



# **ANALYSIS OF THE INFLUENCE OF PROFITABILITY, CAPITAL STRUCTURE, COMPANY SIZE, AND INTANGIBLE ASSETS ON THE INTRINSIC VALUE OF HEALTH SECTOR COMPANIES LISTED ON THE INDONESIA STOCK EXCHANGE**

**Dedi Sulaiman Rambe** 

Master in Property Management and Valuation, Post-graduate programs  
Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, North Sumatera, Indonesia  
dedisulaiman96@gmail.com

**Khaira Amalia Fachrudin**

Master in Property Management and Valuation, Post-graduate programs  
Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, North Sumatera, Indonesia

**Iskandar Muda**

Master in Property Management and Valuation, Post-graduate programs  
Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, North Sumatera, Indonesia

## **Abstract**

*The intrinsic value of a company reflects its true state and plays a pivotal role in attracting investors. A high company value is often a magnet for investment. This research seeks to ascertain the impact of profitability, capital structure, company size, and intangible assets on the intrinsic value of companies within the health sector. The study's population comprises health sector companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the period from 2018 to 2021. Eight companies were selected from this population for analysis. Various statistical methods were employed, including multiple linear regression analysis, determination coefficient tests, F-tests, and T-tests. The findings reveal that profitability has a positive and statistically significant effect on intrinsic value. In contrast, capital structure has a positive effect but lacks statistical*



*significance regarding intrinsic value. Company size exhibits a positive and significant impact on intrinsic value. On the other hand, intangible assets display a negative influence on intrinsic value, but this effect is not statistically significant.*

*Keywords: Profitability, Capital Structure, Company Size, Intangible Asset, Company Value, Health companies*

## INTRODUCTION

The intrinsic value of a company, as articulated by Vaticasari and Suryono (2022), serves as a critical determinant for potential investors, reflecting the true condition of the company. The continual creation and realization of corporate value, as emphasized by Djaja (2017), becomes imperative for companies seeking to retain investors. Pratt (2008) contends that intrinsic value is calculated through the evaluation of available facts, representing the authentic value of an asset. This strategic enhancement of intrinsic value becomes pivotal in navigating intense market competition and mitigating risks of liquidation (Ajeigbe et al., 2021).

Against the backdrop of the chemical, pharmaceutical, and traditional medicine industries experiencing growth in 2020, these sectors emerge as vital contributors to the overall development of industries in Indonesia (Ministry of Industry of the Republic of Indonesia, 2021). The healthcare industry, with its emphasis on research and development requiring substantial capital, underscores the significance of good financial performance reflected in corporate value, aligning with the findings of Naveed et al. (2020).

The presence of 23 health sector companies on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2020 signals heightened competition, necessitating companies to bolster capital for innovation (Source: Ministry of Industry and Trade of Indonesia, 2021). Examining the financial conditions of various healthcare sector companies in Indonesia from 2018 to 2021, intriguing patterns emerge. PT Darya Varia Laboratoria, Tbk (DVLA), records growth in total intangible assets and total assets despite a dip in net profit. In contrast, PT Kalbe Farma, Tbk (KLBF), distinguishes itself with positive shifts in various financial aspects, while PT Phapros (PEHA) exhibits fluctuations and declines in certain financial parameters. A nuanced, in-depth analysis is warranted to decipher the trends and implications of these recorded financial conditions.

The scholarly landscape on corporate valuation is rich with diverse approaches. Manalu (2016) delves into factors influencing corporate value, employing dividend policy as a moderating variable in manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange, utilizing Tobin's Q. Siregar (2018) explores the influence of intellectual capital and capital structure on corporate value in publicly listed banks on the Indonesia Stock Exchange, utilizing

Price Book Value (PBV). Simanjuntak (2020) investigates the impact of corporate social responsibility on corporate value in SRI Kehati index companies on the Indonesia Stock Exchange from 2009 to 2018, utilizing Tobin's Q.

This research adopts the Discounted Cash Flow method, incorporating the Free Cash Flow To Firm technique for calculating intrinsic company value (Djaja, 2017). This approach considers investment opportunities and calculates company value based on the present value of the company's cash flows. The factors influencing corporate value, as identified by Sembiring and Trisnawati (2019), emphasize the significant influence of profitability on corporate value.

The findings of other empirical studies enrich our understanding of the intricate relationship between corporate attributes and intrinsic firm value. Purbawangsa et al. (2019) contribute insights from the Indian and Chinese stock exchanges, revealing a positive influence of corporate social responsibility and profitability during 2013-2016. In the context of the Indonesian Stock Exchange, Utama and Lisa (2018) found a positive effect of profitability on firms within the food and beverage sector, contrasting with the findings of Sugiastuti et al. (2018), who reported a non-significant negative impact of profitability on the value of banking firms from 2013 to 2016. Similarly, Muharramah and Hakim (2021) discovered that profitability lacked a significant impact on firms in the Property, Real Estate, and Construction sector between 2016 and 2019.

Exploring the influence of capital structure, Saluy et al. (2020) examined property and real estate companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange from 2014 to 2018, concluding that capital structure did not exhibit a positive impact on firm value. Javeed and Azeem (2014) extended this understanding by finding a positive and significant relationship between capital structure and firm value on the Karachi Stock Exchange during 2008-2012. Aligning with these findings, Bestariningrum (2015) demonstrated the positive and significant influence of capital structure on firm value within the LQ 45 companies for the period 2010-2014.

Considering firm size, proxied by total assets, Ratnawati et al. (2018) contributed valuable insights indicating that larger companies tend to command higher market values due to enhanced operational stability. This contradicts the findings of Hertina et al. (2019), who reported a non-significant negative impact of company size on firm value.

The valuation of intangible assets and their contribution to corporate value has been a subject of interest. Gamayuni (2015) underscored the significance of intangible assets in enhancing a firm's profitability and investor appeal, as reflected in market capitalization. In contrast, Giovanni and Santosa (2020) reported a significant negative impact of intangible assets on firm value. However, Wijaya and Suganda's (2020) research contradicted this, suggesting that intangible assets did not exert a significant influence on corporate value.

This study situates itself within the dynamic landscape of healthcare sector companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange, probing the fluctuations in free cash flows as indicative of intrinsic value. The research aims to discern the nuanced impact of factors such as profitability, capital structure, firm size, and intangible assets on the intrinsic value of healthcare sector entities. The research questions seek to unravel the distinct roles played by profitability, the implications of capital structure, the contributions of firm size, and the nuanced impact of intangible assets on the intrinsic valuation of these entities.

With the overarching objective of comprehending the ramifications of profitability, capital structure, company size, and intangible assets on the intrinsic value of healthcare sector companies, this study aims to offer strategic insights for firms in shaping policies that exert influence on their intrinsic worth. Investors stand to acquire profound perspectives on managing investment risks within the healthcare sector, while academia can leverage these findings as a cornerstone for subsequent studies delving into the intricacies of corporate valuation.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Capital Structure Theory**

The capital structure of a company, governing the debt-to-equity ratio, assumes a pivotal role in shaping the company's market value (Yapa Abeywardhana, 2017). The theoretical landscape of capital structure is characterized by several predominant frameworks.

**Irrelevance Theory:** Introduced by Modigliani and Miller (1958), this paradigm posits that, in a perfect capital market, the company's value remains unaffected by its capital structure. Despite its robust theoretical underpinnings, the theory necessitates adjustments to accommodate the tax implications on the cost of capital and the company's overall value (Modigliani and Miller, 1963).

**Trade-Off Theory:** This conceptualization implies that the optimal debt level is attained when the incremental benefits of debt equal the associated incremental costs. The optimal capital structure strikes a balance between the advantages of tax benefits and the costs of potential bankruptcy. While an escalation in leverage can augment the company's value up to a certain threshold, exceeding that point might detrimentally impact the company's value.

**Pecking Order Theory:** This theory underscores a company's inclination to prioritize internal funds, followed by debt, with equity issuance considered as the last resort. Al-Tally (2014) aligns with the notion that companies prefer financing new investments through internal funds and debt before contemplating equity issuance.

## Signal theory

The signal theory, first proposed by Spence (1973), elucidates that the sender, who holds the information, provides signals or signs in the form of information that reflects the company's condition. These signals are beneficial for the receiver, namely investors. If the information is positive, investors will respond positively and can distinguish between companies of good and poor quality. Aru and Widati (2022) corroborate the influence of profitability and company size in the context of signaling theory, where larger profits and company size are deemed attractive for investors to invest.

## Intrinsic Value, Fair Value, and Market Value

In financial analysis, three distinct notions of value—Intrinsic Value, Fair Value, and Market Value—hold significant importance.

**Intrinsic Value:** This concept, articulated by Damodaran (2012), refers to the value ascribed to a company through an impartial analysis. It takes into account anticipated cash flows and employs an appropriate discount rate. Intrinsic value hinges on factors such as size, timing, and the risk associated with future cash flows, all discounted at a weighted average risk.

**Fair Value:** KEPI and SPI (2018) define fair value as the price observed in routine transactions between market participants on the measurement date. This valuation approach reflects the interactions between willing buyers and sellers in the marketplace without any coercive elements.

**Market Value:** Similar to fair value, market value is an estimate of the monetary amount achievable or payable in the exchange of assets or liabilities. It is determined on the valuation date through transactions conducted at arm's length between buyers and sellers who are willingly engaged, devoid of any compulsion (KEPI and SPI, 2018).

Djaja (2017) provides an insightful overview of valuation methodologies, categorizing them into economic methods, relative methods, and asset-based methods. Economic methods, including the Discounted Cash Flow Model and the Economic Value Added Model, project assets' utility and future value. Relative methods, such as the Earnings Model and the Revenue Model, compare assets or transactions. Asset-based methods, like the Liquidation Model and the Realizable Asset Model, emphasize fair value derived from tangible assets.

In essence, these valuation frameworks offer diverse perspectives, contributing to a comprehensive understanding of a company's worth, aligning with the nuanced approaches embraced by finance scholars.

## **Discounted cash flow**

The Discounted Cash Flow (DCF) method serves as a fundamental approach in financial valuation, particularly for estimating the intrinsic value of a company based on its core fundamentals. This method involves discounting future cash flows, such as free cash flow to firm (FCFF), free cash flow to equity (FCFE), or anticipated dividend cash flows, at the appropriate cost of capital (Djaja, 2017).

Within the DCF framework, the discounting process employs two primary measures: free cash flow to equity (FCFE) and free cash flow to the firm (FCFF). Valuation using FCFE assesses a company's worth from an equity standpoint, while FCFF provides a holistic evaluation of the company's overall value (Damodaran, 2012).

Free Cash Flow to the Firm (FCFF) holds significant importance in company valuation as it represents the cash available to meet obligations to all stakeholders, including common shareholders, bondholders, and preferred stockholders (Damodaran, 2012). The financial metrics involved in the FCFF calculation include Earnings Before Interest and Tax (EBIT), which captures profits before interest and tax deductions, Taxes representing the company's tax liabilities deducted from profits, Depreciation accounting for the decrease in asset value over time, Capital Expenditure covering essential capital spending for asset maintenance or enhancement, and Working Capital measuring changes in a company's working capital by considering the difference between current assets and current liabilities.

## **Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC)**

The cost of capital, a pivotal parameter in capital budgeting analysis, is quantified through the Weighted Average Cost of Capital (WACC), representing the aggregate of various cost components (Ehrhardt & Brigham, 2011).

Calculating WACC involves several steps, as delineated by Djaja (2017). Firstly, the breakdown of capital components (debt, common stock, and preferred stock) employed for corporate investment. Subsequently, determining the market value of each financial instrument. Assigning costs to each source of company funding, measured as a percentage of the relevant funds. Establishing the composition (weight) of each instrument relative to the total funds. Lastly, computing WACC and deriving the final result.

WACC provides a comprehensive perspective on the company's cost of capital, factoring in the weight of each funding source and serving as a crucial foundation in financial decision-making processes.

## **Profitability**

Corporate profitability, an outcome of numerous policies and decisions, mirrors the net profit level achievable during operations (Ehrhardt & Brigham, 2011). In this context, profitability elucidates the company's ability to generate profits relative to the capital employed, expressed as a percentage (Nurhayati, 2013; Takdir, 2008). One method for gauging profitability is through Return On Assets (ROA), assessing the operational efficiency of the company in generating profits from its assets. ROA, as a ratio, offers insights into how well the company leverages its assets to produce earnings.

## **Capital Structure**

Optimal capital structure, as a blend of debt and equity, aims to maximize stock prices (Ehrhardt & Brigham, 2011). The primary function of capital structure is to provide a measurable assessment of a business's long-term solvency and its ability to navigate financial challenges while capitalizing on emerging opportunities (P Prat & Niculita, 2008). Encompassing both equity and debt financing (Subramanyam, 2014), a commonly used metric for assessing capital structure is the Debt-To-Equity Ratio (Gunn & Shackman, 2014), offering an overview of the proportion of debt and equity used by the company to fund its operations.

## **Company Size**

Company size, reflecting total assets, is expressed through metrics such as total assets, log size, sales, and market capitalization. Larger companies tend to experience positive development and growth, thereby enhancing their corporate value (Hertina et al., 2019; Lumapow & Tumiwa, 2017). Measurement of company size involves various metrics, with larger companies carrying lower risks due to better market control, enabling them to face economic competition more effectively (Siahaan, 2013). The general formula to calculate company size involves taking the natural logarithm (Ln) of total assets (Susanto & Pradipta, 2019).

## **Intangible Assets**

Intangible assets, as defined by PSAK No. 19 (revised 2009), pertain to assets lacking physical presence but holding monetary value and prospective economic benefits. The acknowledgment of intangible assets' contribution to enhancing corporate value is evident (Kombih & Sugiharto, 2017). The comprehensive definition of intangible assets includes elements like patents, trademarks, goodwill, and other non-physical factors anticipated to yield productive benefits in the future (Blair & Wallman, as cited in Mohammed & Al Ani, 2019;

Ehrhardt & Brigham, 2011). The assessment of intangible asset value involves the division of the intangible asset value by the total assets (Fachruddin & Octavianus, 2021).

## CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Several factors affecting the value of a company include its profitability and capital structure (Kontesa, 2015). Drawing on findings from previous research by Bukit et al. (2018), Tui et al. (2017), and Jihadi et al. (2021), Kontesa (2015) suggests that profitability positively and significantly impacts the value of a company. Based on these findings and the conceptual framework, the research hypothesis is formulated as follows:

*H1: Profitability has a positive and significant influence on the intrinsic value of a company in the health sector on the Indonesia Stock Exchange.*

Most studies on capital structure concentrate on the debt-to-equity ratio and the composition of capital on the right side of the company's balance sheet (Myers, 2001). Previous research by Hamidy et al. (2015), Javeed and Azeem (2014), Suzulia et al. (2020), and Antwi et al. (2012) indicates that capital structure has a positive and significant relationship with the value of a company. Based on the above, the research hypothesis is formulated as follows:

*H2: Capital structure has a positive and significant influence on the intrinsic value of a company in the health sector on the Indonesia Stock Exchange.*

Company size is a crucial factor considered by investors when forming investment strategies and can be used as a metric reflecting a company's scale through total assets and sales growth (Bestariningrum, 2015). Previous research by Bestariningrum (2015), Husna and Satria (2019), and Al-Slehat et al. (2020) indicates that company size has a positive and significant impact on the value of a company. Based on this research and the conceptual framework, the research hypothesis is formulated as follows:

*H3: Company size has a positive and significant influence on the intrinsic value of a company in the health sector on the Indonesia Stock Exchange.*

The notable gap between book equity value and market equity value, coupled with the increasing prominence of intangible assets, has led researchers to investigate whether intangible assets play a crucial role in enhancing a company's value and contribute to the significant disparities between book equity and market equity values (Gamayuni, 2015). Previous research by Gamayuni (2015) and Mohammed and Al Ani (2019) suggest that intangible assets have a positive and significant influence on a company's value. Based on this research and the conceptual framework, the research hypothesis is formulated as follows:

*H4: Intangible assets have a positive and significant influence on the intrinsic value of a company in the health sector on the Indonesia Stock Exchange.*



## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a quantitative approach, employing statistical analysis and computable data. Its causal nature seeks to explore potential cause-and-effect relationships. The research was conducted at the Indonesia Stock Exchange (Bursa Efek Indonesia) using online resources, including the [www.idx.co.id](http://www.idx.co.id) website, company websites, and other relevant links. The study commenced in June 2022.

The population under investigation comprises all healthcare sector companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2021, regularly reporting their financial positions—amounting to a total of 23 companies. The sample selection utilized purposive sampling, considering criteria such as being a healthcare sector company listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2021, publishing comprehensive financial reports for the years 2018-2021, and recording positive profits during these years. Accordingly, the research sample consists of eight companies.

Data for the study is drawn from secondary sources, specifically annual financial reports available on the [www.idx.co.id](http://www.idx.co.id) website.

The research incorporates several variables to analyze relationships within healthcare sector companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX). The operational definition, measurement, and scale of these variables are elucidated as follows:

1. Intrinsic Value of the Company (Y): This value is determined by the size, time, and risk of expected future cash flows. Measurement involves summing the discounted results of future cash flows, with the scale presented as a ratio.
2. Profitability (X1): Measured as the level of net profit achievable in company operations, profitability is computed by dividing net profit by total assets. The scale is expressed as a ratio.
3. Capital Structure (X2): Reflecting the proportion of equity and debt financing, capital structure is measured by dividing total debt by total equity. The scale is presented as a ratio.
4. Company Size (X3): Represented as an assessment of total assets, measured using the natural logarithm, and presented as a ratio.
5. Intangible Asset (X4): Non-physical factors contributing to production or services, expected to provide future benefits. Measured by dividing total intangible assets by total assets, and presented as a ratio.

These variables aim to identify the impact of each factor on the intrinsic value of companies in the healthcare sector listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange, utilizing ratios and operational definitions aligned with research objectives.

In the data analysis phase, various statistical techniques are employed to offer insights and discern relationships among variables.

**Descriptive Statistical Analysis:** This method involves statistical description, frequency, data exploration, cross-tabulation, and ratio analysis. Its objective is to provide a comprehensive overview of the data.

**Regression Statistical Analysis:** In this study, panel data regression is applied, combining time series and cross-sectional data. In this study, three approaches to panel data regression analysis are considered:

- **Common Effects Approach:** This model merges time series and cross-sectional data using Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) to estimate the panel data model. It is essential to evaluate the significance of probability and the coefficient of determination of the model.
- **Fixed Effects Approach:** This model takes into account changes in intercept caused by eliminated variables. Evaluation involves comparing the R<sup>2</sup> value with the common effect model or utilizing the Chow test.
- **Random Effects Approach:** This model considers the relationship between disturbance variables across time and individuals. The benefits of this model include addressing heteroscedasticity issues. The choice between fixed effects and random effects is determined based on the significance of coefficients and the results of the Hausman test.

With these techniques, the goal is to pinpoint and quantify the impact of specific variables on the intrinsic value of companies in the healthcare sector listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange.

## RESULTS

Descriptive statistical analysis was performed to outline the characteristics of the research variables. The analyzed variables encompass profitability (ROA), capital structure (DER), company size (Size), intangible assets, and intrinsic company value (Y). The findings of the analysis are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 reveals that profitability (X1) has an average of 0.125653, with a minimum of 0.006145 and a maximum of 0.309881. Capital structure (X2) averages 0.448450, ranging from a minimum of 0.143710 to a maximum of 1.584998. Company size (X3) has an average of 29.11695, with a minimum of 28.15149 and a maximum of 30.87621. Intangible asset (X4) has an average of 0.024657, with a minimum of 0.002204 and a maximum of 0.063401. Intrinsic company value (Y) averages 28.87075, ranging from a minimum of 26.77100 to a maximum of 30.72400.

These results highlight that in 2021, PT Phapros had the lowest ROA (0.006145), whereas PT Industri Jamu and Farmasi Sidomuncul recorded the highest ROA (0.309881). PT Mitra Keluarga Karya Sehat in 2018 exhibited the lowest capital structure (0.143710), contrasting with PT Phapros in 2020, which had the highest (1.584998). The smallest company size was observed in PT Darya Varia in 2018 (28.13), while PT Kalbe Farma in 2021 boasted the largest company size (30.87621).

Further analysis indicates that PT Phapros in 2019 held the smallest intangible asset variable (0.22%), while PT Mitra Keluarga Karya Sehat in 2021 recorded the largest (0.063401). The lowest intrinsic company value was found in PT Industri Jamu and Farmasi Sidomuncul in 2019 (26.77100), while PT Kalbe Farma in 2021 achieved the highest intrinsic value (30.72400).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics (in percentage and Indonesian Rupiah)

	Y	X1	X2	X3	X4
Date: 07/13/23					
Time: 05:29					
Sample: 2018 2021					
Mean	28.87075	0.125653	0.448450	29.11695	0.024657
Median	28.95800	0.120800	0.235172	28.93662	0.024741
Maximum	30.72400	0.309881	1.585998	30.87621	0.063401
Minimum	26.77100	0.006145	0.143710	28.15149	0.002204
Std. Dev.	1.049060	0.069057	0.452253	0.864556	0.018669
Skewness	-0.175546	0.773951	1.793809	0.655477	0.535726
Kurtosis	2.332269	3.387386	4.666508	2.217806	2.209335
Jarque-Bera	0.663985	2.970413	18.25629	2.718835	2.068687
Probability	0.717493	0.226456	0.000109	0.256810	0.355460
Sum	808.3810	3.518274	12.55659	815.2746	0.690406
Sum Sq. Dev.	29.71425	0.128760	5.522375	20.18132	0.009411
Observations	28	28	28	28	28

### Selection of Panel Data Regression Model

In the panel data analysis, three regression model approaches are utilized: the common effect model, fixed effect model, and random effect model.

- **Common Effect Model:** This approach disregards the time and space dimensions in panel data, assuming that individual behavior remains consistent across various time periods. Test results indicate that variables X1 and X3 significantly influence the dependent variable LNY.

- Fixed Effect Model: This model employs dummy variables to capture intercept differences among companies, assuming that the slope (regression coefficient) remains constant for each company and over time. Test results show that variables X1 and X3 do not significantly affect the dependent variable LNY.
- Random Effect Model: This approach considers the potential correlation between time and individuals in the residual panel data. Test results indicate that variables X1 and X3 also have a significant influence on the dependent variable LNY.

In selecting the optimal regression model, it is crucial to consider various tests and evaluation criteria such as R-squared, Akaike information criterion, Schwarz criterion, and others. The regression model that performs best based on these criteria will be chosen for use in this research.

### Chow test

The Chow test is utilized to determine the superior regression model between the fixed effect model and the common effect model. The decision-making relies on the probability value of the cross-section chi-square. In this test, the hypotheses being examined are H0: Common effect model and H1: Fixed effect model.

Table 2. Chow test

Redundant Fixed Effects Tests			
Equation: Untitled			
Test cross-section fixed effects			
Effects Test	Statistic	d.f.	Prob.
Cross-section F	0.561479	(6,17)	0.7550
Cross-section Chi-square	5.062246	6	0.5359

The Chow test results show a probability value of the cross-section chi-square at 0.5359, which is higher than the significance level of 0.05. Consequently, H0 is accepted, and the selected regression model is the common effect model. The subsequent step to identify the best model between the common effect model and the random effect model will involve the Lagrange test.

### Lagrange test

The Lagrange test is performed to ascertain the optimal method in panel data regression, i.e., choosing between the common effect model and the random effect model. The

tested hypotheses are H0: Common effect model and H1: Random effect model. The Lagrange test relies on the probability value of the Breusch-Pagan test, and if this probability value exceeds 0.05, H0 is accepted.

Table 3. Lagrange test

Lagrange Multiplier Tests for Random Effects			
Null hypotheses: No effects			
Alternative hypotheses: Two-sided (Breusch-Pagan) and one-sided (all others) alternatives			
Test Hypothesis	Cross-section	Time	Both
Breusch-Pagan	1.966886 (0.1608)	1.110345 (0.2920)	3.077231 (0.0794)
Honda	-1.402457 (0.9196)	1.053729 (0.1460)	-0.246588 (0.5974)
King-Wu	-1.402457 (0.9196)	1.053729 (0.1460)	0.050657 (0.4798)
Standardized Honda	-0.358316 (0.6399)	1.341024 (0.0900)	-2.350582 (0.9906)
Standardized King-Wu	-0.358316 (0.6399)	1.341024 (0.0900)	-1.889240 (0.9706)
Gourieroux, et al.	--	--	1.110345 (0.2895)

The Lagrange test results show that the probability value of the Breusch-Pagan test is greater than 0.05, specifically 0.0794. Hence, H0 is accepted, and the preferred model is the common effect model.

### Testing Classical Assumptions

First, the normality test assesses whether residuals in the regression model follow a normal distribution. The hypotheses tested are H0: Residuals are normally distributed and H1: Residuals are not normally distributed. The decision is based on the Jarque-Bera statistic; if the probability value (Jarque-Bera) < 0.05, H1 is accepted, indicating non-normal distribution of residuals. The normality test results show a probability value of 0.119270 > 0.05. Therefore, H0 is accepted, concluding that residuals have a normal distribution.

The Heteroskedasticity test determines variance differences among observations in a regression model. If the probability value  $> 0.05$ , there is no heteroskedasticity. The results show that independent variables with probability values  $> 0.05$ —profitability, capital structure, company size, and intangible assets—indicate the absence of heteroskedasticity in the regression model.

The Multicollinearity test identifies strong correlations among independent variables in a regression model. Results show no signs of multicollinearity among independent variables, with correlation values not exceeding 0.8.

The Autocorrelation test uses the Durbin-Watson test to detect autocorrelation between residuals of one observation and another. The Durbin-Watson test results show a DW value of 2.062123, indicating no autocorrelation. The DW Stat (2.062123) falls between the lower limit ( $dL=1.1044$ ) and upper limit ( $dU=1.7473$ ), close to the midpoint ( $4-du=2.2527$ ) of this range. Therefore, no autocorrelation is indicated.

### Panel data regression

In this study, the analysis method is panel data regression, combining time series and cross-sectional data over a four-year period from 2018 to 2021. The research sample consists of 8 health companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange.

For the panel data regression, the Common Effect Model (FEM) is employed. The aim is to evaluate relationships among independent variables, including profitability, capital structure, company size, and intangible assets, with intrinsic value. The results of the panel regression using the EGLS method (Cross-section weight) are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Panel Data Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	2.996355	7.615591	0.393450	0.6976
X1	7.697471	3.054107	2.520368	0.0191
X2	0.565911	0.522713	1.082641	0.2902
X3	0.853075	0.264468	3.225625	0.0037
X4	-7.525115	12.39987	-0.606870	0.5499

The panel data regression equation reveals that the intrinsic value of a company (Y) can be estimated using the formula:

$$Y = 2.996355 + 7.697471 \times \text{Profitability} + 0.565911 \times \text{Capital Structure} + 0.853075 \times \text{Company Size} - 7.525115 \times \text{Intangible Asset}$$

Interpretations are as follows: The constant value (2.996355) indicates that if all independent variables (profitability, capital structure, company size, and intangible asset) are zero, the intrinsic value of the company would be 2.996355. The coefficient of the profitability variable (7.697471) suggests that a one-unit increase in profitability corresponds to an increase of 7.697471 in the intrinsic value of the company. The coefficient of the capital structure variable (0.565911) implies that a one-unit increase in capital structure results in a 0.565911 increase in the intrinsic value of the company. The coefficient of the company size variable (0.853075) indicates that a one-unit increase in company size leads to a 0.853075 increase in the intrinsic value of the company. The coefficient of the intangible asset variable (-7.525115) suggests that a one-unit increase in intangible asset corresponds to a decrease of 7.525115 in the intrinsic value of the company.

### Goodness of Fit Test

Goodness of fit test is evaluated through the coefficient of determination (R<sup>2</sup>), measuring the extent to which the variance in the dependent variable can be explained by the independent variables. In this study, the R<sup>2</sup> value (R-Square) is used to assess how much profitability, capital structure, company size, and intangible asset can explain intrinsic value. The coefficient of determination ranges from 0 to 1, where a value close to 1 indicates that the independent variables significantly contribute information about the dependent variable.

Table 5. Coefficient of Determination Test

Root MSE	0.731409	R-squared	0.495903
Mean dependent var	28.87075	Adjusted R-squared	0.408234
S.D. dependent var	1.049060	S.E. of regression	0.807004
Akaike info criterion	2.569456	Sum squared resid	14.97887
Schwarz criterion	2.807350	Log likelihood	-30.97238
Hannan-Quinn criter.	2.642182	F-statistic	5.656530
Durbin-Watson stat	2.062123	Prob(F-statistic)	0.002542

The coefficient of determination test results reveal an R-square value of 0.495903. This implies that approximately 49.5903% of the variation in intrinsic value can be explained by the variables profitability, capital structure, company size, and intangible asset. The remaining 50.4097% is considered to be influenced by other factors not included in this study.

### F-test

The F-test is utilized to determine whether the independent variables collectively (simultaneously) influence the dependent variable. The commonly used significance level is 0.05 or 5%. If the probability value (F-statistic) is greater than or equal to 0.05, it is considered that the independent variables do not have a significant impact on the dependent variable. Conversely, if the probability value (F-statistic) is less than 0.05, it is considered that the independent variables collectively influence the dependent variable.

Table 6. F-test

Root MSE	0.731409	R-squared	0.495903
Mean dependent var	28.87075	Adjusted R-squared	0.408234
S.D. dependent var	1.049060	S.E. of regression	0.807004
Akaike info criterion	2.569456	Sum squared resid	14.97887
Schwarz criterion	2.807350	Log likelihood	-30.97238
Hannan-Quinn criter.	2.642182	F-statistic	5.656530
Durbin-Watson stat	2.062123	Prob(F-statistic)	0.002542

Based on the F-test results, a Prob (F-statistic) value of 0.002542 is obtained, which is less than 0.05. Therefore, it can be concluded that, simultaneously, the independent variables—profitability, capital structure, company size, and intangible asset—significantly influence the intrinsic value of the company.

### t-test

The t-test is conducted to assess the influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable, using a significance level of 0.05. If the p-value for the t-test is less than or equal to 0.05, it concludes that the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable. Here are the t-test results for each variable:

1. Profitability has a t-value of 0.0191, indicating a significant positive effect on intrinsic value.
2. Capital Structure has a t-value of 0.2902, suggesting a positive but not significant effect on intrinsic value.
3. Company Size has a t-value of 0.0037, signifying a significant positive effect on intrinsic value.
4. Intangible Asset has a t-value of 0.5499, indicating a non-significant negative effect on intrinsic value.



These results offer a thorough understanding of the relative contribution of each variable to changes in the intrinsic value of the company.

## **DISCUSSION**

### **The Influence of Profitability on Intrinsic Value**

Statistical test results indicate that profitability, measured through return on assets (ROA), has a positive and significant effect on the intrinsic value of the company (probability 0.0191). Profitability, reflecting management effectiveness in generating profits, is a key factor in achieving high company performance. High profits increase investor confidence in the company's finances, making profitability an essential component in assessing company performance.

Return on assets (ROA) is used as an indicator of profitability in this study, measuring the company's ability to generate profit from its assets. ROA reflects the company's ability to generate profits that can be projected into the future. The research findings indicate that an increase in profitability, as measured by ROA, has a positive and significant impact on the intrinsic value of the company. Investors in investment activities become more cautious in analyzing the company's ability to earn profits, as their investments aim to receive dividends or gains.

These findings align with previous research, including studies by Utama and Lisa (2018), Pena (2023), Djashan and Agustinus (2020), Pratiwi (2020), and others, stating that profitability has a positive and significant influence on the intrinsic value of the company. However, these findings differ from some studies, such as Muharromah and Hakim (2021), Ali and Ali (2021), and Ananda (2017), which suggest that profitability does not have a significant effect on firm value.

### **The Influence of Capital Structure on Intrinsic Value**

Statistical testing on capital structure, measured by the debt-to-equity ratio (DER), shows a positive but not significant effect on firm value (probability 0.2902). Capital structure reflects the company's financing proportion using debt, also defined as the ratio of debt value to its own equity value or total company capital. The proper selection of capital structure is considered crucial to avoid financial difficulties and potential bankruptcy.

In the trade-off theory, optimizing capital structure can be achieved through adjusting the level of debt and equity. The study shows that if the capital structure is already optimal, adding debt will not affect the firm's value. Research on companies in the healthcare sector indicates that most have managed their debt levels well, with DER ratios mostly < 100%. These results

align with previous research that states a positive but not significant influence of capital structure on firm value.

This study contradicts some previous research findings that found a positive and significant relationship between capital structure and firm value but aligns with other research findings that found a negative and significant influence. (Tumangkeng and Mildawati, 2018; Sukmayanti et al., 2018; Suranto and Walandouw, 2017) support positive but not significant findings, while (Hamidy et al., 2015; Javeed and Azeem, 2014; Suzulia et al., 2020; Antwi et al., 2012) found a positive and significant relationship. This research contributes to understanding the complexity of the relationship between capital structure and firm value.

### **The Influence of Company Size on Intrinsic Value**

The test indicates that company size has a positive and significant effect on company value (probability 0.037). Company size, measured by total assets, reflects the maturity of the company and its ability to obtain funding. It is also interpreted as the total assets of the company, and larger companies tend to have more stable cash flows, reducing the risk of default.

Company size, represented by the "size" variable calculated through the natural logarithm of total assets, shows that the larger the company, the higher the intrinsic value of the company. The research findings align with previous studies stating that company size has a positive and significant impact on the intrinsic value of the company, as found by (Emeka, 2023; Bestariningrum, 2015; Husna and Satria, 2019; Al-slehat et al, 2020).

However, these results contradict some other studies stating that company size does not affect company value, as reported by (Mahardikari, 2021; Pratiwi, 2020; Suwardika and Mustanda, 2017). Additionally, these findings also contrast with the research by Le (2023), stating that company size has a negative effect on company value in the context of microeconomic factors in Vietnam. This study provides additional insights into the complexity of the relationship between company size and intrinsic company value.

### **The Influence of Intangible Asset on Intrinsic Value**

The test indicates that intangible assets have a negative and not significant relationship with intrinsic value at a 5% significance level (probability 0.5499). This indicates that an increase in the value of intangible assets does not impact the increase in company value, and changes in the value of intangible assets do not significantly affect company value.

Intangible assets, as measured by their ratio to total assets, tend to have a small percentage in companies in the health sector, with intangible assets < 10% of total assets. This

suggests that companies in the health sector are more focused on investing in tangible assets, which are considered easier to measure and estimate their value.

Strict regulations from the Food and Drug Supervisory Agency (BPOM) force companies in the health sector to comply with strict standards in drug production, adding complexity to the production process. Another influencing factor is the dependence on imported raw materials, which reaches 90% - 95%, posing a significant challenge for companies in the health sector in Indonesia.

The results of this study are consistent with previous research findings stating that intangible assets do not significantly affect company value, as reported by (Kurniawati and Asyik, 2017; Wijaya and Suganda, 2020; Wardoyo et al, 2022; Nuryani, 2022). However, these findings differ from the research by James and Ofor (2023), who found a positive but not significant influence of intangible assets on company value. Additionally, these results also contrast with research findings stating that intangible assets have a positive and significant influence on company value, as reported by (Sahoo et al, 2023; Azamat et al, 2023; Gamayuni, 2015; Mohammed and Al Nani, 2019).

## CONCLUSION

Based on the research findings and discussions, several key points can be concluded. Firstly, the profitability of companies in the health sector demonstrates a positive and significant influence on intrinsic value. This underscores the importance of companies maintaining the ability to generate profits without compromising social values, with a suggestion to consider registering pharmaceutical products in categories covered by national health insurance (BPJS). Secondly, capital structure, measured by the debt-to-equity ratio, exhibits a positive but not significant impact on intrinsic value. It is recommended that companies consider prioritizing the use of internal capital in their operational activities. Thirdly, company size plays a crucial role with a positive and significant influence on intrinsic value. Companies in the health sector should consider company size as a key factor in efforts to optimize value and secure funding. Lastly, intangible assets show a negative and not significant relationship with intrinsic value. The focus on managing intangible assets, especially in terms of identification, control, and future economic value, is crucial for enhancing the intrinsic value of the company. In this context, proposed recommendations include emphasizing profit without compromising social values, re-evaluating capital structure, concentrating on intangible asset management, and introducing additional research variables for future investigations.

Moving forward, this research provides valuable insights into the intricate relationships between financial indicators and intrinsic company value, particularly in the healthcare sector.

To advance the understanding of these dynamics, future studies could explore nuanced aspects, such as conducting in-depth industry analyses to uncover sector-specific variations and considering cross-country comparisons to discern regulatory influences. Longitudinal research could track the evolution of these financial relationships over time, providing a dynamic perspective. Additionally, a more granular examination of the types of intangible assets influencing intrinsic value could contribute to a comprehensive understanding. Comparative studies with other industries would be beneficial to determine the universality of these relationships. Overall, further research endeavors in this domain will enrich our comprehension of the complex interplay between profitability, capital structure, company size, intangible assets, and intrinsic company value, offering valuable insights for strategic decision-making, especially within the challenging landscape of the healthcare industry.

## REFERENCES

- Abate, M. T., & Kaur, R. (2023). The Evolution of Modern Capital Structure Theory: A Review. *Central European Management Journal*, 31(2), 958-974.
- Ahmed, A. M., Sharif, N. A., Ali, M. N., & Hågen, I. (2023). Effect of Firm Size on the Association Between Capital Structure and Profitability. *Sustainability*, 15(14), 11196.
- Ajeigbe, K. B., Swanepoel, T., & van Vuuren, H. J. (2021). Firm's Value Sustainability via Accounting Ratios: The Case of Nigerian Listed Firms. *Journal of Economic and Financial Sciences*, 14(1), 1-11.
- Akash, R. S. I., Khan, M. I., & Shear, F. (2023). The Corporate Financial Policy and the Firm Value. *International Journal of Business and Economic Affairs*, 8(3), 65-74.
- Al Nimer, M., Warrad, L., & Al Omari, R. (2015). The Impact of Liquidity on Jordanian Banks Profitability Through Return on Assets. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(7), 229-232.
- Ali, J., Faroji, R., & Ali, O. (2021). Pengaruh Profitabilitas terhadap Nilai Perusahaan: (Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Sektor Industri Barang Konsumsi Di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2017-2019).
- Almira, N. P. A. K., & Wiagustini, N. L. P. (2020). Return on Asset, Return on Equity, dan Earning Per Share berpengaruh terhadap Return Saham (Doctoral dissertation, Udayana University).
- Al-Slehat, Z. A. F., Zaher, C., Fattah, A., & Box, P. O. (2020). Impact of Financial Leverage, Size and Assets Structure on Firm Value: Evidence from Industrial Sector, Jordan. *International Business Research*, 13(1), 109-120.
- Ananda, N. A. (2017). Pengaruh Profitabilitas Dan Struktur Modal Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan.
- Antwi, S., Mills, E. F. E. A., & Zhao, X. (2012). Capital Structure and Firm Value: Empirical Evidence From Ghana. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(22), 103-111.
- Aru, Y. A. P., & Widati, L. (2022). Profitabilitas, Struktur Modal, Ukuran Perusahaan, dan Kebijakan Dividen terhadap Nilai Perusahaan di BEI.
- Axim, L. G. (2023). The Influence Of The Capital Structure On The Profitability: Evidence From The Romanian Retail Industry. *Bulletin of the Transilvania University of Braso Economic Sciences Series V*, 16(1), 109-120.
- Azamat, K., Galiya, J., Bezhan, R., & Nurdana, Z. (2023). The Impact of Intangible Assets on the Value of FMCG Companies Worldwide. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, 8(1), 1-7.
- Basuki, A. T., & Prawoto, N. (2016). Analisis Regresi Dalam Penelitian Ekonomi dan Bisnis.
- Bergh, D. D., Connelly, B. L., Ketchen Jr, D. J., & Shannon, L. M. (2014). Signalling Theory and Equilibrium in Strategic Management Research: An Assessment and a Research Agenda. *Journal of Management Studies*, 51(8), 1334-1360.
- Bestariningrum, N. (2015). Analyzing The Effect Of Capital Structure and Firm Size on Firm Value (Case Study: Company That Listed in LQ-45 Index Period 2010-2014). *Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisiensi*, 15(4), 354-365.

- Brusov, P., & Filatova, T. (2023). Capital Structure Theory: Past, Present, Future. *Mathematics*, 11(3), 616.
- Bukit, R. B., Haryanto, B., & Ginting, P. (2018). Environmental Performance, Profitability, Asset Utilization, Debt Monitoring and Firm Value. In *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 122(1), 012137.
- Chandrasekaran, D., & Munawer, I. (2023). Evaluating the Nexus between Leverage and Profitability: With Specific Focus on the Cement Industry. *International Journal of Economic Studies and Management (IJESM)*, 3(1), 383-397.
- Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling Theory: A Review and Assessment. *Journal of Management*, 37(1), 39-67.
- Damodaran, A. (2012). *Investment Valuation: Tools and Techniques for Determining the Value of Any Asset* (Vol. 666). John Wiley & Sons.
- Demiraj, R., Dsouza, S., & Demiraj, E. (2023). Capital Structure and Profitability: Panel Data Evidence from the European Tourism Industry. *6th International Scientific Conference ITEMA 2022*, 10(8), 1-19.
- Djaja, I. (2017). *All About Corporate Valuation*. Elex Media Komputindo.
- Djashan, I.A., & Agustinus, Y. (2020). The Effect of Firm Size, Profitability, Audit Committee, and Other Factors to Firm Value. *Accounting and Financial Review*, 5(1), 22-27.
- Ehrhardt, M. C., & Brigham, E.F. (2011). *Financial Management: Theory and Practice* (Thirteenth Edition). South-Western Cengage Learning.
- Eldomiaty, T. I. (2004). Signaling Corporate Market Value in Transition Economies: Perspectives from Egypt. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 20(1), 52-70.
- EIRabat, M. M., Abdel-Fattah, H. A. N., & Mohamed, M. A. A. (2023). The Moderating Role of Firm Size on the Relationship between Financial Distress and Earnings Management. *The Academic Journal of Contemporary Commercial Research*, 3(1), 42-60.
- Emeka, O. (2023). Effect of bankruptcy risk on the value of conglomerate firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Management Studies*, 10(1), 10-19.
- Fachrudin, K. A., & Octavianus, H. (2021). What Drives Value on Pharmaceutical Firms During the Covid-19 Pandemic?. *21st Malaysia-Indonesia International Conference on Economics, Management and Accounting*, 56-64.
- Fahmi, I. (2018). *Pengantar Manajemen Keuangan*. (Edisi Keenam). Bandung: ALFABETA.
- Fatima, N., Shaik, A. R., & Tripathy, S. (2023). Firm Value and Profitability of Saudi Arabian Companies Listed on Tadawul: Moderating Role of Capital Structure. *Planning*, 18(5), 1515-1521.
- Firdaus, M. (2018). *Aplikasi Ekonometrika untuk Data Panel dan Time Series*. IPB Press.
- Gamayuni, R. R. (2015). The Effect of Intangible Asset, Financial Performance and Financial Policies on The Firm Value. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 4(1), 202-212.
- Ghalandari, K. (2013). The Moderating Effects of Growth Opportunities on the Relationship Between Capital Structure and Dividend Policy and Ownership Structure with Firm Value in Iran: Case study of Tehran Securities Exchange. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 5(4), 1424-1431.
- Ghozali, I., & Ratmono, D. (2017). *Analisis Multivariat Dan Ekonometrika*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.
- Giovanni, G., & Santosa, S. (2020). Do Intellectual Capital and Intangible Assets Influence The Firm Value? (Case Study in Trade, Service, and Investment Sector in Indonesia). *Ultima Management: Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen*, 12(2), 200-209.
- Gostkowska-Drzewicka, M., & Majerowska, E. (2023). Capital structure vs financing rules-the Visegrad Group countries. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Śląskiej. Organizacja i Zarządzanie*, (169), 301-318.
- Gumanti, T. A. (2009). Teori Sinyal Dalam Manajemen Keuangan. *Manajemen Usahawan Indonesia*, 38(6), 4-13.
- Gunn, T., & Shackman, J. (2014). A Comparative Analysis of The Implications of the Islamic Religion on Corporate Capital Structures of Firms in Emerging Market Countries. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, 7(3), 277-287.
- Hamidy, R. R., Wiksuana, I. G. B., & Artini, L. G. S. (2015). Pengaruh Struktur Modal Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan dengan Profitabilitas Sebagai Variabel Intervening Pada Perusahaan Properti dan Real Estate di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *E-Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana*, 4(10), 665-682.
- Hapsoro, D., & Falih, Z. N. (2020). The Effect of Firm Size, Profitability, and Liquidity on the Firm Value Moderated by Carbon Emission Disclosure. *Journal of Accounting and Investment*, 21(2), 240-257.

- Hertina, D., Hidayat, M. B. H., & Mustika, D. (2019). Ukuran Perusahaan, Kebijakan Hutang, dan Profitabilitas Pengaruhnya Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. *Jurnal Ecodemica Jurnal Ekonomi Manajemen dan Bisnis*, 3(1), 110.
- Hirdinis, M. (2019). Capital Structure and Firm Size on Firm Value Moderated by Profitability. *International Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 7(1), 174–191.
- Husna, A., & Satria, I. (2019). Effects of Return on Asset, Debt to Asset Ratio, Current Ratio, Firm Size, and Dividend Payout Ratio on Firm Value. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 9(5), 50-54.
- Ibrahim, A., Alang, A. H., Madi, B., & Ahmad, M. A. Darmawati. (2018). \*Metodologi Penelitian.
- Ionita, C., & Dinu, E. (2021). The Effect of Intangible Assets on Sustainable Growth and Firm Value—Evidence on Intellectual Capital Investment in Companies Listed on Bucharest Stock Exchange. \*Kybernetes.
- James, A. D., & Ofor, T. (2023). Corporate Asset Composition and Firm Value: The Moderating Role Of The Corporate Board From Listed Manufacturing Firms In The Nigeria Exchange Groups. \*Proceedings of the 7th Annual International Academic Conference on Accounting and Finance Disruptive Technology: Accounting Practices, Financial and Sustainability-Reporting, 1-13.
- Javeed, A., & Azeem, M. (2014). Interrelationship Among Capital Structure, Corporate Governance Measures and Firm Value: Panel Study From Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 8(3), 572-589.
- Jihadi, M., Vilantika, E., Hashemi, S. M., Arifin, Z., Bachtiar, Y., & Sholichah, F. (2021). The Effect of Liquidity, Leverage, and Profitability on Firm Value: Empirical Evidence from Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 8(3), 423-431.
- Jonathan, A., & Irvan (2022). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Nilai Perusahaan Manufaktur Di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi TSM*, 2(1), 243-256.
- Jufrizen, J., & Al Fatin, I. N. (2020). Pengaruh Debt To Equity Ratio, Return On Equity, Return On Assets Dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan Pada Perusahaan Farmasi. *Jurnal Humaniora: Jurnal Ilmu sosial, ekonomi dan hukum*, 4(1), 183-195
- Kode Etik Penilai Indonesia & Standar Penilaian Indonesia (KEPI & SPI) (2018). *Edisi VII*. MAPPI: Jakarta.
- Kodongo, O., Mokoaleli-Mokoteli, T., & Maina, L. N. (2015). Capital Structure, Profitability and Firm Value: Panel Evidence of Listed Firms in Kenya. *African Finance Journal*, 17(1), 1-20.
- Kombi & Sugiharto. (2017). Pengaruh Aktivitas Pemasaran, Kinerja Keuangan, dan Aset Tidak Berwujud Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan, 1(3), 281-302.
- Kontesa, M. (2015). Capital Structure, Profitability, and Firm Value. What's New. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 6(20), 185-192.
- Kuniawati, R., & Asyik, N. F. (2017). Kinerja Keuangan Sebagai Variabel Intervening Pengaruh R&D Dan Intangible Asset Pada Nilai Perusahaan. *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Akuntansi (JIRA)*, 6(10), 1-22.
- Le, P. L. (2023). How Microeconomic Factors Influence Vietnam's Listed Manufacturing Firm Value. *Investment Management and Financial Innovations*, 20(2), 267-285.
- Lim, H., & Rokhim, R. (2021). Factors Affecting Profitability of Pharmaceutical Company: an Indonesian Evidence. *Journal of Economic Studies*, 48(5), 981-995.
- Lisvery, S., & Ginting, I. Y. (2014). Aktiva Tak Berwujud. *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Keuangan Indonesia*, 1(1), 1-15.
- Lumapow, L. S., & Tumiwa, R. A. F. (2017). The Effect of Dividend Policy, Firm Size, and Productivity to The Firm Value. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 8(22), 20-24.
- Manalu, I. F. (2016). Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Nilai Perusahaan dengan Kebijakan Dividen sebagai Variabel Moderating pada Perusahaan Manufaktur yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *Tesis*. Medan : Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Mansikkamäki, S. (2023). Firm Growth And Profitability: The Role of Age And Size In Shifts Between Growth–Profitability Configurations. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights*, 19, 1-10.
- Modigliani, F., & Miller, M. H. (1958). The Cost of Capital, Corporation Finance and The Theory of Investment. *The American economic Review*, 48(3), 261-297.
- Modigliani, F., & Miller, M. H. (1963). Corporate Income Taxes and The Cost of Capital: a Correction. *The American economic review*, 53(3), 433-443.

- Mohammed, Z. O., & Al Ani, M. K. (2019). The Effect of Intangible Assets, Financial Performance and Financial Policies on the Firm Value: Evidence from Omani Industrial Sector. *Contemporary Economics*, 14(3), 379-392.
- Muhajirin, M., & Maya, P. (2017). *Pendekatan Praktis: Metode Penelitian Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Idea Yogyakarta.
- Muharramah, R., & Hakim, M. Z. (2021). Pengaruh Ukuran Perusahaan, Leverage, dan Profitabilitas Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. In *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 569-576.
- Myers, S. C. (2001). Capital Structure. *Journal of Economic perspectives*, 15(2), 81-102.
- Nadyayani, D. A. D., & Suarjaya, A. A. G. (2021). The Effect Of Profitability On Stock Return. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research (AJHSSR)*, 5(1), 695-703.
- Nagaraja, N., & Vinay, N. (2016). The Effect of Intangible Assets on the Firm Value. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Research (IJEMR)*, 6(1), 307-315.
- Naveed, M., Ali, S., Iqbal, K., & Sohail, M. K. (2020). Role of Financial and Non-financial Information in Determining Individual Investor Investment Decision: a Signaling Perspective. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 9(2), 261-278.
- Nizam, B. H. B., Shafai, N. A., & Asari, F. F. A. H. (2023). Determinants Of Capital Structure: An Analysis Of Listed Firms In Malaysia. *International Journal of Accounting*, 8(48), 72-81.
- Nurhayati, M. (2013). Profitabilitas, Likuiditas dan Ukuran Perusahaan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Kebijakan Dividen dan Nilai Perusahaan Sektor Non Jasa. *Jurnal Keuangan & Bisnis Program Studi Magister Manajemen Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Harapan*, 5(2), 144-153.
- Nuryani, N. (2022). Investasi Dalam Aset tak Berwujud dan Nilai Perusahaan. *Jurnal Akuntansi*, 11(2), 84-93.
- OHIO, A. E., & UGBOGBO, S. N. (2023). Capital Structure and Corporate Financial Distress of Quoted Non-Financial Firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*, 7(6), 1302-1314.
- 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), 1-26.
- Peña, M. J. C. D. (2023). The Impact of Financial Ratios on Firm Value: Evidences from Publicly Listed FBT Companies in the Philippines. *B- Business Administration/Economics*, 14-30.
- Pernyataan Standar Akuntansi Keuangan (PSAK), No.19, "Aktiva Tidak Berwujud", Revisi 2000.
- Pongsaporamat, P. (2023). The Impact of Intangible Assets on Firm Growth and Firm Value. *Journal of Roi Kaensarn Academi*, 8(6), 595-605.
- Pratiwi, R. D. (2020). Do Capital Structure, Profitability, and Firm Size Affect Firm Value?. *Jurnal Penelitian Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 5(2), 194-202.
- Pratt, Shannon & Niculita V, Alina. (2008). *Valuing a Business The Analysis and Appraisal of Close Held Companies*. The McGraw – Hill.
- Purbawangsa, I. B. A., Solimun, S., Fernandes, A. A. R., & Rahayu, S. M. (2019). Corporate Governance, Corporate Profitability Toward Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure and Corporate Value (Comparative Study in Indonesia, China and India Stock Exchange in 2013-2016). *Social Responsibility Journal*.
- Rahayu, S. M., & Saifi, M. (2019). The Reciprocal Relationship Between Profitability and Capital Structure and its Impacts on The Corporate Values of Manufacturing Companies in Indonesia. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 69(2), 236-251.
- Rahimipour, A. (2017). Investigating the Validity of Signaling Theory in the Tehran Stock Exchange: Using Real Earnings Management, Accrual- Based Earnings Management and Firm Growth. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 11(3), 925-936.
- Ramirez, P. G., & Hachiya, T. (2012). Intangible Assets and Market Value of Japanese Industries and Firms. *International Journal of Technology Management*, 59(1/2), 1-21.
- Ratnawati, V., Freddy, D., & Wahyuni, N. (2018). The Impact of Institutional Ownership and a Firm's Size On Firm Value: Tax Avoidance as a Moderating Variable. *J. Fin. Bank. Review*, 3(1), 1-8.
- Rosdini, D. (2016). Relevansi Nilai Aset Tak Berwujud. *Jurnal Akuntansi Maranatha*, 8(1), 65-85.
- Rudangga, I. G. N. G., & Sudiarta, G. M. (2016). Pengaruh Pertumbuhan Perusahaan dan Leverage terhadap Profitabilitas dan Nilai Perusahaan. *E-Jurnal Manajemen Universitas Udayana*, 3(5), 4394-4422.

- Sahoo, G. K., Swain, R. K., & Das, M. C. P. (2023). Does Disclosure Of Intangible Assets Influence Operational Efficiency And Value Of The Firm: An Empirical Study On Nse-500 Companies, *52(10)*, 133-147.
- Sari, M. M. (2019). Faktor-Faktor Profitabilitas Di Sektor Perusahaan Industri Manufaktur Indonesia (Studi Kasus: Sub Sektor Rokok). *Jumant*, *11(2)*, 61-68.
- Semiring, S., & Trisnawati, I. (2019). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Nilai Perusahaan. *Jurnal Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, *21(1a-2)*, 173-184.
- Siahaan, F. O. (2013). The Effect of Good Corporate Governance Mechanism, Leverage, and Firm Size on Firm Value. *GSTF Journal on Business Review (GBR)*, *2(4)*, 137-142.
- Simanjuntak, B. (2021). Pengaruh Corporate Social Responsibility (Csr) terhadap Corporate Value dengan Profitabilitas sebagai Intervening (Studi Kasus pada Perusahaan yang Tergabung dalam Indeks Sri Kehati yang Terdaftar di BEI 2009-2018). Tesis. Medan : Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Siregar, D. (2018). Pengaruh Modal Intelektual dan Struktur Modal terhadap Nilai Perusahaan dengan Kinerja Keuangan sebagai Variabel Intervening pada Perbankan Go Public di Bursa Efek Indonesia. Tesis. Medan : Universitas Sumatera Utara.
- Situmorang, S. H. (2019). *Analisis Data Untuk Riset Manajemen Dan Bisnis*. USU Press.
- Sodiya, A. K., Adetokunboh, O. O., & Agbato, S. E. (2023). Intangible Asset Valuation In Nigeria: A Review Of The Concept and Practice. In: Laryea, S. and Irem, E. (Eds) Procs 7th West Africa Built Environment Research (WABER) Conference, 945-960.
- Spence, M. (2002). Signaling in Retrospect and The Informational Structure of Markets. *American Economic Review*, *92(3)*, 434-459.
- Submitter, G. A. T. R., Djashan, I. A., & Agustinus, Y. (2020). The Effect of Firm Size, Profitability, Audit Committee, and Other Factors to Firm Value. *Journals and Djashan, Indra Arifin and Agustinus, Yosua, The Effect of Firm Size, Profitability, Audit Committee, and Other Factors to Firm Value (March 31, 2020)*.
- Subramanyam R, K. (2014). *Financial Statement Analysis*. McGraw – Hill Education.
- Sucuahi, W., & Cambarihan, J. M. (2016). Influence of profitability to the firm value of diversified companies in the Philippines. *Accounting and Finance Research*, *5(2)*, 149-153.
- Sugiasuti, R. H., Dzulkriom, M., & Rahayu, S. M. (2018). Effect of Profitability, Leverage Toward Dividend Policy and Firm Value. *Russian Journal of Agricultural and Socio-Economic Sciences*, *80(8)*, 88-96.
- Sukmayanti, P., Wayan, N., & Triaryati, N. (2018). Pengaruh Struktur Modal, Likuiditas Dan Ukuran Perusahaan terhadap Profitabilitas pada Perusahaan Property Dan RealEstate. *E-Jurnal Manajemen*, *8(1)*, 7132-7162.
- Suranto, V. A. M., & Walandouw, S. K. (2017). Analisis Pengaruh Struktur Modal dan Kinerja Keuangan Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan Pada Perusahaan Perbankan di Bursa Efek Indonesia. *Jurnal EMBA: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi, Manajemen, Bisnis Dan Akuntansi*, *5(2)*, 1031-1040.
- Susanto, Y. K., & Pradipta, A. (2019). Firm Value, Firm Size and Income Smoothing. *J. Fin. Bank. Review*, *4(1)*, 01-07.
- Sutama, D., & Lisa, E. (2018). Pengaruh Leverage dan Profitabilitas Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. *JSMA (Jurnal Sains Manajemen Dan Akuntansi)*, *10(1)*, 21-39.
- Suardika, I. N. A., & Mustanda, I. K. (2017). Pengaruh Leverage, Ukuran Perusahaan, Pertumbuhan Perusahaan, dan Profitabilitas Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan Pada Perusahaan Properti. *E-Jurnal Manajemen*, *6(3)*, 1248-1247.
- Suzulia, M. T., & Saluy, A. B. (2020). The Effect of Capital Structure, Company Growth, and Inflation on Firm Value with Profitability as Intervening Variable (Study on Manufacturing Companies Listed on BEI Period 2014- 2018). *Dinasti International Journal of Economics, Finance & Accounting*, *1(1)*, 95-109.
- Takdir, D. S. (2008). *Manajemen Keuangan (Teori dan Aplikasi)*. Unhalu Press.
- Tomić, S., Leković, B., & Matić, M. (2023). Determinants of Capital Structure: Empirical Evidence of Manufacturing Companies in the Republic of Serbia. *Sustainability*, *15(1)*, 778.
- Tui, S., Mahfud, N., Mukhlis, S., & Andi, N. (2017). Determinants of Profitability and Firm Value: Evidence from Indonesian Banks. *IRA-International Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, *7(1)*, 84-95.
- Tumangkeng, M. F., & Mildawati, T. (2018). Pengaruh Struktur Modal, Pertumbuhan Perusahaan, Profitabilitas dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Akuntansi (JIRA)*, *7(6)*.



- Vaticasari, G. D. A., & Suryono, B. (2022). Pengaruh Good Corporate Governance, Profitabilitas, dan Leverage terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. *Jurnal Ilmu dan Riset Akuntansi (JIRA)*, 11(2), 1-16.
- Wahyuni, T., Ernawati, E & Murhadi, R. W. (2013). Faktor-Faktor yang mempengaruhi Nilai Perusahaan di Sektor Property, Real Estate, & Building Construction yang Terdaftar di BEI Periode 2008-2012. *Calypra: Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Universitas Surabaya*, 2(1), 1-18.
- Wardoyo, D. U., Kusumaningtyas, A. W., Afifah, D. R., & Pangestu, F. I. G. (2022). Pengaruh Intangible Asset Dan Kepemilikan Asing Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan Pada Perusahaan Sektor Infrastruktur Yang Terdaftar Di Bursa Efek Indonesia Periode 2018-2020. *Juremi: Jurnal Riset Ekonomi*, 2(1), 25-30.
- Wibowo, P. I., & Ulum, A. S. (2022). Determinant Factors On Firm Value Of Manufacturing Industry. *MediaTrend*, 17(1), 131-145.
- Wijaya, R. A., & Suganda, T. R. (2020). Pengaruh Investment Opportunity Set, Kinerja Keuangan, dan Intangible Asset terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. *Akuntabel*, 17(2), 215-225.
- Winarno, W. W. (2020). *Analisis Ekonometrika dan Statistik dengan EViews (4th ed.)*. UPP STIM YKPN.
- Yapa Abeywardhana, D. (2017). Capital Structure Theory: An Overview. *Accounting and Finance Research*, 6(1), 133-138.
- Zuhroh, I. (2019). The Effects of Liquidity, Firm Size, and Profitability on The Firm Value with Mediating Leverage. *The 2nd International Conference on Islamic Economics, Business, and Philanthropy (ICIEBP) Theme: "Sustainability and Socio-Economic Growth*, 203–230.