The Influence of Asset Structure, Business Risk, Profitability, Company Size, and Capital Structure on Company Value in Property and Real Estate Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) for the 2015 – 2019 Period

Robin[1], Eka Bertuah[2]
[1,2]*Universitas Esa Unggul, Jakarta, Indonesia*
robin.go2709@gmail.com, eka.bertuah@esaunggul.ac.id

Abstract

At the national level, the property industry has a considerable influence. The rapid growth of the property industry will have an impact on other industries. Examples include the material, logistics and service industries, as well as the banking industry through KPR (House Ownership Credit) which will have an impact on job creation and the economy. growth in the country. This study aims to determine the effect of Asset Structure, Business Risk, Profitability, Company Size and Capital Structure on Firm Value (PBV). The period of this research is 5 (five) years, namely 2015 to 2019. This study uses panel data regression analysis. The population of this study includes property and real estate companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) for the period 2015 – 2019. The results of this study indicate that the asset structure, business risk, profitability, firm size and capital structure have a simultaneous effect on firm value. Profitability and Capital Structure variables have a positive and significant effect on firm value. Asset structure, business risk, and firm size have no effect on firm value. This study contributes to testing and proving signaling theory and firm value on profitability and capital structure that affect firm value. and the size of the company has no effect on the value of the company. This study contributes to testing and proving signaling theory and firm value on profitability and capital structure that affect firm value. and the size of the company has no effect on the value of the company. This study contributes to testing and proving signaling theory and firm value on profitability and capital structure that affect firm value.

I. Introduction

At the national level, the property industry has a considerable influence. The rapid growth of the property industry will have an impact on other industries. Examples include the material, logistics and service industries, as well as the banking industry through KPR (House Ownership Credit) which will have an impact on job creation and the economy. growth in the country according toMangindaan, (2021), the property and real estate industry sector shows whether a country's economy is experiencing a downturn or growth. This means that the Indonesian economy is increasing, which is shown by the increase in quantity of companies. Its development is quite rapid in the era of globalization which is increasingly sophisticated

9978

and advanced. Companies must develop in order to survive in today's competitive environment.

Bank Indonesia (BI) policy in providing leniency regarding the determination of down payment (DP) property credit/financing at a rate of 0% which will take effect on March 1, 2021. There is this leeway intends to increase credit growth in the property sector which is currently dealing with the current Covid-19 pandemic. Through the relaxation of the LTV/FTV ratio, every prospective property customer is not charged with a down payment because the amount is 0%. Even in terms of overall property financing, potential buyers can still takealternativethrough KPR/KPA or home/apartment mortgages insured by banks. The relaxation of the 0 rupiah down payment is intended for banks with non-performing loan ratios (NPL/NPF) below 5%.

Profitability is the company's ability to make a profit in relation to sales, total assets and own capital. Profitability ratios are very important to know by users of financial statements because they inform how much the company's ability to generate profits, the greater the profit ratio shows the better management in managing the company, (Sartono in Angelia, N et al. 2020)

The 0% down payment housing program promoted by the government actually still leaves pros and cons because it is only temporary. Basically, the obstacle faced by the community regarding property needs is the availability of land, not a down payment or installments. The conditions and potentials of the property sector are the reasons for researchers to take the property and real estate sectors as objects of research. Positive growth will certainly have an impact on the country's economy. This shows that the sector has become so crucial in the midst of improving the country's economy.

The value of the company is a form of argumentation regarding the company's price from creditors and shareholders (Meilina & Tjong, 2021). If there is an increase in the price, it will also increase the level of welfare of the shareholders. Thus, it can be understood that the maximum value of the company can actually bring prosperity to the shareholders(Ancient, 2021). There is also that the value of the company is a projection of the company's performance, as well as material for investors in perceiving the company regarding their investment policies(Pramukti, Ashoer, & Fadhil, 2019). During the Corona virus pandemic, especially since March 2020, the property and real estate sectors have experienced considerable turmoil. Despite getting various restrictions and pressures from the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic like other business sectors because in general it requires physical interaction with consumers, the property and real estate sector is recorded to be still in the growing stage.(Faturinaldi, Suryadi, & Safitri, 2018). Regarding investors' desire for the highest possible return and low level of risk, certain considerations and calculations arise as carefully as possible in the context of investment. In addition to the company's ability to generate profits, investors also consider the debt from the company in the midst of its operations(Faturinaldi et al., 2018). This phenomenon is described in the Price Book Value (PBV) table below:

Table 1. Firm value (PBV)

NO	issuer	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	APLN	0.35	0.24	0.36	0.41
2	BSDE	1.14	0.72	0.87	0.77
3	CTRA	1.59	0.97	1.2	1.1
4	DILD	0.82	0.46	0.55	0.42

5	DUTI	1.33	1.07	1.2	0.68
6	GPRA	0.76	0.4	0.36	0.33
7	JRPT	2.01	1.13	0.98	0.99
8	KIJA	1.03	0.75	1.04	0.71
9	MTLA	0.9	0.88	0.89	0.84
10	PWON	2.13	1.62	1.94	1.45
Average		1,206	0.824	0.939	0.77

Source : data processed by researchers (2021)

From the table, through the PBV measurement, it can be seen that the acquisition of company value fluctuated throughout 2017 to 2020, according to the period in this study. Of the 10 sample companies and their average PBV throughout the study period, Pakuwon Jati Tbk (PWON) obtained the highest PBV. Based on the PBV as a whole and consecutively the gains are 1.206 for 2017, 0.824 for 2018, 0.939 for 2019 and 0.77 for 2020. This means that not only the company's performance makes the market believe, but also follows the future prospects of the company.(Meilina & Tjong, 2021). Because in seeking the trust and confidence of new investors and investors to increase the share portion, it is determined from the value of the company (Novrita in 2009).Siregar & Dalimunthe, 2019).

If the company's economic condition is good, the use of debt to finance operational activities can be considered better, even profitable, than using the company's capital because it can increase the cost of capital turnover and increase stock returns for its holders. But on the other hand, the consideration of taking on large amounts of debt has the potential to increase the sustainability risk of the company if in the future it encounters a difficult period(Brigham & Houston, 2011). As a result, debt that is quite large and without discretion in its use will provide opportunities for shareholders to feel losses. The following is data on the capital structure of ten companies through the measurement of the Debt to Equity Ratio (DER):

Table 2. Capital Structure (DER)

NO	issuer	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	APLN	1.50	1.42	1.30	1.68
2	BSDE	0.57	0.72	0.62	0.77
3	CTRA	1.05	1.06	1.04	1.26
4	DILD	1.08	1.18	1.04	1.60
5	DUTI	0.27	0.34	0.30	0.33
6	GPRA	0.45	0.42	0.51	0.64
7	JRPT	0.58	0.57	0.51	0.46
8	KIJA	0.91	0.95	0.93	0.95
9	MTLA	0.61	0.51	0.59	0.46
10	PWON	0.83	0.63	0.44	0.50
Average		0.785	0.780	0.728	0.865

Source : data processed by researchers (2021)

It can be seen how the capital structure with the measurement of DER for each company during the period 2017 – 2020. Of the ten sample companies, the highest DER gain is PT Agung Podomoro Land Tbk (APLN) during the study period. From the sample above, it can be seen that 50% of property and real estate companies have funding sources that are dominated by debt. This is reflected in the DER value of more than 1. Meanwhile, there are also 50% of companies funded by equity which is marked by a DER value of less than 1.

The structure of the assets owned by the company can be a determinant of the company's debt structure. ForBrigham, Eugene F. and Houston, (2011)The ratio of long-term fixed assets that is greater than a company can make its debt more because fixed assets can be used as collateral for debt.Kusumaningtyas, (2012)explain the opposite that companies with higher asset structure will not need debt to finance their operating expenses. The reason is that the company can have larger internal funds if the asset structure is high, so that internal funding sources can be used first rather than using external funding sources, namely debt to meet the company's operating expenses. The following is a graph illustrating the company's asset structure.

Table 3. Table of Asset Structure (SA)

NO	issuer	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	APLN	13.96	14.99	12.42	12.87
2	BSDE	1.68	1.30	1.16	0.96
3	CTRA	9.87	9.08	8.53	6.61
4	DILD	1.75	1.67	1.58	1.36
5	DUTI	3.33	2.51	2.21	1.98
6	GPRA	4.35	2.77	2.41	2.22
7	JRPT	1.27	1.27	12.88	1.40
8	KIJA	21.03	19.07	17.57	16.67
9	MTLA	7.74	15,14	6.31	8.30
10	PWON	7.20	6.93	7.95	8.90
Average		7,218	7,473	7,302	6,127

Source : data processed by researchers (2021)

The table shows that during the study period, PT Agung Podomoro Land Tbk (APLN) had the highest asset structure compared to other companies. Because it has become a tendency for property companies to use fixed assets to invest some of their capital. So that property and real estate companies expect a return on their investment in fixed assets. However, the difference is in tangible current assets, there is cash along with other assets in a period that has the potential to be used or sold, in order to reduce the risk of lenders, tangible fixed assets can be used as debt guarantees. From the table above, it can be seen that 50% of companies have an asset structure that is dominated by fixed assets, while 50% of companies whose asset structure is dominated by current assets. The following is a table showing the company's business risk as measured by the EBIT/Revenue comparison.

Table 4. Table of business risk (DOL)

NO	issuer	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	APLN	5.64	3.14	1.35	1.88
2	BSDE	2.61	1.85	11.66	6.60
3	CTRA	4.68	1.46	2.61	1.38
4	DILD	13.08	-3.00	66.08	-13.58
5	DUTI	1.52	2.49	1.39	1.69
6	GPRA	1.36	1.92	-1.20	2.03
7	JRPT	12.90	2.24	-0.60	-0.11
8	KIJA	-34.31	3.63	-6.09	-12.43
9	MTLA	6.84	-0.89	-1.94	1.99
10	PWON	1.05	1.63	8.52	1.45
Average		1,537	1,447	8.178	-0.91

Source : data processed by researchers (2021)

From these data, it appears that the highest business risk is owned by PT Intiland Development Tbk (DILD) during the study period. This company in 2018 and 2020 experienced a decline in EBIT resulting in high business risk.

Study Fajaria & Isnalita (2018)also shows that profitability is an important indicator that shows the company's performance so that an increase in profitability can help increase the value of the company. Meanwhile, companies with good profitability are more likely to obtain sources of funds from both investors and creditors. The following is a table that shows the company's profitability through the measurement of Return on Assets (ROA) below:

Table 5. Table of profitability (ROA)

NO	issuer	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	APLN	6.54	0.65	0.41	0.59
2	BSDE	11.29	3.27	5.75	0.79
3	CTRA	3.18	3.78	3.55	3.49
4	DILD	2.07	1.37	2.96	0.44
5	DUTI	6.13	8.91	9.36	4.64
6	GPRA	2.49	3.28	3.24	2.01
7	JRPT	11.79	9.96	89.04	8.83
8	KIJA	1.33	0.57	1.16	0.37
9	MTLA	11.43	20.97	7.98	4.83
10	PWON	8.67	11.30	12.42	4.23
Average		6,492	6,406	13,587	3.022

Source: data processed by researchers (2021)

The table shows that PT Jaya Real Property Tbk (JRPT) has the highest ROA during the study period. It can be seen that the ten companies in the sample have a fluctuating ROA, in other words, companies in this industry are profitable.

According to Munthe, (2019)If the size of the company gets bigger, then in deciding funding in order to maximize the value of the company, the company's management will have a considerable influence. Sales are very important for the survival of the company, because sales depend on assets that must be backed by financial assets. The more sales achieved, the value of the company's assets will increase (Dewinta & Setiawan, 2016). The following is a table of company size aspects through measuring the company's sales growth.

Table 6. Company size table (PP)

NO	issuer	2017	2018	2019	2020
1	APLN	0.17	-0.29	-0.25	0.31
2	BSDE	0.59	-0.36	0.07	-0.13
3	CTRA	-0.04	0.19	-0.01	0.06
4	DILD	-0.03	0.16	0.07	0.06
5	DUTI	-0.15	0.29	0.11	-0.30
6	GPRA	-0.15	0.19	-0.09	-0.19
7	JRPT	0.01	-0.03	0.04	-0.10
8	KIJA	0.02	-0.09	-0.17	0.06
9	MTLA	0.11	0.09	0.02	-0.21
10	PWON	-0.19	0.23	0.02	-0.45
Average		0.034	0.038	-0.019	-0.089

Source : data processed by researchers (2021)

Through the table, it appears that the size of the company is based on fluctuating sales growth throughout 2017 to 2019, according to the research period. As well as the acquisition of the average sales growth throughout the period. Of the 10 sample companies, PT Bumi Serpong Damai Tbk (BSDE) received the highest sales growth. company during the study period. When viewed as a whole, the sales growth was 0.034 for 2017, 0.038 for 2018, -0.019 for 2019 and -0.089 for 2020.

II. Research Method

It has been determined that this research is a causal type of research because it aims to determine the causality of firm value on the influence of the proxied asset structure (SA), business risk as proxied by Degree of Operating Leverage (DOL), profitability by proxy Return On Assets (ROA), the size of the company as a proxy for Sales Growth, and the capital structure as a proxy for the Debt to Equity Ratio (DER). The determination of the research data is the final financial statements of 2015 to 2019.For Sugiyono, (2017)The definition of population is the result of generalizing the area which is divided into objects/subjects with certain qualities and classifications according to the needs of the author so that they can be investigated so that conclusions can be drawn from their research. In this study, the population includes property and real estate companies listed on the IDX in the 2015 - 2019 periods with a total of 65 companies.

III. Result and Discussion

3.1. Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis that is applied intends to describe the value of all variables based on the maximum, minimum, average (mean) and standard deviation values. Where is the firm value (PBV) which will be the dependent variable, and the asset structure (SA), business risk (DOL), profitability (ROA), firm size (PP), capital structure (DER) which will be the independent variables.

The results of the descriptive analysis can be seen through the table below:

Table 7. Descriptive Statistics

Variable		mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Observations
PBV	overall	0.884	0.655	0.100	3.010	N = 135
	between		0.531	0.174	2,142	n = 27
	within		0.394	-0.396	2.144	T = 5
SA	overall	5.683	5.770	0.020	31,480	N = 135
	between		5,500	0.262	20,334	n = 27
	within		1988	-0.449	17,861	T = 5
DOL	overall	4.110	28,990	-186.340	168.120	N = 135
	between		15,678	-35,172	67.030	n = 27
	within		24,534	-147.058	105,200	T = 5
ROA	overall	4.448	4.795	-7.060	21,980	N = 135
	between		3,590	-0.522	11.950	n = 27
	within		3.239	-4.734	17,282	T = 5
PP	overall	6,524	37,273	-55,200	174.910	N = 135
	between		14.165	-15,844	41,132	n = 27
	within		34,563	-69,526	140,302	T = 5
DER	overall	0.731	0.516	0.040	2,980	N = 135
	between		0.487	0.084	1,880	n = 27
	within		0.191	-0.039	1,831	T = 5

In this research, the capital structure variable is proxied through the use of the Debt to Equity Ratio (DER) variable. It is shown that the capital structure variable of the 135 samples has a minimum value of 0.040 and a maximum of 2.980 with an average of 0.731 and a standard deviation of 0.516. Among all the samples studied, the companies with the lowest DER values are companiesPuradelta Lestari Tbk (DMAS) for the 2018 period, while the companies with the highest DER values are companies PP Properti Tbk (PPRO) for the 2019 period.

3.2. Panel Data Regression Test

Before testing the hypothesis, the data will be tested first to determine the suitability of the model with the characteristics of the data through the use of common effects, fixed effects, and random effects models.

<p style="text-align:center">Table 8. Panel Data Regression Test Results for PBV</p>

Independent Variable	Panel Data Analysis Dependent Variable Firm Value (PBV)					
	Common Effect		Fixed Effect		Random Effect	
	Coef.	P>t	Coef.	P>t	Coef.	P>t
SA	-0.01583	0.103	0.01551	0.451	-0.00255	0.840
DOL	-0.00021	0.903	-0.00126	0.421	-0.00111	0.447
ROA	0.05642	0.000	0.03595	0.003	0.04299	0.000
PP	0.00120	0.398	0.00034	0.768	0.00061	0.581
DER	0.43699	0.000	0.27043	0.201	0.31413	0.024
Cons	0.39680	0.000	0.44141	0.063	0.47858	0.003
Prob > chi2					0.0008	
Prob > F	0.0000		0.0299			
Wald > chi2					20.99	
Number of obs	135		135		135	
Number of groups			27		27	
R- squared	0.2378					
R- sqWithin			0.1117		0.1035	
R- sq Between			0.1646		0.3158	
R- sq Overall			0.1453		0.2232	
Adj R-squared	0.2082					

Data source : *secondary data was processed using stata 16.0 (2021).*

The dependent variable is capital structure which is proxied by DER. So for the estimation results of the model selection, as follows:

a. Pooled Least Square Panel Data Regression Model / cammon effect

Based on the test using the common effect model, the results obtained are that those that affect PBV are profitability (ROA) and capital structure (DER). Meanwhile, asset structure (SA), business risk (DOL), and firm size (PP) do not affect firm value (PBV).

b. Fixed Effect Panel Data Regression Model

Based on the test using the fixed effect model, the four independent variables such as asset structure (SA), business risk (DOL), firm size (PP), and capital structure (DER) do not affect firm value (PBV).

c. Random Effect Panel Data Regression Model

Based on testing with the random effect model, what is obtained, namely from the three independent variables such as asset structure (SA), business risk (DOL), and firm size (PP) do not affect firm value (PBV).

3.3. Classical Assumption Test for Selected Model

The analysis of the panel regression analysis technique is carried out in order to find the effect of the independent variable simultaneously on the dependent variable. The stages in panel regression analysis include model selection, regression model testing and classical assumption testing. Here's the explanation:

a. Multicollinearity Test

The use of multicollinearity test aims to show the value of VIF centered on each independent variable. The model can be considered not to contain multicollinearity if the VIF value of the model is < 10 and the Tolerance (1/VIF) > 0.1.

Table 9. Multicollinearity Test Results

• **Asset Structure**	1.22	0.818618	
• **Business Risk**	1.20	0.830439	
• **Profitability**	1.09	0.918688	No multicollinearity
• **Company Size**	1.08	0.924375	
• **Capital Structure**	1.01	0.987362	

Source :*processed data (2021)*

Based on the table, the results of the analysis show that the VIF value of all independent variables is < 10 and tolerance > 0.1, so that multicollinearity is not found in the regression model.

b. Heteroscedasticity Test

In the heteroscedasticity test, the Breusch-Pagan test was chosen because it can determine the model contains heteroscedasticity if the probability of Chi Square <0.05, and vice versa if the probability of Chi Square> 0.05 then the model is considered not to contain heteroscedasticity.

Table 10. Heteroscedasticity Test Results

chi 2 (1)	Prob > chi 2	Conclusion
27.05	0.0000	Heteroscedasticity occurs

Source : *processed data (2021)*

From the test results, it appears that the chi square probability value obtained is 0.0000 <0.05, meaning that there is heteroscedasticity in the regression model. To overcome this problem, Robust treatment is carried out.

```
. xtreg YPBV X1SA X2DOL X3ROA X4PP X5DER, robust

Random-effects GLS regression              Number of obs     =        135
Group variable: No                         Number of groups  =         27

R-sq:                                      Obs per group:
    within  = 0.1035                                    min =          5
    between = 0.3158                                    avg =        5.0
    overall = 0.2232                                    max =          5

                                           Wald chi2(5)      =      18.84
corr(u_i, X)   = 0 (assumed)               Prob > chi2       =     0.0021

                               (Std. Err. adjusted for 27 clusters in No)

                           Robust
        YPBV      Coef.    Std. Err.      z     P>|z|    [95% Conf. Interval]

        X1SA   -.0025846   .0118957    -0.22   0.828    -.0258997   .0207306
       X2DOL   -.0011135   .0009028    -1.23   0.217     -.002883    .000656
       X3ROA    .0429909   .0147523     2.91   0.004      .014077   .0719049
        X4PP    .0006118   .0012379     0.49   0.621    -.0018144   .0030381
       X5DER    .3141315   .1982083     1.58   0.113    -.0743496   .7026126
       _cons    .4785805   .1309148     3.66   0.000     .2219923   .7351687

     sigma_u    .42596122
     sigma_e    .42390144
         rho    .50242365   (fraction of variance due to u_i)
```

The model in Robust treatment has overcome the problem of heteroscedasticity. But this model still has to be tested by autocorrelation test.

c. Autocorrelation Test

Autocorrelation Test This can be accomplished through the use of the Wooldrige test. The regression model is considered not to contain autocorrelation in this study if the probability value of the test results > 0.05.

Table 11. Woodridge Test Results

F(1, 26)	Prob > F	Conclusion
6,390	0.0179	Autocorrelation occurs

Source : processed data (2021)

Based on the table, the probability value of the Wooldridge test is 0.0179, thus it has a probability value of <0.05, so it can be concluded that the regression model has autocorrelation problems. To overcome this problem, GLS treatment was carried out.

Table 12. Results of the t-test on the GLS . regression model

Variable	Coefficient	SE	z	{p>|z|}	Conclusion
SA	-0.01583	0.009	-1.68	0.093	No influence
DOL	-0.00021	0.002	-0.12	0.901	No influence
ROA	0.05642	0.011	5.29	0.000	There is Influence
UK	0.00120	0.001	0.87	0.385	No influence
DER	0.43699	0.105	4.18	0.000	There is Influence
Regression Constant	0.39680	0.108	3.67	0.000	No influence

Source :processed data (2021)

From the results of the analysis in the table, the regression constant is 0.39680, the Asset Structure (SA) regression coefficient is -0.01583, the business risk regression coefficient (DOL) is -0.00021, the profitability regression coefficient (ROA) is 0, 05642, the regression coefficient of firm size (Sales Growth) is 0.00120 and the capital structure regression coefficient (DER) is 0.43699, so that the panel regression equation describes the effect of SA, DOL, ROA, UK and DER on PBV as follows:

PBV = 0.39680 – 0.01583 SA – 0.00021 DOL + 0.05642 ROA + 0.00120 PP + 0.43699 DER

3.4. Effect of Asset Structure on Firm Value

The comparison of fixed assets and total assets is often known as the structure of assets or Fixed Assets Ratio (FAR) or tangible assets. The total fixed assets is the sum of each company's tangible fixed assets, such as land, buildings, etc., then deducted by depreciation of fixed assets. Then in finding total assets is through the sum of current assets and non-current assets. The results of this study indicate that the asset structure (SA) has no effect on the value of property and real estate companies. This means that the high and low asset structure of property and real estate companies does not have an impact on the high and low value of the company. Companies with high asset structure do not always have high firm value. Likewise, property and real estate companies that have low asset structures do not always have low company values. The value of property and real estate companies in the 2015 – 2019 period tends to be influenced by other factors outside the asset structure. SimilarMandalika, (2016)which states the results that the asset structure of public companies listed on the IDX for the period 2011 to 2014 does not affect the value of the company. As in researchPrincess, (2018) who found similar results.

3.5. Effect of Business Risk on Company Value

In this study, it turns out that business risk proxied by the Degree of Operating Leverage (DOL) variable is proven not to be a variable that affects the value of property and real estate companies in the period 2015 to 2019. This also shows that the effect of changes in sales on income (profit) does not result in increase or decrease in the value of the company. High and low business risk does not have an impact on increasing or decreasing the value of the company. The value of property and real estate companies tends to be influenced by other factors outside of business risks such as profitability and the company's capital structure. Similar toIrmansyah, (2017) which in his research found the results that business risk did not affect the value of the company.

3.6. The Effect of Profitability on Firm Value

The results of the analysis show that profitability is a factor that is quite influential on the value of property and real estate companies. There is a relationship of profitability on the value of the company that is in the same direction (positive), so the higher the profitability of the company, the higher the value of the company. Proving that the company's profit is able to affect the value of the company. In companies that experience increased profitability, the company's ability to manage debt will also get better so that debt will be used to buy current assets in the form of strategic land that can be quickly built. Thus, the company will get the company's profit faster so that it can further increase the value of the company. SimilarPrasetyorini, (2013), Nabila, (2021), Maryam et al., (2020), Novari & Lestari, (2016), as well as Ayem & Nugroho, (2016) which explains that the value of the company has a positive and significant influence on the profitability aspect.

3.7. The Effect of Firm Size on Firm Value

It is easy for large property and real estate companies to enter the market which then brings in external sources of funds with guarantees that are assets owned by the company. This capital is used by property and real estate companies to purchase land and build houses to be traded so as to generate value for the company. The size of the company as seen from the sales growth in this study is proven not to be an influential factor in the value of the company. The high and low sales growth does not always indicate the high and low value of the company. There is no tendency for high firm value in large-sized firms as well as no tendency for low firm value in small-sized firms. Property company value & real estate is more influenced by factors other than sales growth, such as profitability and the company's capital structure. Similar toNabila, (2021), Irmansyah, (2017), Manoppo & Arie, (2016), Meidiawati, (2016), which shows the zero effect of firm size on firm value. Similar toLumoly et al. (2018) which resulted in the conclusion that the size of the company is not a measure of the high and low value of the company.

3.8. Research Findings

Based on the description and discussion above, the following are the findings that can be obtained:

1. Profitability can positively affect the value of the company. During the research period, it was proven that investors prioritized the profitability factor in selecting investments in property stocks. Profitability from property stocks can increase and has good prospects, if supported by government policies related to interest rates (KPR) and taxes on property ownership. This increase in profitability can increase the value of the company as well as a signal of good news for those who are interested. Thus, this research supports the signaling theory. In addition, this research also contributes to firm value theory.

2. Capital structure is able to positively affect the value of the company. If funding comes from debt, the higher it shows the increased trust given by creditors on the company's ability to meet its obligations. It is also a good signal for potential investors. It is proven that this research contributes to the proof of signaling theory.

V. Conclusion

Based on the research conducted, several variables such as capital structure, business risk, profitability, company size, and capital structure simultaneously affect the value of property & real estate companies in 2015 – 2019. The contribution of all independent variables to firm valueis 42.11%, whereas as much as 57.89% by other factors outside of the study. Several variables that may affect firm value are company liquidity, ownership, investment policy, dividend policy, and company external factors. Asset structure does not affect firm value. The level of asset structure does not have an impact on the high and low value of property and real estate companies during the period 2015 – 2019. The value of the company is more influenced by other factors outside the asset structure such as company profitability and company capital structure, the level of asset structure of property and real companies estate during the period 2015 – 2019 does not always show the high value of property and real estate companies in 2015 – 2019, asset structure is proven not to be a factor that significantly affects the value of property and real estate companies during the period 2015 – 2019. Business risk does not affect the value of the company. The high and low business risk did not have an effect on the value of property and real estate companies during the 2015 – 2019 period.

Company value is more influenced by other factors outside of business risk such as company profitability and company capital structure, the high and low business risk of property and real estate companies during the period 2015 - 2019 does not always indicate high company value, business risk is proven not to be a significant factor affect the value of property and real estate companies during the period 2015 – 2019. Profitability positively affects the value of the company. The higher the profitability of the company, the higher the value of property & real estate companies, during the period 2015 – 2019 profitability has proven to be a factor that significantly affects the high and low value of the company, During this period, companies with high profitability tend to have high company values, and vice versa, companies with low profitability generally have low company values. Firm size has no effect on firm value. This means that no matter how big or small the size of the company does not affect the value of the property & real estate company during the period 2015 – 2019.

Company value tends to be more influenced by other factors outside of company size such as company profitability and company capital structure, the size of the property and real estate company during the period 2015 – 2019 does not always indicate the high and low value of property and real estate companies in 2015 – 2019, company size is proven not to be a factor that significantly affects the value of property and real estate companies during the period 2015 – 2019. The capital structure positively affects the value of the company. That is, if the company's capital structure is higher, the value of property & real estate companies will also be higher, during the period 2015 - 2019 capital structure has been proven to be a factor that significantly influences the high and low value of the company.

References

Angelia, N et al. (2020). The Analysis of Factors Affecting Dividend Policy in Food and Beverage Sector Manufacturing Companies Listed in Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2015-2017. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal). P. 902-910.

Ayem, Sri, & Nugroho, Ragil. (2016). The Influence of Profitability, Capital Structure, Dividend Policy, And Investment Decisions on Firm Value. Journal of Accounting, 4(1), 31–39.

Brigham, Eugene F., & Houston, Joel F. (2011). Fundamentals of Financial Management. Jakarta: Four Salemba.

Dewinta, Ida Ayu Rosa, & Setiawan, Putu Ery. (2016). Effect of Firm Size, Company Age, Profitability, Leverage, and Sales Growth on Tax Avoidance. 14, 1584–1613.

Fajaria, Ardina Zahrah, & Isnalita. (2018). The Effect Of Profitability, Liquidity, Leverage And Firm Growth Of Firm Value With Its Dividend Policy As a Moderating Variable. International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research (IJMSR), 6(10), 55–69. https://doi.org/10.20431/2349-0349.0610005

Faturinaldi, Muhammad, Suryadi, Edy, & Safitri, Heni. (2018). The Effect of Operating Leverage, Financial Leverage, and Combination Leverage on Earning Per Share in Property and Real Estate Sub-Sector Service Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. Journal of Productivity, 5(1), 104–115. https://doi.org/10.29406/jpr.v5i1.1247

Ginting, Feren Geovannie, Saerang, Ivonne S., & Maramis, Joubert B. (2020). The Influence of Business Risk, Financial Risk and Market Risk on Company Value at State-Owned Banks for the 2011-2018 Period. EMBA Journal, 8(1), 252–261.

Irmansyah, Firmansyah Man. (2017). Company Size, Profitability, Income Volatility, and Business Risk on Company Value With Debt Policy as Moderating Variables in JII (Jakarta Islamic Index) Stocks on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. AJIE: Asian Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship, 2(1). https://doi.org/10.20885/ajie.vol2.iss1.art2

Kusumaningtyas. (2012). The Effect of Audit Committee Independence and Institutional Ownership on Earnings Management.

Lumoly, Selin, Murni, Sri, & Untu, Victoria N. (2018). Effect of Liquidity, Firm Size and Profitability on Firm Value. EMBA Journal: Journal of Economic Research, Management, Business And Accounting, 6(3), 1108–1117.

Mandalika, Andri. (2016). The Influence of Asset Structure, Capital Structure, and Sales Growth on Firm Value in Public Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (Study on the Automotive Sector). Scientific Journal of Efficiency, 16(1), 207–218.

Manoppo, Heven, & Arie, Fitty Valdi. (2016). The Effect of Capital Structure, Company Size and Profitability on the Value of Automotive Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the Period 2011-2014. EMBA Journal: Journal of Economic Research, Management, Business And Accounting, 4(2), 485–497.

Maryam, Sitti, Mus, Abdul Rahman, & Priliyadi, Annas. (2020). The Effect of Firm Size, Firm Growth, Liquidity, Profitability and Dividend Policy on Firm Value. Center of Economic Student Journal, 3(1), 90–109.

Meidiawati, Karina. (2016). Effect of Size, Growth, Profitability, Capital Structure, Dividend Policy on Firm Value. 5(2).

Meilina, & Tjong, William. (2021). Effect of Liquidity, Profitability, Dividend Payout Ratio and Company Size on Company Value in Hospital Industry Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the 2015 – 2019 Period. EMBA Journal: Journal of Economic

Research, Management, Business and Accounting, 9(1), 807–823 . https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.v9i1.32590

Munthe, Inge Lengga Sari. (2019). The Effect of Firm Size on Earnings Management With Capital Structure As Moderating Variable. Indonesian Scientific Journal of Accounting and Finance, 2(2), 53–60. https://doi.org/10.31629/jiafi.v2i2.1720

Nabila, Empress Tasha. (2021). Effect of Profitability, Firm Size, Investment Opportunity Set and Capital Structure on Firm Value.

Novari, Putu Mikhy, & Lestari, Putu Vivi. (2016). The Influence of Company Size, Leverage, And Profitability on Firm Value in the Property and Real Estate Sector. E-Journal of Unud Management, 5(9), 5671–5694.

Pramukti, Andika, Ashoer, Muhammad, & Fadhil, Muhammad. (2019). Analysis of the Effect of Ownership Structure on Profitability and Firm Value of Companies Listed on the IDX. 2(2).

Prasetia, Ta'dir Eko, Tommy, Parengkuan, & Saerang, Ivone S. (2014). Capital Structure, Company Size And Company Risk Towards The Value Of Automotive Companies Listed On IDX. EMBA Journal: Journal of Economic Research, Management, Business And Accounting, 8792(2), 879–889.

Prasetyorini, Bhekti Fitri. (2013). Effect of Firm Size, Leverage, Price Earning Ratio and Profitability on Firm Value. Journal of Management Science, 1(1).

Purba, Imelda. (2021). The Influence of Managerial Ownership, Institutional Ownership and Public Ownership on Company Value in Property and Real Estate Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the 2016-2018 Period. 7(1), 18–29.

Daughter, Akhita. (2018). The Influence of Asset Structure, Asset Growth, and Business Risk on Firm Value with Capital Structure as an Intervening Variable. Journal of Accounting Science and Research.

Siregar, M. Edo Suryawan, & Dalimunthe, Sholatia. (2019). The Effect of Profitability, Company Size, Dividend Policy and Capital Structure on Firm Value in Manufacturing Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the 2015-2017 Period. Indonesian Journal of Science Management Research (JRMSI), 10(2), 356–385.

Sugiyono. (2017). Quantitative, Qualitative, and R&D Research Methods. Bandung: Alfabeta, CV.

Sumolang, Rossemia Jannet, Mangindaan, Joane V, & Keles, Dantje. (2021). Prediction Analysis of Bankruptcy of Property Companies Listed on the Stock Exchange with the Altman Z-Score Model. 2(1), 31–36.