that firm value is determined by IOS. Adiputra (2016), explains that the influence of Investment Opportunity Set (IOS) on the firm value is positive and significant influence in the ASEAN 5 countries.

The influence of sales growth to tobins'q is negative but significant. This study supports Lang et. al., (1996); and Lee (2013). The influence of firm size to tobins' is positive and significant. Firm size has meaning to improve firm value when total assets increases. It goes along with Putu et. al., (2014); Moeljadi (2014); and Gedajlovic and Shapiro (1998). But it is inconsistent with Khodamipour et. al., (2013); Mule et. al., (2015); and Nguyen et. al., (2015).

The influence of earning volatility to tobins'q is positive but insignificant. Earning volatility depicts the height of business risk and level of bankruptcy. Earning volatility is also an indicator that shows business risk of a firm, used by debt holder to predict future earning as a protection to the lent money. Business risk becomes an indicator of return instability got by stakeholders (Gitman, 2003). The research done by Barnes (2001) found the negative relationship between earning volatility and market value if the firm. After re-testing the relationship, including adding control variables such as firm size, leverage, investment current, and sales growth, the influence of earning volatility still gives negative significant result. Amit and Wernerfelt (1990) also found that the risk of business and significant negative effect on firm value. But this research is inconsistent with Sari and Hutagaol (2009).

The influence of R&D to tobins'q is positive and significant. This goes along with the research by Gharbi et. al., (2013) emphasizing the importance of investment in R&D in a firm. Because R&D becomes one of policies that is able to overcome the asymmetric information, and finally the relationship between investment in R&D and earning volatility for stakeholders is very high and positive. This result also supports Eng and Ozdemir (2013); Garner et. al., (2002) Hashi and Stojcic (2013), but not with Santos et. al., (2014).

Structural equation 1.4 shows that the influence of debt to equity ratio to intensity of R&D is positive and significant. It means that the raise of debt to equity ratio can increase R&D intensity significantly. This supports Thippayana (2014), but is inconsistent with Kale and Shahrur (2007). The influence of *capital expenditure to book value of assets* to R&D intensity is positive and significant. This is suitable with Gaver and Gaver (1993) that stated investment choice in the future is not only on the projects funded by R&D but also the ability to explore the opportunity to get profit. The existence of investment opportunity set gives positive signal to R&D activity (signaling theory). The investment in technology for foreign market and continuous R&D in parent company is the strategies applied by multinational company to penetrate the market (Huang, 2013).

The influence of sales growth to R&D intensity is negative and significant. It goes along with Schimke and Brenner (2011) who stated that there is different finding between firm growth and R&D. In a firm with low technology, the relationship between firm growth and R&D is negative. While in firm with high technology, the relationship is positive. This study is inconsistent with Goedhuys and Veugelers (2011). Coad and Rao (2010) explained that firms increase expense on R&D if the sales increase.

Meanwhile, the influence of firm size to R&D intensity is negative and significant. It is consistent with Akcigit (2008) in his review found that firm size has negative relation with R&D intensity and sales growth. Kim et. al., (2003) defined that the bigger the firm size, the less fund to be invested in R&D activities. Goodwin (1998) stated that there is no clear relationship between firm size and R&D, except for pharmacy firm, the firm size influences R&D expenses. The result is inconsistent with Knott and Vieregger (2016); Arias-Aranda et. al., (2000); and Baldwin (1999).

The test result of mediation variables of R&D intensity to the effect of DER, CAPBVA, GS, and LNNTA to Tobins'qare; **First**, R&D intensity mediated the influence of DER to Tobins'q significantly with t-test result 1,769096 bigger than t-table value 1.651906. **Second**, R&D intensity mediated the influence of CAPBVA to TOBINS'Q significantly with t-test result 1,655977 bigger than t- table1.651906.**Third**, R&D intensity did not mediate the influence of GS to Tobins'q because t-test result is -1.416608 smaller than t-table 1.651906, **Fourth**, R&D intensity did not mediate the influence of LNNTA to Tobins'q because the t-test result is -2.006881 smaller than t-table at 1.651906.

5. CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The test result showed that R&D intensity had real mediation role to the influence of debt to equity ratio to TOBINS'Q. This finding also gave input to trade off theory, with debt so the purpose of management to optimize the debt can raise the firm growth (Thippiyana, 2014). Chung et. al., (2013) explained that firm will increase the capital structure if it has interesting growth chance, in other words, the relationship between capital structure and growth is a correlational positive one (Gul et. al., 2012). The contribution to signaling theory, R&D intensity is the value expected by many people, both internal and external. The availability of R&D intensity reflects the condition where the firm has signal on stock price in the future to increase the firm value. From the investors' point of view, the growth of a firm is a sign that it has profitable aspect, and the investors expect good rate of return from the investment (Ross, 1977). The result suggests the management to be brave to take aggressive act in funding policy. This policy followed by investment on fixed assets, those are assets that are profitable, and the investment on R&D is proven to increase the firm value, so the prosperity of the owners can be reached through the function of finance management.

The second important finding is that R&D intensity is able to mediate the influence of CAPBVA to TOBINS'Q. This result contributes to *signaling theory*, with the existence of investment opportunity set which resulting assets growth so it is expected to increase the investment in R&D expenses. R&D is an expected value wanted by all sides, both internal (management) and external (investors, creditors). The effect of this innovation is expected to give positive signal to the firms, because investors expect to get high return from the investment so it affects the raise of firm value (Ross, 1977; and Qiao et. al., 2014). Gharbi et. al., (2013) emphasizes the importance of investment in R&D to the firms, because R&D becomes one of policies that is able to overcome the asymmetric information, and finally the relationship between investment in R&D and earning volatility becomes so high and positive for the stakeholders. This becomes rational because investment in R&D encourages manufacture firms to develop their new products to win the competition in developing country (Eng and Ozdemir, 2013). This will go along with the result that found R&D intensity effect of firm value is positive and significant. This result suggests management to be brave to act by investing in profitable assets. The investment opportunity set followed by R&D activities is proven to be able to increase the firm value.

References

- Adedeji, A., (1988). Does the Pecking Hypotesis Explain the Dividend Payout Ratio of Firm in The UK?. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting* 25 (9) and (10), November/December: pp. 1127-1155.
- Adiputra, I Gede, (2016). The Effect of Internal and External Factors on the Value of a Firm Through its Investment Opportunities on The Stock Exchange of the Southeast Asian Countries. *International Business Management* 10 (4): pp. 370-376.
- Akcigit, Ufuk, (2008). Firm Size, Innovation Dynamics and Growth. *Job Market Paper*, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, pp. 1-67.
- Amit, Raphael and Wernerfelt, Birger, (1990). Why Do Firms Reduce Business Risk?. *The Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 33, no 3: pp. 520-533.
- Arias-Aranda, D.; Minguela-Rata, Beatriz; and Rodriguez-Duarte' A., (2000). Innovation and Firm Size: An Empirical Study for Spanish Engineering Consulting Companies. *First World Conference on Production and Operation Management POM Sevilla 2000*: pp. 1-10.
- Assih, p. ; Baridwan, Z.; Kusuma, I.W.; and Supriyadi, G., (2006). The Effect of Investment Opportunity Set on The Association Between Incentives And Earnings Management Level. *The International Journal of Accounting and Business Society*, Vol. 14, no 1: pp. 1-15.
- Baldwin, John, R., (1999). Innovation, Training and Success. *Analytical Studies Branch – Research Paper Series 1 Statistics Canada*, no 137: pp. 1-23
- Barnes, Ronnie, (2001). *Earning Volatility and market Valuation*. London Business School Sussex Place, Regent Park London NW1 4SA, email : rbarnes@london.edu, Tel: 44(0)207262 5050
- Bayless, E.M. and Diltz D.J., (1994). Securities Offerings and Capital Structure Theory. *Journal of Bussiness Finance & Accounting*, Vol. 21: pp. 77-91.
- Berger, Allen N. and Di Patti, Emilia Bonaccorsi, (2006). Capital Structure and Firm Performance: A New Approach to Testing Agency Theory and an Application to the Banking Industry. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 30: pp. 1065-1102.
- Berzkalne, Irina and Zelgalve, Elvira, (2011). Innovation And Company Value:Evidence From The Baltic Countries. *Regional Formation And Development Studies*, no 3: pp. 39-51.
- Brigham, E. F. and Houston, J.F., (2006). *Foundations of Financial Management*. Volume 1. Translated by Ali Akbar Yulianto, Tenth Edition, Publisher: Salemba Empat, Jakarta.
- Chen, Li-Ju and Chen, Shun-Yu, (2011). The influence of profitability on firm value with capital structure as the mediator and firm size and industry as moderators. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, Vol. 8, Issue 3: pp. 121-129.
- Chen, Yu-Shan, and Chan, Ke-Chiun, (2010). The relationship between a firm's patent quality and its market value, The case of US pharmaceutical industry. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change* 77: pp. 20-33.
- Cheng, Yu-Shu; Liu, Yi-Pei and Chien, Chu-Yang, (2010). Capital Structure and Firm Value in China : A Panel Threshold Regression Analysis. *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 4(12): pp. 2500-2507.
- Chun, Hyunbae; Ha, Joonkyung ; and Kim, Jung-Wook, (2014). Firm heterogeneity, R&D, and economic growth. *Economic Modelling* 36 (2014): pp. 149–156.
- Chung, Y. Peter, Na, Hyun Seung, and Smith, Richard, (2013). How Important is Capital Structure Polity to Firm Survival?. *Journal of Corporate Finance* 22: pp. 83-103.

- Chung, K. H., Wright, Peter, and Charoenwong, Charlie, (1998). Investment opportunities and market reaction to capital expenditure decisions. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 22: pp. 41-60
- Claude, Rusibana, (2016). Organizational Determinants, Capital Structure and Financial Performance of Firms Registered in Rwanda Development Board. *The International Journal Of Business & Management*, Vol. 4, Issue 8: pp. 105-129
- Coad, Alex and Rao, Rekha, (2010). Firm growth and R&D expenditure. *Journal Economics of Innovation and New Technology*, Vol. 19, Issue 2: pp. 127-145
- Cuong, Nguyen Thanh and Canh, Nguyen Thi, (2012). The Effect of Capital Structure on Firm Value for Vietnam. *International Research Journal of Finance and Economics*, Issue 89: pp. 221-233.
- Dastgir, M.; Sajady, S.H.; and Sabet, H., (2007). Factors Affecting Bias In Management Earnings Forecasts. *Journal Of Social Sciences & Humanities Of Shiraz University*, Vol. 26, no 1, pp. 1-17.
- DeAngelo and Masulis, R., (1980). Optimal Capital Structure Under Corporate and Personal Taxation. *Journal of Financial Economic*, 8(1): pp. 3-29.
- Dunne, Paul, and Hughes, Alan, (1994). Age, Size, Growth, and Survival : UK Companies in the 1980. *The Journal of Industrial Economics*, Vol. 2, no 2 : pp. 115-140.
- Dushnitsky, Gary and Lenox, Michael J., (2006). When Does Corporate Venture Capital Investment Create Firm Value. *Journal of Business Venturing* 21: pp. 753-772.
- Eng, Teck-Yong, and Ozdemir, Sena, (2013). International R&D Partnerships and Intra Firm R&D Marketing Production Integration of Manufacturing Firms in Emerging Economies. *Industrial Marketing Management*: pp. 1–13.
- Fama, Eugene F., (1978). The Effect of A Firm Investment and Financing Decision on The Welfare of Its Security Holders. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 68: pp. 272-280.
- Fama, Eugene F. and Miller, Merton H., (1972). *The Theory of Finance*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Inton, Inc.
- Fama, Eugene F., and French, Kenneth R., (2000). Testing Trade Off and Pecking Order Predictions About Dividend and Debt. *Working Paper*, University of Chicago.
- Fama, Eugene F., and French, Kenneth R., (1998). Taxes, Financing Decision, and Firm Value. *The Journal of Finance*, Vol. LIII, No.3: June: pp. 819-843.
- Fosu (2013). Capital Structure, Product Market Competition and Firm Performance: Evidence from South Africa. *The Quarterly Review of Economics and Finance*, 53: pp. 140-151.
- Gaver, Jennifer J., and Gaver, Kenneth M., (1995). Compensation Policy and the Investment Opportunity Set. *Financial Management*, Vol. 24: pp. 19-32.
- Gaver, Jennifer J., and Gaver, Kenneth M., (1993). Additional Evidence on the Association between the Investment Opportunity Set and Corporate Financing, Dividend, and Compensation Policies. *Journal of Accounting and Economics* 16: pp. 125-160.
- Garner, Jacqueline L., Nam, Nam, and Ottoo, Richard E., (2002). Determinants of corporate growth opportunities of emerging firms. *Journal of Economics and Business* 54: pp. 73-93.
- Gedajlovic, Eric D. and Shapiro, Andiel. M., (1998). Management and Ownership Effect: Evidence of Five Countries. *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 19: pp. 533-553.
- Gharbi, Sami, Sahut, Jean-Michel, and Teulon, Frederic, (2013). R&D Investment and High-Tech Firms' Stock Return Volatility. *Technological Forecasting & Social Change* XXX: pp. 7-13.
- Gitman, Lawrence, J., (2003). *Principals of Managerial Finance*. Edisi 10, Pearson Education International

- Goedhuys, Micheline and Veugelers, Reinhilde, (2012). Innovation strategies, process and product innovations and growth: Firm-level evidence from Brazil. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* 23: pp. 516-529.
- Goodwin, Melissa, (1998). Firm Size and R&D; Testing the Schumpeterian Hypothesis. *University Avenue Undergraduate Journal of Economics*, Vol. 2, Issue 1: pp. 1-8.
- Griliches, Zvi and Klette, Tor Jakob, (2000). Empirical Patterns of Firm Growth and R&D Investment: A Quality Ladder Model Interpretation. *Economic Journal* 110, pp. 363-387.
- Gul, Sajid, Khan, Muhammad Bilal, Razzaq, Nasir, and Saif, Naveed, (2012). How Firm Characteristics Affect Capital Structure in Banking and Insurance Sectors (The Case of Pakistan). *European Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 4, no 2: pp. 1-11.
- Hagerman, R. L. and Ruland, W., (1979). The accuracy of management forecasts and forecasts of simple alternative models. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 31: pp. 172-179.
- Hashi, Iraj and Stojic, Nebojsa, (2013). The impact of innovation activities on firm performance using a multi-stage model: Evidence from the Community Innovation Survey 4. *Research Policy* 42; pp. 353-366
- Huang, Shu-Chin, (2013). Capital outflow and R&D investment in the parent firm. *Research Policy* 42 : pp. 245-260
- Homaifar, Ghassem; Zeitz, J.; and Benkato, Omar, (1994). An Empirical Model of Capital Structure: Some New Evidence. *Journal of Business Finance and Accounting*, Vol. 21: pp. 1-14
- Imam, Mahmood Osman and Malik, Mahfuja, (2007). Firm Performance and Corporate Governance Through Ownership Structure: Evidence from Bangladesh Stock Market. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, Vol. 3 No.4: pp. 88-110.
- Jensen, Michael C., and Meckling, (1976). Theory of Firm : Managerial Behavior, Agency Cost, and Ownership Structure. *Journal of Financial Economic* 3: pp. 305-360.
- Jensen, Michael C., (1986). Agency Cost of Free Cash Flow, Corporate Finance and Takeover. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 76: pp. 330-339.
- Johnson, Shane A., (1997). The Effect of Bank Debt on Optimal Capital Structure. *Financial Management*, Vol. 26, no 4, Winter.
- Kale, Jayant R., and Shahrur, Husayn, (2007). Corporate capital structure and the characteristics of suppliers and customers. *Journal of Financial Economics* 83 : pp. 321-365.
- Khodamipour, Ahmad; Golestani, Shahrar; and Khorrani, Majied, (2013). The relationship between liquidity and the company size with company value in companies listed on the Tehran Stock Exchange. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, Vol.2, no 3(s): pp. 1210-1217.
- Kim, Yangseon; Liu, Caixing; and Rhee, S. Ghon, (2003). *The Effect of Firm Size on Earnings Management*. University of Hawai'i: pp. 1-32.
- King, M.R., and Santor, E., (2008). Family Values: Ownership Structure, Performance and Capital Structure of Canadian Firms. *Journal of Banking & Finance*, 32: pp. 2423-2432.
- Knott, Anne Marie, and Vieregger, Carl, (2016). *Reconciling the Firm Size and Innovation Puzzle*. Washington University & University of Illinois: pp. 1-29
- Lang, Larry, Ofek, Eli, and Stulz, Rene M., (1996). Leverage, Investment, and Firm Growth. *Journal of Financial Economics* 40: pp 3-29.
- Lee, Sanghoon, (2013). The Relationship Between Growth and Profit : Evidence from Firm-level Panel Data. *Structural Change and Economic Dynamics* (2013), <http://ds.doi.org/10.1016/j.strueco.2013.08.002>

- Li, Dongmei, (2011). Financial Constraints, R&D Investment, and Stock Returns. *Advance Access publication* June 3: pp. 1-34.
- Lindenberg, Eric B., and Ross, Stephen A., (1981). Tobin's q Ratio and Industrial Organization. *Journal of Business*, Vol. 54, no 1: pp. 1-32.
- Loi, Teng Hou and Khan, Arslan Aslam, (2012). *Determinants Of Firm Growth: Evidence From Belgian Companies*. Universiteit Gent: pp. 1-48.
- Mbodja, M. and Mukherjee, Tarunk, (1994). An Investigation into Causality Among Firm Dividend, Investment & Financing Decision. *Journal of Financial Research*: pp. 517-530.
- Michalski, Grzegorz, (2008). Debt & equity costs determinants in small enterprise. JEREMIE fund influence on financial situation of SME. *MPRA Paper 13290*, University Library of Munich, Germany.
- Modigliani, F., and Miller, M.H., (1958). The Cost of Capital, Corporate Finance and The Theory of Investment. *American Economic Review*, Vol. 48: pp 261 – 297.
- Moeljadi (2014). Factors Affecting Firm Value: Theoretical Study On Public Manufacturing Firms In Indonesia. *South East Asia Journal Of Contemporary Business, Economics and Law*, Vol. 5, Issue 2: pp. 6-15.
- Mudambi, Ram and Swift, Tim, (2011). Proactive R&D management and firm growth: A punctuated equilibrium model. *Research Policy* 40; pp. 429-440.
- Mule, R.K.; Mukras, M.S.; and Nzioka, O.M., (2015). Corporate Size, Profitability And Market Value: An Econometric Panel Analysis Of Listed Firms In Kenya. *European Scientific Journal*, Vol.11, No.13: pp. 376-396.
- Myers, Steward C, (1977). Determinant of Corporate Borrowing. *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 5: pp. 147-175.
- Myers, Steward C., (2001). Capital Structure. *The Journal of Economic Perspectives*, Vol. 15, no 2: pp. 81-102.
- Nakajo, Akiko, (1995). Analysis of Firm Size Effect on R&D Activities in Japan. *Journal of Applied Input-Output Analysis*, Vol.2, No.2: pp. 80-93.
- Nieh, Chien-Chung, Yau, Hwey-Yun, and Liu, Wen-Chien, (2008). Investigation of Target Capital Structure for Electronic Listed Firms in Taiwan. *Emerging Markets Finance & Trade*, Vol. 44. no 4: pp. 75-87.
- Nguyen, p. ; Rahman, N.; Tong, A.; and Zhao, R., (2015). Board Size and Firm Value: Evidence from Australia. *Working Paper* no 182: pp. 1-28.
- Ota, K., (2003). The Impact of Price and Return Models on Value Relevance Studies: A Review of Theory and Evidence. *Accounting Research Journal*. Vol. 16. no 1: pp. 6-20.
- Paramasivan, C., and Subramanian, T., (2009). *Financial Management*. New Age International (P) Limited, Publishers.
- Putu, Martini; Ni Nyoman, G.M.; Moeljadi; Djumahir and Djazuli, Atim, (2014). Factors Affecting Firms Value of Indonesia Public Manufacturing Firms. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, Vol. 3, Issue 21: pp. 35-44.
- Qiao, Peng-hua, Ju, Xiao-feng, and Fung, Hung-Gay, (2014). Industry association networks, innovations, and firm performance in Chinese small and medium-sized enterprises. *China Economic Review* 29: pp. 213-228.
- Qureshi, Muhammad Azeem, (2006). System Dynamics Modelling of Firm Value. *Journal of Modelling in Management*. Vol. 2, no 1: pp. 24-39.
- Ravid, S., (1988). On Interaction of Production and Financial Decision. *Financial Management*, no 17: pp. 87-99.
- Ross, Stephen A., (1977). The Determination of Financial Structure : The Incentive Signaling Approach. *The Bell Journal of Economics*, Vol. 8: pp. 23-40.

- Ruan, Wenjuan, Tian, Gary and Ma, Shiguang, (2011). Managerial Ownership, Capital Structure and Firm Value : Evidence from China's Civilian-run firms. *The Australasian Accounting Business and Finance Journal*, Vol. 5. Issue 3: pp. 73-92.
- Santos, David, F., L., Basso, Leonardo, F.,C., Kimura, Herbert, and Kayo, Eduardo, K., (2014). Innovation efforts and performances of Brazilian firms. *Journal of Business Research* 67, pp. 527–535.
- Sari, L.A., and Hutagaol, Y., (2009). Debt To Equity Ratio, Degree Of Operating Leverage Stock Beta and Stock Returns Of Food and Beverages Companies On The Indonesian Stock Exchange. *Journal Of Applied Finance and Accounting* 2(2): pp. 1-13.
- Schimke, Antje and Brenner, Thomas, (2011). Long-run Factors of Firm Growth – a Study of German Firm. Working Paper Series in Economics, University of The State of Baden-Wuerttemberg and National Laboratory of The Helmholtz Association, pp. 1-23.
- Smith Jr., Clifford W., and Ross L. Watts, (1992). The Investment Opportunity Set and Corporate Financing, Dividend, and Compensation Policies. *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 32: pp. 263-292.
- Thippayana, Pornpen, (2014). Determinants of Capital Structure in Thailand. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 143: pp. 1074-1077.
- Walker, M Mark, (2000). Corporate Take Over, Strategic Objectives, and Acquiringn Firm Shareholders Wealth. *Financial Management*, Winter: pp. 36-46.
- Weston, J.F., and Copeland, (1992). *Managerial Finance*. 9th Ed. The Dyden Press, Orlando, Florida.
- Wright, Peter, and Ferris, Stephen p. , (1997). Agency Conflict & Corporate Strategy: The Effect of Divestment on Corporate Value. *Strategic. Management Journal*, Vol. 18: pp. 77-83.
- Yildiz, Orkun; Bozkurt, Ozlem, C.; Kalkan, Adnan, and Ayci, Ali, (2013). The Relationships between Technological Investment, Firm Size, Firm Age and The Growth Rate of Innovational Performance. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 99: pp. 590-599.
- Yuliani; Zain, Djumilah; Sudarma, Made; and Solimun, (2012). Diversification, Investment Opportunity Set, Envinronmental Dynamics and Firm Value (Empirical Study of Manufacturing Sectors in Indonesia Stock Exchange). *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)* Vo. 6, Issue 4: pp. 1-15.
- Zeitun, R. and Tian, G.G., (2007). Capital Structure and Corporate Performance: Evidence from Jorand. *The Australasian Accounting Business and Finance Journal*, Vol. 1. no 4: pp 40-61.
- Zhu, Zhaohui and Huang, Feng, (2012). The Effect of R&D Investment on Firms' Financial Performance: Evidence from the Chinese Listed IT Firms. *Modern Economy*, 3 : pp. 915-919.