

The negative impact of family ownership

by Juniarti -

Submission date: 22-Feb-2021 01:09PM (UTC+0700)

Submission ID: 1514993865

File name: Publikasi1_94015_2886.pdf (228.68K)

Word count: 6385

Character count: 33938

The negative impact of family ownership structure on firm value in the context of Indonesia

Juniarti

Petra Christian University,
Siwalankerto 121-131 Surabaya,
East Java, Indonesia
Email: yunie@petra.ac.id

Abstract: A number of studies concluded that family ownership structure increased firm's performance and also firm value. However, the benefit of family ownership will elapse when the opportunity to expropriate minority exists (Jiang and Peng, 2011). According to Claessen et al. (2000), higher entrenchment occurred in Indonesia, together with Philippines and Thailand. As of 16.6% of Indonesia's public companies was controlled by family as a single majority shareholder, on the other hand, the low law enforcement and the lowest corruption index are another fact in Indonesia. In such a condition it is expected that family ownership has a negative impact on firm value. Using big capitalisation public companies listed in Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) as a research sample, this study supports the hypothesis that there is a negative impact of family ownership on firm value, at the significance level of 10%.

Keywords: family ownership structure; firm value; expropriation; Indonesia.

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Juniarti (2015) 'The negative impact of family ownership structure on firm value in the context of Indonesia', *Int. J. Business and Globalisation*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp.446–460.

Biographical notes: Juniarti is a doctoral student in Accounting at the University of Airlangga. She is a Senior Lecturer in the Department of Accounting Business of Petra Christian University. She likes to follow the latest developments in the field of accounting research and presented her research in several international conferences and actively publishes her writings in various national and international journals. In addition to teaching, she is also the Chief Editor of the *Journal of Accounting and Finance*, which is slightly among nationally accredited journals. Her research interests are in financial and management accounting, especially related to family firm business, good corporate governance, corporate social responsibility and sustainable development issues.

This paper is a revised and expanded version of a paper entitled 'Family ownership structure and firm value (case study on big-cap public companies)' presented at SGBED Conference, Ancona, Italy, 16–18 July 2014.

1 Introduction

Family ownership structure has become as one of the interested topics to be studied, particularly its effects on firm value. Villalonga and Amit (2006), Maury (2006), Jiang

3
and Peng (2011), Barontini and Caprio (2006), Anderson and Reeb (2003) and Claessen et al. (2000) are some of the researchers that actively studied this topic. Villalonga and Amit (2006) examined whether family ownership, control and management influence firm value. 42 By using the company's data-Fortune-500 companies, during the years 1994 to 2000, Villalonga and Amit (2006) found that family ownership creates added value if the founder acts as the CEO or the Chairman of the Board of Commissioners with CEOs recruited from outside.

Maury (2006) conducted a study to examine how the performance of a company controlled by the family (family-control) compared with companies that are not controlled by the family in 1,672 non-financial companies in the region of Western Europe. The study objective was to confirm the existence of control by the family, whether the performance of the family control better than non-family control, given the diversity of the various results of previous studies. The results showed that family-controlled companies is positively associated with higher performance than companies that are not controlled by the family. 9

Jiang and Peng (2011) observed whether the family ownership and control play an important role in major companies in Asia, since there is still a puzzle regarding the association between the family ownership concentration and control on the one hand and performance on the other, whether good, bad or not related. The study was conducted in 744 large public companies in eight Asian countries. 66 study was designed in two studies, study I and study II. The study II is study I added with a variable level of investor protection. The results of the study I showed that the existence of the family as the CEO is positively related to performance, supported by two countries, i.e., Indonesian and Taiwan. The study II exhibited that the presence of the family as the CEO is positively associated with performance in the countries with low level of investor protection. Further, the existence of pyramid ownership on the contrary, was positively related to performance in countries with high levels of investor protection as supported by Hong Kong, Malaysia and Singapore, except Indonesia and South Korea.

This result enhanced the previous research and provided better explanation the diversity of the research related to whether family ownership contributes benefits to the performance of the company. The study successfully demonstrated that the supremacy of law in each country as shown by the level of investor protection is the useful factor to distinguish the presence or absence of a family control to the company's performance. It also entailed that the state is not always neutral in the relationship between family ownership and performance.

Barontini and Lorenz (2006) searched 675 companies in eleven countries of Continental Europe. The purpose of the study was to investigate the association of ownership structure, firm value and performance. The study indicated that family ownership structures did not decrease firm value and performance. The existence of family's founder control and the presence of descendant in the board of director were significantly affect firm value and performance. However, if the descendant as CEO, the company's value and performance were not different from non-family corporate ownership. The results are in line with the findings of several previous studies that family ownership is positively related to the performance and firm value. However, care should be taken in interpreting these results due to several factors that have not been

anticipated in the test, such as the level of investor protection as conducted by Jiang and Peng (2011).

Anderson and Reeb (2003) examined the relationship between the family as the founding family, ownership and corporate performance in the 403 companies included in the S&P 500, period 1992 to 1999. The results denoted that the performance of firms with founding family firm is much better than with non-founding family firm. Based on further analysis, it was found that the relationship between the founding family firm performance is nonlinear, family CEO has better performance as compared to non-family CEO. Overall these results reject the agency hypothesis, in other words, family ownership is an effective ownership structure.

On the other hand, Demsetz (1983) argues differently, that concentration of ownership is the result of a decision to maximise the profit made by the shareholders. At this time, therefore there is no effect on firm value. Some research supports Demsetz and Lehn (1985), Himmelberg et al. (1999) and Demsetz and Villalonga (2001). Claessens et al. (2000), specifically stated that Indonesia is a country with concentrated ownership, 16.6% of the total listed companies as a public company controlled by the family as a sole proprietor. Meanwhile, Jiang and Peng (2011) said that the level of rule of law in Indonesia is relatively low at 3.98 and has the lowest corruption index among the countries in the East Asia region, i.e., 2.15, implied that the level of investor protection is very weak. In such condition, the family ownership has a big opportunities to expropriate minority shareholders.

It is therefore interesting to study further in the context of Indonesia where the level of investor protection is weak and corrupt, to prove allegations that family ownership does not have a positive impact on firm value due to agency conflicts between owners actually exist, the latter, this study once wanted to confirm the results research (Jiang and Peng, 2011), that in Indonesia, the presence of family ownership negatively affect performance.

2 Theoretical review and hypotheses development

2.1 Family ownership

The definition of family firm or family ownership is very broad, and is different from research to research. Neubauer and Lank (1998) tried to construct the development concept of family firm from 1975 to 1988, to identify aspects that exist in the family firm, which are controlled by the family, founded by the owners expected later replaced by its successor, the family members will share in the company profit, important decisions and succession planning are influenced by family members and relatives have legal control over the company (Casillas et al., 2007). While Villalonga and Amit (2006) stated that family firm as a company extensively owned by family, including

- 1 one or more family members are as a company's director or board of directors or a majority shareholder
- 2 a company that at least one of its members on the board of commissioners or management

- 3 the company's largest voting rights or number of shares owned by the largest families
- 4 the company's second generation of one or more family members are as management or directors, and so on.

Similar to the Villalonga and Amit (2006) and Casillas et al. (2007), characterise some aspects that are categorised as a family enterprise, namely ownership or control of the company, the family of power beyond the power company, the intention to carry on business to the next generation and involve the next generation in the company.

Family firms have advantages compared with non-family companies, firstly, family firm can overcome the agency problem between owners and management. Berle and Mean (1932) and Fama and Jensen (1983) supports that the presence of family ownership will overcome agency conflict between owners and management, due to the owner has an interest to oversee management to ensure management actions that do not conflict with the interests of owners. Secondly, family firm concern to keep family name, lead the company to act conservatively. Therefore, family firm will tend to avoid to be overly aggressive that can severely damaged family reputation (Harris et al., 2004). Moreover, the family firm is more emphasis on the sustainability of the family enterprise than simply maximising profitability or increase the market price of the securities (Atassiou et al., 2002).

On the other hand, that family ownership may create agency problems between majority shareholders and minority shareholders (Shleifer and Vishny, 1997). Additionally, Sort et al. (2009) found that the family firm has three dimensions of entrepreneurial orientation lower than non-family firms in terms of autonomy, proactiveness and risk taking. Although Sort et al. (2009) did not succeed in proving that the level of aggressiveness in competing and innovativeness different with non-family companies.

2.2 Family ownership in the context of Indonesia

Indonesia is one of the developing countries in the South East Asia, developing a small scale entrepreneurs and characterised by labour-intensive industry. Government shall provide assistance in the form of training, facilities and subsidies to business groups that uniquely grouped into centres of business based on the similarity of economic sectors and geographical areas (Dana, 2007). Furthermore, Dana (2007) explains that historically, Indonesian style in the old entrepreneur usually has more than one accounting, one for personal, one for the shareholders and another one for taxes. Although the next generation has a more open western education with western management style, but corruption remains ongoing in the future. Corruption is common in business and government.

Currently, according to the study of Jiang and Peng (2011), it has confirmed that Indonesia has been recorded as a country with the lowest position of corruption index among other countries in the East Asia region, i.e., 2.15 and also has a low level of law enforcement, i.e., 3.98. On the other hand, Claessens et al. (2000) uncovered that Indonesia is a country with concentrated ownership, in which 16.6% of the public companies controlled by the family as a sole proprietor. In such condition,

therefore, there is a great opportunity for the controlled family to expropriate the minority. ²²

In the Indonesian context, the ownership of the family actually increase the risk of expropriation of the minority shareholders or known as the agency conflict II. It was due to the law environment that remain uncondusive. Eventhough by the enactment of Law 40 of 2007, the rights of minority shareholders has indeed been accommodated, but these rights do not directly reflect a legal protection of minority shareholders. It is recognised that a perfect legal protection to minority interests according to the principles of good corporate governance was still hard to apply in Indonesia (Priyatna, 2012).

¹⁵ 2.3 Family ownership and firm value

A number of studies have show ⁶ that the market appreciates firms with family ownership (Barontino and Caprio, 2005; Villalonga and Amit, 2006; Anderson and Reeb, 2003; Ying and Peng, 2010; Maury, 2006). The results of these studies demonstrated that family ownership structure is positively associated with increased firm value. But Anderson and Reeb (2003) noted that it is occurred, especially in countries that have well-established economic regulation. In countries with a low level of transparency, the presence of family ownership actually cause expropriation risk to minority shareholders. Furthermore, Maury (2006) warns that in countries with a low level of transparency, increased profitability can not be transferred into higher firm value.

Leemon and Lins (2001) revealed that companies' Tobins' Q in Asia where expropriation against minority shareholders exist, has declined an average of more than 12% compared to other companies. Meanwhile Claessens et al. (2000) stated that high expropriation occurred in countries such as Indonesia, the Philippines and Thailand, while in the countries of Malaysia, Singapore and Taiwan, there was evidence of expropriation. As it is known, Malaysia, Singapore and Taiwan have a higher level of investor protection than Indonesia, Philippines and Thailand.

There are two approaches used to explain the possible behaviour chosen by the controlling shareholder (Siregar, 2007) which is a positive incentive effect (PIE) and negative entrenchment effect (NEE). Although both of these approaches are built by assuming the presence of excess control rights, i.e., the difference between control rights and rights dividends (Jensen and Meckling, 1979; Shleifer and Vishny, 1997), but still relevant to be used to explain the possible behaviour of family ownership as the main holder of control. PIE assumed that controlling shareholder has an incentive and huge capacity to observe management intensively, thereby increasing the company's value and lower the cost of equity. The dominant ownership in certain groups ⁵⁸ rove efficiency when large blockholder have a greater incentive to effectively monitor managers (Shleifer and Vishny, 1986). ²²

On the other hand, NEE argue that ⁵⁷ rolling shareholders will take advantage of its large capacity to undertake actions for personal gain at the expense of minority shareholders. Large shareholder ⁷ impact negatively on the value of the company, because they misused his position at the expense of minority shareholders (Stiglitz, 1985; Silanes et al., 1999). It refers to a fundamental problem in the agency theory, where there is conflict of interest between outside investors and controlling shareholders who have complete control of the manager (Shleifer and Vishny, 1997).

With due respect to the results of previous studies that proved market appreciates family ownership (Barontino and Caprio, 2005; Villalonga and Amit, 2006; Anderson

and Reeb, 2003; Ying and Peng, 2010; Maury, 2006), however this study to prove different side of the existence of family ownership based on the context of Indonesia. This research uses NEE argumentation to build hypothesis. NEE, assumed that companies in which legal control held by family will use ⁶⁹r authority to maximise their own interest at the expense of outside ⁵⁶investor, in line to Shleifer and Vishny (1997) that ownership by a tight family creates agency problems between majority shareholders and minority shareholders. The acts of majority to maximise their own interest at the expense of minority will be negatively responded by investor, due to higher risk expropriation in such firms. Then, the higher risk profile of family ownership perceived by investor will decrease firm value. Thus the presence of family ownership negatively associated with firm ³⁷value.

In the context of Indonesia, there are a number of ⁵⁴factors that support that family ownership will be perceived negatively by investors, thus lowering the value of the company, firstly, the low level of investor protection in Indonesia (Priyatna, 2012; Jiang and Peng, 2011), in such condition, the likelihood of the majority shareholder to expropriate minority is very large. Second, according to Anderson and Reeb (2003), Maury (2007) and Jiang and Peng (2011), ownership concentration is only effective to the countries that have established rule of law and being counter-productive for un-transparency countries, otherwise decreasing firm value. The results of some of the previous research, Claessens et al. (2000) and Darmadi (2012) supported that Indonesia as a country with high level of expropriation. Therefore, the low law enforcement in Indonesia provides a conducive condition for family ownership to expropriate minority interest. Lemmon and Lins (2000) also uncovered that companies Tobin's Q in Asia, where expropriation to the minority exist, have experienced a decreasing of firm value as of 12% and above, compared ⁵³the other. This will be perceived negatively by investors, ⁵²by reducing the value of the company. Thus the presence of family ownership negatively associated with firm value. Based on the NEE arguments, then the hypothesis of this study is:

²¹
H₁ Family ownership has a negative impact on firm value.

⁶⁸ 2.4 Control variables

In many studies, the determinant of firm value other than the ownership structure, is the financial performance, company profiles associated with firm size, market share and firm age (Black et al., 2006, 2013; Baek et al., 2004). Black et al. (2006) employed a number of control variables such as market share, leverage and growth as the important determinant of firm value. Wide market share indicates high potential profitability. However, this study uses the changes in operating profit, as a control variable, not market share, since operating earnings more represent the real performance of companies than market share. Companies whose profits increased from time to time will be more attractive and positively appreciated by investors. Another control variable is the leverage. High leverage represents a high risk enterprise. Companies with high leverage will be negatively associated with firm value.

Growth companies will be more interesting to investors, some previous studies support a ³positive association between growth and firm value. Contrarily to prior studies that used research and development ²⁵(R&D) as a proxy of growth (Vilalunga and Amit, 2006; Black et al., 2006, 2013), this study chooses sales as a proxy of growth, because

sales better describe the actual growth experienced by the company and not just the potential for growth.

3 Research methodology

3.1 Model analysis

This study uses regression analysis to examine proposed hypothesis. Regression model is stated as below:

$$TQ_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 FAMONR_{it} + \beta_2 LOBD_{it} + \beta_3 LEV_{it} + \beta_4 SGROWTH_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

TQ_{it} firm value of company I at period t

$\beta_0 \beta_1 \beta_2 \beta_3 \beta_4$ regression coefficient

$FAMONR_{it}$ family ownership of firm I at period t

$LOBD_{it}$ change of operating income of company I at period t

LEV_{it} debt to equity ratio of company I at period t

$SGROWTH_{it}$ growth of company I at period t

ε_{it} error term.

3.2 Operational variables

Variables	Operational definition	Scale
1 Firm value (TQ)	Is the value of the business as an ongoing enterprise. Firm value is measured by Tobin's Q, as follow: $\frac{(\text{Total assets} - \text{Book value of equity}) + \text{Market value of equity}}{\text{Book value of total assets}}$	Ratio
2 Family ownership ($FAMONR$)	Company in which one or more family members act as a chief executive or are in a board of directors and as the majority shareholder (Vilalona and Amit, 2006). Majority shareholder limitation percentage is 10%, referring to Siregar (2007), Claessens (2000) and La Porta (1999), that the 10% ownership level has been quite effective in controlling the company. Companies that meet the above criteria where family members act as the director/board of directors and have a share of at least 10%, given the numbers 1 and 0 otherwise.	Nominal
3 Changes in operating income ($LBOD$)	Operating income is income from the company's main activity which obtained by subtracting operating income to operating expenses. The formula changes in operating income is as follow: $\frac{\text{Operating profit}_{t-1} + \text{Operating profit}_t}{\text{Operating profit}_{t-1}}$ Then, companies that have positive earnings change, given the numbers 1 and 0 otherwise.	Nominal

Variables	Operational definition	Scale
4 Debt to equity ratio (<i>LEV</i>)	Proportion of equity that comes from debt. $\frac{\text{Total debt}}{\text{Total equity}}$	Ratio
5 Growth (<i>SGROWTH</i>)	The potential increased of the company to the next, is measured by the growth of sales: $\frac{\text{Net sales}_{t-1} + \text{Net sales}}{\text{Net sales}_{t-1}}$	

3.3 Sample

Data was obtained from annual reports published in the website Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) and the respective company websites, for companies whose annual report data is not found on IDX sites, whereas the database shareholder obtained from the OSIRIS. This study uses all large cap companies (big capitalisation) in 2008, 2009, 2010 and 2011 based on Fact Book documents published by the Stock Exchange in the years. The selection of companies with large market capitalisation, referring to Anderson and Reeb (2003), Villalonga and Amit (2006) and Jiang and Peng (2011), which uses large companies in their research, in addition, large firms are also more concern to investors and analysts than small companies (Chen and Jian, 2006). Data qualified as sample are as many as 146 observations, which obtained from the following process:

The number of companies entering the big group of capitalisation in 2008 – 2011	200
Companies that do not have complete data needed for the study.	(54)
The number of qualified samples to be processed	146

The data were processed with the aid of SPSS software version 19.

4 Results and discussion

The first classical assumption test on 146 observations, did not meet the four classical assumptions. The test results showed a number of data normality were identified as extreme data (outliers), a total of 37 observations were identified outliers are removed from observation and repeated testing. After dropping all outliers data, the second test against the 105 observations, shows the data meet the assumptions as indicated by multicollinearity VIF of each variable under 10 (Appendix 1). There is no autocorrelation can be seen from the residual value of Durbin Watson for 1.289 is higher than the value of α is set at 0.05 (Appendix 2). The model has also been free of heteroscedasticity, which can be seen from Spearman unstandardised residual values for all variables were above the $\alpha = 0.05$ level (Appendix 3).

However, the data still can not fully meet the assumptions of normality (Appendix 4). One cause of the data does not meet the normal distribution because there are several variables like FAMONR and LBOD as a dummy variable with a value of 0 and 1, so it can not meet the required normality. However, because the number of observations is large enough (> 30), then theoretically meet the normal distribution of data, other than that based on the data plot (box-plot) the data have shown a normal distribution, and the value of R^2 and numbers suitability model (F-test) have shown an increase in compared with the values of these parameters on the initial test.

Profile of 105 observations that have met the classical assumption test and descriptive statistics are presented in Table 1. Panel A shows the sample by industry which dominated by a financial sector that is equal to 26% of the entire sample, and followed by the mining sector as much as 25%. Although the proportion is uneven, almost all industry groups are represented except property sector, real estate and building. The number of observations is also fairly distributed between the family and non-family ownership.

Panel B displays a general descriptive statistics for each variable. Regression analysis was performed on 96 valid observations, because some variables are not available in full at 105 corresponding number of observations. The results of descriptive statistic is presented in Table 1, panel B.

The model summary (Table 2), suggesting a correlation (R) are high among all predictor variables (FAMONR, LOBD, LEV, SGROWTH) with the response variable (TQ) of 0.539. Furthermore, the regression model also showed the adjusted R^2 is quite high at 25.9% 0.259, it means that the changes of TQ variable can be explained by the four predictor variables together. Goodness regression model to the data can be seen from the F value of 9.296 and significant at $\alpha = 0.01$, respectively.

Testing the main hypothesis of this study (Table 2), shows that FAMONR significantly negative effect on the value of the company, at the 10% significance level. It is proven that firm with family ownership is perceived negatively by the market, this result once again consistent with the results of the research of Jiang and Peng (2011), Lemmon and Lins (2001) and Claessens et al. (2000), which found that Indonesia is one of countries with the high-level expropriation where family ownership is negatively related to performance. The majority shareholder entrenchment caused negative effects, which utilises a large capacity to undertake actions for personal gain at the expense of the minority shareholders. This behaviour is possible since the level of investor protection in Indonesia is still very weak (Priyatna, 2012; Jiang and Peng, 2011).

The dominance of family ownership in large-scale enterprises to be inefficient, as investors are aware of the increased risk of expropriation on these companies which resulted in a decrease in the firm value. The movement of large companies more closely followed by investors than small firms (Chen and Jian, 2006). Therefore investors are more sensitive to any possible risks as a result of actions taken by large-scale enterprises, and quickly anticipate such risks in the valuation of the company. These findings, although still preliminary and still need to be further tested its consistency, successfully wrecked the opinion of Demsetz and Lehn (1985), Himmelberg et al. (1999) and Demsetz and Villonga (2001), that the ownership structure is not related to performance and merely the results of the current shareholders' decision to maximise profits.

Control variables prove to affect the value of the company, namely the LBOD and LEV. High operating profit performance is perceived positively by investors, significant at $\alpha = 0.01$. The companies with good earnings performance show positively associated with firm value. In contrast, firms with high leverage indicates a high risk and perceived negatively by investors resulting in a decline in the value of the company, supported by the results of the test that the coefficient is significant at $\alpha = \text{LEV } 0.001$. Meanwhile, growth which proxied by sales, proved not significantly affect the value of the company.

Table 1 Sample profile

Panel A. Industrial sectors and ownership structure					
Industrial sector					
Agriculture	11	10%			
Mining	25	24%			
Basic Industries	13	12%			
Others	3	3%			
Consumer goods	9	9%			
Infrastructure, utilities and transportation	12	11%			
Finance	26	25%			
Investment	6	6%			
	105	100%			
Ownership structure					
Family	50	48%			
Non-family	55	52%			
	105	100%			
Panel B. Descriptive statistic					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. deviation
TQ	104	0.49	7.82	2.1463	1.4223
FAMONR	105	0	1	0.48	0.502
LBOD	101	0	1	0.69	0.464
LEV	105	0.22	12.05	2.9558	3.3471
SGROWTH	97	-0.21	1.03	0.2164	0.2341
Valid N (listwise)	96				

Notes: TQ = (total asset-book value of equity) + market value of equity scaled by book value of assets; FAMONR = dummy variable of family ownership structure, 1 = if family's member is assigned as a Chairman/CEO and has at least 10% of family ownership, 0 otherwise; LBOD = dummy variable of change in operating income, 1 if positive change and 0 otherwise; LEV = total debt to total equity; SGROWTH = changes in net sales.

Table 2 Estimation model

<i>Regression model estimation</i>				
$TQ_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 FAMONR_{it} + \beta_2 LOBD_{it} + \beta_3 LEV_{it} + \beta_4 SGROWTH_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$				
<i>Variable</i>	<i>Predicted sign (+ /-)</i>	<i>Coefficient</i>	<i>t-statistic</i>	<i>Sig</i>
(Constant)		2.476	9.090	.000
FAMONR	-	-.465	-1.741	.085*
LBOD	+	1.041	3.425	.001***
LEV	-	-.209	-4.738	.000***
SGROWTH	+	-.986	-1.571	.120
R		.539		
Adjusted R ²		.259		
F-stat		9.296***		

Notes: ***, *Each significant, at the level 0.01 and 0.1,

TQ = (total asset – book value of equity) + market value of equity scaled by book value of assets; FAMONR = dummy variable of family ownership structure, 1 = if family's member is assigned as a Chairman/CEO and has at least 10% of family ownership, 0 otherwise; LBOD = dummy variable of change in operating income, 1 if positive change and 0 otherwise; LEV = total debt to total equity; SGROWTH = changes in net sales.

5 Conclusions, implication and limitation

This study aims to determine the impact of family ownership on firm value in the context of Indonesia, where the level of investor protection is weak and corrupt, and to confirm the results of research of Jiang and Peng (2011), in particular the results of research that in Indonesia, the presence of family ownership negatively affect performance. A number of control variables are used to examine the determinants of the firm value in addition to the family ownership structure. Control variables used in this study is the change in operating income, which represents the risk and leverage growth proxied by changes in sales.

Research shows that family ownership structure negatively affect the firm value, at a significance level of 10%, consistent with Jiang and Peng (2011), Lemmon and Lins (2001) and Claessens et al. (2000), which found that Indonesia was a country with a high level of expropriation where family ownership was negatively related to performance. The majority shareholder entrenchment causes negative effects, which utilises a large capacity to undertake actions for personal gain at the expense of minority shareholders. In addition it is evident that the change in operating profit significantly positive effect on firm value, whereas negatively affect leverage on firm value, respectively at a significance level 1%. While the growth of the company which is proxied by changes in sales, not shown to affect the value of the company.

However, this study does not exercise control over the level of investor protection as done by Gompers et al. (2003), which uses antitakeover index (GIndex) which is based on entrenchment index (EIndex) by Bebchuk et al. (2009). This study only assume the level of protection against expropriation of investors or existing investors based on the results of previous studies. Future research should incorporate control variables investor

protection index, in order to obtain more accurate results. Besides, future research could compare with companies that do not include a large company, to gain a broader generalisation of the results of the study. Measurement of family ownership structure can be traced by using the ultimate ownership as done by Siregar (2007), not only by ownership immediate as done in this study.

References

- Anderson, R. and Reeb, D. (2003) 'Founding family, ownership and firm performance: evidence from S&P 500', *The Journal of Finance*, June, Vol. 58, No. 3, pp.1301–1329.
- Athanassiou, N., Crittenden, W.F., Kelly, L.M. and Marquez, P. (2002) 'Founder centrality effects on the Mexican family firm's top management group: firm culture, strategic vision and goals and firm performance', *Journal of World Business*, Vol. 37, pp.139–150.
- Baek, J., Kang, J. and Park, K. (2004) 'Corporate governance and firm value: evidence from the Korean financial crisis', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 71, pp.265–313.
- Barontini, R. and Caprio, L. (2006) 'The effect of family control on firm value and performance: evidence from Continental Europe', *European Financial Management*, Vol. 12, No. 5, pp.689–723.
- Black, B., Jang, H. and Kim, W. (2006) 'Does corporate governance affect firm value? Evidence from Korea', *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, Vol. 22, No. 2, pp.366–412.
- Casillas, J.C., Acedo, F.J. and Moreno, A.M. (2007) *International Entrepreneurship in Family Businesses*, Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd, UK.
- Claessens, S., Djankov, S. and Lang, L. (2000) *Expropriation of Minority Shareholders: Evidence from East Asia*, CEI Working Paper Series No. 200-4.
- Claessens, S., Djankov, S., Fan, J. and Lang, L. (2000) 'The separation of ownership and control in East Asia Corporation', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp.81–112.
- Claessens, S., Djankov, S., Fan, J. and Lang, L. (2002) 'Disentangling the incentive and entrenchment effects of large shareholdings', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 57, No. 6, pp.2741–2771.
- Dana, L.P. (2007) 'Asian models of entrepreneurship from the indian union and the kingdom of Nepal to the Japanese archipelago', *Context, Policy and Practice*, World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., USA.
- Darmadi, S. (2013) *Ownership Concentration, Family Control, and Auditor Choice: Evidence from an Emerging Market* [online] <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1999809> (accessed 3 June 2013).
- Demsetz, H. (1983) 'The structure of ownership and the theory of the firm', *Journal of Law and Economics*, Vol. 26, pp.375–390.
- Demsetz, H. and Villalonga, B. (2001) 'Ownership structure and corporate performance', *Journal of Corporate Finance*, Vol. 7, pp.209–233.
- Demsetz, J. and Lehn, K. (1985) 'The structure of corporate ownership: causes and consequences', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 93, No. 6, pp.1155–1177.
- Ficici, A. and Aibar, C. (2012) 'Corporate governance and firm value in emerging markets an empirical review analysis of ADR issuing emerging markets firm', *Emerging Markets Journal*, Vol. 2, pp.37–51.
- Gompers, P., Ishii, J. and Metrick, A. (2003) 'Corporate governance and equity prices', *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, Vol. 118, No. 1, pp.107–155.
- Harris, D., Martinez, J. L. and Ward, J. L. (1994) 'Is strategy different for the family owned business?', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 7, No. 2, pp.159–174.
- Himmelberg, C., Hubbard, R. and Palia, D. (1999) 'Understanding the determinants of managerial ownership and the link between ownership and performance', *Journal of Corporate Finance*, Vol. 53, No. 3, pp.353–384.

- Jensen, M. and Meckling, W. (1979) 'Theory of the firm: managerial behavior, agency cost and ownership structure', *Journal of Law, Economics and Organization*, Vol. 3, pp.305–360.
- Jiang, Y. and Peng, M. (2011) 'Are family ownership and control in Karge firms good, bad or irrelevant', *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, Vol. 28, No. 1, pp.15–36.
- La Porta, R., Silanes, L., Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R. (2000) 'Investor protection and corporate governance', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 58, No. 1, pp.3–27.
- Lemmon, M. and Lins, K. (2001) *Ownership Structure, Corporate Governance and Firm Value: Evidence from the East Asian Financial Crisis*, William Davidson Working Paper No. 393.
- Maury, B. (2006) 'Family ownership and firm performance: empirical evidence from western corporations', *Journal of Corporate Finance*, Vol. 12, No. 2, pp.321–341.
- Priyatna, F. (2012) 'Perlindungan Hukum terhadap Pemegang Saham Minoritas Perseroan Terbatas Terbuka (Legal Protection for Minority Shareholders Public Company)', May 13.
- Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R. (1997) 'Survey of corporate governance', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 52, pp.737–783.
- Shleifer, A. and Vishny, R.W. (1986) 'Large stockholders and corporate control', *Journal of Political Economy*, Vol. 94, No. 3, pp.461–488.
- Short, J.C., Payne, G. T., Brigham, K. H., Lumpkin, G. T. and Broberg, J.C. (1999) 'Family firms and entrepreneurial orientation in publicly trade firms, a comparative analysis of the S&P 500', *Family Business Review*, Vol. 22, No. 1, pp.9–24.
- Silanes, F. L., La Porta, R. and Shleifer, A. (1999) 'Corporate ownership around the world', *Journal of Finance*, Vol. 54, No. 2, pp.471–517.
- Siregar, B. (2007) *Pengaruh Pemisahan Hak Aliran kas dan hak Kontrol Terhadap Deviden (Effect of Cash Flow Rights and the Separation of Control Rights against Dividend)*, National Symposium on Accounting X, Universitas Hassanudin, Makasar.
- Stiglitz, J.E. (1985) 'Credit markets and the control of capital', *Journal of Money, Credit and Banking*, Vol. 17, No. 2, pp.133–152.
- Villalonga, B. and Amit, R. (2006) 'How do family ownership, control and management affect firm value', *Journal of Financial Economics*, Vol. 80, No. 2, pp.385–417.

Appendix 1

Multicollinearity test

		19						
		Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardise d coefficients		Standardise coefficients	t	Sig.	Collinearity statistics	
		B	Std. error	Beta			Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	2.476	.272		9.090	.000		
	FAMONR	-.465	.267	-.158	-1.741	.085	.944	1.059
	LBOD	1.041	.304	.332	3.425	.001	.831	1.203
	LEV	-.209	.044	-.419	-4.738	.000	.997	1.003
	SGROWTH	-.986	.627	-.154	-1.571	.120	.816	1.225

Note: ^aDependent variable: TQ

Appendix 2

Autocorrelation test

	¹⁸ <i>R</i>	<i>R square</i>	<i>Adjusted R square</i>	<i>Std. error of the estimate</i>	<i>Durbin-Watson</i>
1	.539 ^a	.290	.259	1.26929	1.289

Notes: ^aPredictors: (Constant), SGROWTH, LEV, FAMONR, LBOD

Appendix 3

Heteroschedasticity test

			Correlations				
			FAMONR	LBOD	LEV	SGROWTH	Unstandardised residual
Spearman's rho	FAMONR	Correlation coefficient	1.000	.187	.099	.169	-.004
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.	.062	.316	.098	.971
		N	105	101	105	97	96
	LBOD	Correlation coefficient	.187	1.000	-.071	.435**	.013
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.062	.	.482	.000	.898
		N	101	101	101	97	96
	LEV	Correlation coefficient	.099	-.071	1.000	.153	-.007
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.316	.482	.	.136	.947
		N	105	101	105	97	96
	SGROWTH	Correlation coefficient	.169	.435**	.153	1.000	.069
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.098	.000	.136	.	.505
		N	97	97	97	97	96
	Unstandardised residual	Correlation coefficient	-.004	.013	-.007	.069	1.000
		Sig. (2-tailed)	.971	.898	.947	.505	.
		N	96	96	96	96	96

28

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

Appendix 4**2**
Normality test

<i>One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test</i>		<i>FAMONR</i>	<i>LBOD</i>	<i>LEV</i>	<i>SGROWTH</i>	<i>Standardised residual</i>
N		105	101	105	97	96
14 ma parameters ^{a,b}	Mean	.48	.69	2.9858	.2164	.0000000
	Std. deviation	.502	.464	3.34707	.23407	.97872097
Most extreme differences	Absolute	.352	.439	.279	.133	.150
	Positive	.352	.254	.279	.133	.150
	Negative	-.328	-.439	-.204	-.053	-.090
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		3.612	4.413	2.863	1.305	1.471
Asymp. sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.066	.026

Notes: ^aTest distribution is normal.^bCalculated from data.

The negative impact of family ownership

ORIGINALITY REPORT

19%

SIMILARITY INDEX

17%

INTERNET SOURCES

12%

PUBLICATIONS

4%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

www.virtusinterpress.org

Internet Source

2%

2

lib.ibs.ac.id

Internet Source

1%

3

www.emeraldinsight.com

Internet Source

1%

4

mediatum.ub.tum.de

Internet Source

1%

5

www.emerald.com

Internet Source

1%

6

scholarworks.uno.edu

Internet Source

1%

7

Submitted to University of West Florida

Student Paper

1%

8

ideas.repec.org

Internet Source

1%

9

Yi Jiang, Mike W. Peng. "Are family ownership and control in large firms good, bad, or

1%

irrelevant?", Asia Pacific Journal of Management, 2010

Publication

10	espace.curtin.edu.au Internet Source	<1 %
11	repository.unair.ac.id Internet Source	<1 %
12	Submitted to University of Newcastle Student Paper	<1 %
13	sinta3.ristekdikti.go.id Internet Source	<1 %
14	www.scribd.com Internet Source	<1 %
15	www.infobaselearning.com Internet Source	<1 %
16	www.aidea2013.it Internet Source	<1 %
17	inderscience.blogspot.com Internet Source	<1 %
18	www.ijert.org Internet Source	<1 %
19	Submitted to University of Cambridge Student Paper	<1 %

Marcelo Ortiz, Michael Carney, Patricio Duran,

20	Matias Braun, Julio Riutort. "Inheritance tax, shareholder protection, and the market value of family firms: A cross-country analysis", Global Strategy Journal, 2020 Publication	<1 %
21	doczz.net Internet Source	<1 %
22	eprints.bournemouth.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
23	Anaïs Hamelin. "Influence of family ownership on small business growth. Evidence from French SMEs", Small Business Economics, 2012 Publication	<1 %
24	Luis J. Sanz. "THE EFFECTS OF INVESTOR PROTECTION ON THE VENTURE CAPITAL INDUSTRY", Corporate Ownership and Control, 2007 Publication	<1 %
25	theses.dur.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
26	Submitted to Middlesex University Student Paper	<1 %
27	Hyun-Jung Nam, Yohan An. "The Effect of Interlocking Directors Network on Firm Value and Performance: Evidence from Korean-Listed	<1 %

Firms", Global Economic Review, 2017

Publication

-
- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 38 | www.hamline.edu
Internet Source | <1 % |
|----|---|------|
-
- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| 29 | Submitted to University of Huddersfield
Student Paper | <1 % |
|----|--|------|
-
- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 30 | businessperspectives.org
Internet Source | <1 % |
|----|---|------|
-
- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 31 | es.scribd.com
Internet Source | <1 % |
|----|---|------|
-
- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| 32 | Submitted to Santa Clara University
Student Paper | <1 % |
|----|--|------|
-
- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| 33 | Submitted to Hanken School of Economics
Student Paper | <1 % |
|----|--|------|
-
- | | | |
|----|--|------|
| 34 | Kun Tracy Wang, Fiki Kartika, Wanbin Walter Wang, Guqiang Luo. "Corporate social responsibility, investor protection, and the cost of equity: Evidence from East Asia", Emerging Markets Review, 2021
Publication | <1 % |
|----|--|------|
-
- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 35 | id.123dok.com
Internet Source | <1 % |
|----|---|------|
-
- | | | |
|----|---|------|
| 36 | etheses.whiterose.ac.uk
Internet Source | <1 % |
|----|---|------|
-

37	eprints.soton.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
38	International Journal of Organizational Analysis, Volume 23, Issue 4 (2015) Publication	<1 %
39	www.rc-sar.es Internet Source	<1 %
40	Mats Hansson, Eva Liljeblom, Minna Martikainen. "Corporate governance and profitability in family SMEs", The European Journal of Finance, 2011 Publication	<1 %
41	www.ersj.eu Internet Source	<1 %
42	core.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
43	pure.royalholloway.ac.uk Internet Source	<1 %
44	María J. Martínez-Romero, Rubén Martínez-Alonso, Alfonso A. Rojo-Ramírez, Julio Diéguez-Soto. "chapter 13 Understanding Family Firm Profitability Heterogeneity", IGI Global, 2020 Publication	<1 %
45	gatrenterprise.com Internet Source	<1 %

46

Publication

<1 %

47

www.irbrp.com

Internet Source

<1 %

48

libsysdigi.library.illinois.edu

Internet Source

<1 %

49

oer.unn.edu.ng

Internet Source

<1 %

50

Submitted to University of Edinburgh

Student Paper

<1 %

51

archive.org

Internet Source

<1 %

52

researchportal.port.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1 %

53

mafiadoc.com

Internet Source

<1 %

54

journalarticle.ukm.my

Internet Source

<1 %

55

www.cbcbg.me

Internet Source

<1 %

56

sciedu.ca

Internet Source

<1 %

57

hdl.handle.net

Internet Source

<1 %

58	tel.archives-ouvertes.fr Internet Source	<1 %
59	researchbank.rmit.edu.au Internet Source	<1 %
60	www.berr.gov.uk Internet Source	<1 %
61	zombiedoc.com Internet Source	<1 %
62	eprints.usq.edu.au Internet Source	<1 %
63	slidelegend.com Internet Source	<1 %
64	journals.sagepub.com Internet Source	<1 %
65	Anggadwita, Grisna, Hendrati Dwi Mulyaningsih, Veland Ramadani, and M. Yahya Arwiyah. "Women entrepreneurship in Islamic perspective: a driver for social change", International Journal of Business and Globalisation, 2015. Publication	<1 %
66	Ana Isabel Lopes, Isabel Costa Lourenço, Mark T Soliman, Manuel Castelo Branco. "Is the relation between non-controlling interests and	<1 %

parent companies misleading?", Australian
Journal of Management, 2020

Publication

67

Jason L. De Bruin, Nicholas R. Jordan, Paul M. Porter, Sheri C. Huerd. "Soil microbiota effects on rye growth: implications for integration of a rye cover crop into temperate cropping systems", Renewable Agriculture and Food Systems, 2007

Publication

<1 %

68

repository.hkbu.edu.hk

Internet Source

<1 %

69

Management Research Review, Volume 36,
Issue 11 (2013-11-02)

Publication

<1 %

Exclude quotes On

Exclude matches

< 5 words

Exclude bibliography On