Denny Kurnia<sup>1</sup>, Ahmad Firdaus<sup>2</sup>, Deni Sunaryo<sup>3</sup>, Mia Karlina<sup>4</sup> Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Serang Raya e-mail : dennyrahmadhiya@gmail.com

#### ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the effect of Return On Assets, Current Ratio, and Debt to Assets Ratio on company value, which is moderated by Financial Distress and Total Assets Turnover in the food and beverage sub-sector which is listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange for the 2012-2020 period. The data collected is secondary data with the documentation method in the form of the company's annual report. The analytical tool used to test the hypothesis is SPSS 26. The population in this study are companies in the Food and Beverage subsector which are listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange with a total population of 147 companies. The sampling method used in this study used a *purposive sampling technique* in order to obtain 12 companies with a sample of 108 samples. The analysis technique used is multiple linear regression analysis, moderating regression analysis (MRA), partial test, and simultaneous test. The results of the study partially concluded that Return On Assets had no partial effect on the Price Earning Ratio, the Current Ratio had a significant effect on the Price Earning Ratio, and the Debt to Assets Ratio had a significant effect on the Price Earning Ratio. The results of the study simultaneously show that Return On Assets, Current Ratio, and Debt to Assets Ratio have a significant effect on the Price Earning Ratio. In moderation Earning Per Share is able to moderate the relationship between Return On Assets and Current Ratio to Price Earning Ratio, Earning Per Share is not able to moderate the relationship between Debt to Assets Ratio to Price Earning Ratio, Moderating Total Assets Turnover is not able to moderate the relationship between Return On Assets and Current Ratio to Price Earning Ratio, Total Assets Turnover is able to moderate the relationship between Debt to Assets Ratio to Price Earning Ratio. Keywords: Return On Assets, Current Ratio, Debt to Assets Ratio, Price Earning Ratio, Earning Per

Share, Total Assets Turnover

#### PRELIMINARY

In the current era of globalization, the development of the manufacturing industry is very competitive, where the competition makes companies try their best to improve their performance to achieve their goals. The manufacturing industry, especially in the *food and beverage sub-sector*, is the most superior industry in every country, including in Southeast Asia. Especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, which did not only occur in Indonesia, but also in other countries in the Southeast Asia region. The value of the company is very important because it reflects the financial performance that can affect investors' assessment of the company.

Firm value is generally interpreted as investors' perception of the level of success of the company, where high company value will make the market believe in company performance and management performance in managing the company (Sianturi, 2015). The *price earning ratio* proves how much money investors are willing to pay for each dollar of reported profit. This ratio is used to measure how big the comparison is between the value of the company and the profits that the company gets.

The following is data on *price earning ratios* achieved by food and beverage companies listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period which are presented in the table below:

Table 1

Company Value (*Price Earning Ratio*) in the Food and Beverage Sector listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange for the 2012 -2020 period

No	COUNTRY	CODE		PER (%)									
		CODE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020		

Received November 07, 2022; Revised Desember 2, 2022; Accepted Januari 02, 2023 \*Corresponding author, e-mail dennyrahmadhiya@gmail.com

1		INDF	15.77	23.16	15.25	15.31	16.11	16.06	17.40	18.10	20.18
2		ULTJ	10.90	39.82	36.87	21.95	18.12	17.51	18.81	16.58	16.00
3	INDONESIA	BREAD	23.41	32.67	35.15	23.67	19.88	60.77	54.13	55.03	37.80
4		ICBP	20.86	26.70	29.33	26.18	26.48	27.34	26.23	27.04	16.95
5	SINGADODE	DELF	0.82	1.03	0.48	3.00	0.56	0.44	0.41	0.22	0.24
6	SINGAPORE	JPFD	17.73	14.46	16.93	17.57	17.74	18.29	19.63	19.48	18.03
7	DUII IDDINIES	FB	13.68	13.69	12.91	6.03	7.97	19.03	27.89	28.81	32.21
8	FILLIFFINES	URC	22.66	24.15	36.44	32.49	23.56	30.57	29.69	32.28	31.25
9	MALAVSIA	NESM	29.16	28.39	29.18	29.14	28.78	37.47	52.46	51.23	58.93
10	WALAISIA	HSIB	0.20	0.21	0.17	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.19	0.18	0.19
11	THAILAND	TIPCO	12.11	30.87	40.00	7.11	8.17	10.68	- 12.25	17.79	7.15
12		MINT	18.96	18.10	26.86	22.66	23.83	35.86	36.29	17.52	-5.47

Source: Data processed from several sources listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange using Microsoft Excel (2010)

Table 1 shows the company value (*Price Earning Ratio*) of the food and beverage sub-sector listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period, the value of which is increasingly positive, indicating that the company's investment is getting better. According to (Rahmah 2020) If the PER is higher, it will make the company's value rise in front of investors because a high PER will give the view that the company is in good health and shows the company's growth.

*Return On Assets* data achieved by food and beverage companies listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period which is presented in the table below:

 Table 2

 Return On Assets in the Food and Beverage Sector listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange

 2012 -2020 Period

Ν	COUNTRY	CODE				F	ROA (%	)			
0	COUNTRI	CODE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
1		INDF	8.50	5.00	5.99	4.04	6.41	5.85	3.73	6.10	6.70
2		ULTI	14.6	11.5	9.71	14.7	16.7	13.7	11.1	15.6	12.6
-		OLIV	0	6	2.71	8	4	2	4	7	8
3	INDONESIA	BREA	12.3	8 67	8 80	10.0	9.58	2 97	1.63	5 10	3 80
5		D	8	8.07	0.00	0	9.58	2.91	1.05	5.10	5.80
1		ICBP	13.8	11.4	10.1	11.0	12.5	11.2	10.5	14.7	10.4
4		ICDI	0	0	6	1	6	1	1	0	0
5		DELF	0.06	0.18	0.15	0.02	0.11	0.06	0.10	0.11	0.07
6	SINGAPORE	IDED	13.1	18.9	19.0	12.4	0.80	11.5	13.3	7.60	1.20
0		JPFD	0	0	0	0	9.80	0	0	/.00	1.50
7	PHILIPPINE	FB	0.08	0.08	0.09	0.11	0.13	0.19	0.18	0.17	0.12
8	S	URC	0.13	0.17	0.18	0.14	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.07	0.08
9	MALAVSIA	NESM	0.33	0.34	0.30	0.29	0.31	0.31	1.94	0.12	0.11
10	MALAISIA	HSIB	0.22	0.15	0.14	0.21	0.10	0.28	0.20	0.21	0.29
11		TIPCO	3 70	1.90	1 40	17.6	11.9	10.1	-0.40	3 10	7 40
11	THAILAND	1100	5.70	1.70	1.70	0	0	0	-00	5.10	7.40
12		MINT	6.95	7.33	6.55	8.15	6.37	4.77	2.33	4.10	-6.94

e-ISSN: 2963-7643; p-ISSN: 2963-8194, Hal 66-83

Source: Data processed from several sources listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange using Microsoft Excel (2010)

Table 2 displays the *Return On Assets* of the food and beverage sub-sector which are listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period which shows an increase every year. The higher this ratio, the better a company. With a high *ROA ratio*, it will attract investors to invest in the company. The more interested the company is by investors, the more the value of the company will increase according to Kasmir (2017: 203).

*Current Ratio* data achieved by food and beverage companies listed on the Southeast Asia Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period which is presented in the table below:

	the 2012 -2020 period											
No	COUNTRY	CODE					CR (%)					
110	COUNTRI	CODE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	
1		INDF	205.00	167.00	180.74	170.53	150.81	150.27	113.10	127.00	137.00	
2		ULTJ	202.00	246.00	334.46	374.55	484.36	419.19	507.28	444.41	140.34	
3	INDONESIA	BREAD	112.00	114.00	136.64	205.34	296.23	225.86	271.43	170.00	380.00	
4	-	ICBP	272.00	241.00	218.32	232.60	240.68	242.83	202.01	254.00	226.00	
5	SINICADODE	DELF	1.29	2.31	2.32	2.21	1.71	1.49	1.55	1.61	1.75	
6	SINGALORE	JPFD	2.12	2.60	2.78	2.81	2.99	2.87	2.91	2.79	0.94	
7	DHII IDDINIES	FB	1.68	2.15	1.62	1.89	1.73	1.69	1.28	1.45	1.22	
8	FILLIFFINES	URC	1.98	2.27	1.90	2.30	1.70	1.92	1.70	1.86	1.22	
9	MALAVSIA	NESM	0.90	0.87	0.68	0.67	0.65	0.65	0.68	0.86	0.86	
10		HSIB	3.15	2.98	2.50	2.50	3.04	2.26	2.18	1.92	1.80	
11	- THAILAND	TIPCO	0.84	0.70	0.68	0.81	1.13	1.01	0.89	0.68	0.61	
12		MINT	1.15	0.96	0.96	1.46	0.95	1.30	0.87	1.08	1.26	

Table 3
Current Ratio in the Food and Beverage Sector listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange for
the 2012 -2020 period

Source: Data processed from several sources listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange using Microsoft Excel (2010)

Table 3 displays the *Current Ratio* of the food and beverage sub-sector listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period. The higher the company's liquidity, the more funds will be available for the company to finance its operations and investments, so that investor perceptions of company performance will increase and this will further affect on company value According to Kasmir (2016: 134).

*Debt to Asset Ratio* data achieved by food and beverage companies listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period which is presented in the table below:

Table 4	
Debt to Asset Ratio in the Food and Beverage Sector listed on	the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange
2012 -2020 Period	

No	COUNTRY	CODE	DAR (%)										
	COUNTRI		2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020		
1		INDF	0.43	0.51	0.52	0.53	0.47	0.47	0.49	0.44	0.51		
2	INDONESIA	ULTJ	0.31	0.28	0.22	0.21	0.18	0.19	0.16	0.14	0.45		
3		BREAD	0.45	0.57	0.55	0.56	0.51	0.38	0.34	0.34	0.27		
4		ICBP	0.33	0.38	0.40	0.38	0.36	0.36	0.35	0.31	0.51		

5	SINGADORE	DELF	0.73	0.38	0.37	0.38	0.41	0.42	0.43	0.43	0.41
6	SINGAPORE	JPFD	0.28	0.26	0.24	0.20	0.21	0.22	0.21	0.23	0.60
7	PHII IPPINES	FB	0.32	0.47	0.46	0.36	0.36	0.44	0.45	0.42	0.52
8	FHILIFFINES	URC	0.34	0.24	0.28	0.41	0.47	0.45	0.45	0.44	0.44
9	MALAVSIA	NESM	0.61	0.61	0.66	0.72	0.74	0.76	0.77	0.59	0.62
10	MALAYSIA	HSIB	0.25	0.27	0.31	0.32	0.25	0.33	0.34	0.37	0.39
11	THAILAND	TIPCO	0.56	0.54	0.50	0.41	1.39	0.37	0.41	0.41	0.35
12		MINT	0.63	0.55	0.60	0.63	0.62	0.58	0.69	0.66	0.79

Source: Data processed from several sources listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange using Microsoft Excel (2010)

Table 4 displays the *Debt to Asset Ratio* of the food and beverage sub-sector listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period which leads to a comparison between total debt and total assets. In other words, how much of the company's assets are financed by debt or how much does the company's debt affect asset management according to Kasmir (2017: 112).

*Earning Per Share* data achieved by food and beverage companies listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period which is presented in the table below:

Table 5Earning Per Share in the Food and Beverage Sector which is listed on the Southeast Asian StockExchange for the 2012 -2020 period

Ν	COUNTRY	CODE				-	EPS (%)				
0	COUNTRI	CODE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
1		INDE	371.0	285.0	442.5	338.0	472.0	474.7	321.1	559.0	735.0
1		INDI	0	0	0	2	2	5	6	0	0
2		ULTI	122.0	113.0	100.8	179.7	243.1	60.86	52 78	89.00	100.0
2	INDONESIA	OLIS	0	0	9	1	7	00.00	52.70	07.00	0
3		BREA	29.47	31.22	37.26	53.45	55.31	28.84	16.63	49.29	35.98
		D									
4		ICBP	374.0	382.0	446.6	514.6	617.4	325.5	298.8	432.0	565.0
	1		0	0	2	2	5	5	3	0	0
5	SINGAPOR	DELF	4.20	3.40	8.00	0.80	4.30	3.20	3.40	4.60	2.90
6	Е	JPFD	3.22	3.70	4.21	2.73	2.17	2.68	3.33	1.92	0.58
7	PHILIPPINE	FB	17.83	17.38	16.11	21.38	29.00	2.78	2.94	2.95	2.08
8	S	URC	3.70	4.60	5.30	5.68	6.94	4.94	4.18	4.43	4.88
9		NESM	216.0	240.0	235.0	252.0	272.0	275.0	281.0	287.0	235.7
	MALAYSIA	INLOW	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10		HSIB	4.10	4.60	4.80	6.80	6.20	5.60	5.10	4.90	5.00
11	THAILAND TI	TIPCO	0.45	0.23	0.16	2.46	1.69	1.46	-0.60	0.43	1.00
12		MINT	0.94	1.04	1.10	1.60	1.50	1.22	0.93	2.04	-4.71

Source: Data processed from several sources listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange using Microsoft Excel (2010)

Table 5 shows the *Earning Per Share* for the food and beverage sub-sector listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period, which experienced an increase, companies can provide profits to shareholders or if there is a decline, it will provide low profits to shareholders. *Increased EPS* will encourage investors to increase the amount of capital invested in the company, so that the company's value

e-ISSN: 2963-7643; p-ISSN: 2963-8194, Hal 66-83

increases. Which states that EPS is able to moderate the *Return On Assets* and *Current Ratio* according to Rodrigo S (2019) and Rusli Moch (2019).

*Total Asset Turnover* data achieved by food and beverage companies listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period which is presented in the table below

Total Asset Turnover in the Food and Be	verage Sector	Listed on the	Southeast Asian	Stock
Exchange	e 2012 -2020 P	eriod		

Table 6

No	COUNTRY	CODE				TA	гтоо	(%)			
	COUNTRI	CODE	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
1		INDF	0.85	0.74	0.74	0.70	0.81	0.80	0.57	0.80	0.50
2	INDONESIA	ULTJ	1.16	1.23	1.34	1.24	1.11	0.94	0.72	0.94	0.68
3	- INDONESIA	BREAD	0.99	0.83	0.88	0.80	0.86	0.55	0.46	0.71	0.72
4		ICBP	1.22	1.18	1.21	1.20	1.19	1.13	0.87	1.09	0.45
5		DELF	0.39	1.09	1.07	1.05	1.17	1.04	1.13	1.10	1.01
6	SINGAPORE	JPFD	2.10	2.00	1.70	1.60	1.60	1.60	1.60	1.60	0.90
7	PHII IPPINES	FB	1.40	1.37	1.55	1.75	1.67	1.23	1.20	1.17	1.01
8	FILLIFFINES	URC	1.02	1.22	1.19	0.98	0.79	0.85	0.84	0.80	0.76
9	MALAVSIA	NESM	2.39	2.29	2.09	1.94	2.03	2.01	1.94	0.72	0.68
10		HSIB	1.21	1.23	1.16	1.17	1.16	1.23	1.30	1.32	1.43
11	THAILAND	TIPCO	0.90	0.91	1.00	0.70	0.77	0.71	0.60	0.53	0.39
12		MINT	0.64	0.61	0.50	0.49	0.53	0.50	0.29	0.51	0.16

Source: Data processed from several sources listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange using Microsoft Excel (2010)

Table 6 shows the *Total Asset Turnover* of the food and beverage sub-sector listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange in the 2012-2020 period leading to a decline which resulted in the turnover of all assets owned by the company and measuring the amount of sales obtained from each rupiah of assets is used to calculate the effectiveness of using total assets According to Kasmir (2017: 172). That TATO cannot moderate the *Return On Assets* and *Current Ratio* according to Stiyarini (2016).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

## **Definition of Corporate Value**

Firm value is the price that prospective buyers are willing to pay if the company is sold. According to (Suripto, 2015: 3) the success of strategic financial decisions made by company management in order to increase firm value is determined not only by internal factors, but also by external factors, especially macroeconomic conditions.

## Definition of Price Earning Ratio (PER)

*Price Earning Ratio* (PER) indicates how many rupiahs of profit investors are currently willing to pay for their shares, in other words PER is the price for each rupiah of profit. An increase in this ratio indicates that the company's shares are increasingly expensive in relation to net income per share and investors think that the company has a good opportunity to develop. According to Eduardus Tandelilin (2017:387).

## Definition of Return On Assets (ROA)

According to the Indonesian Bankers Association (IBI) (2016: 145) ROA is a ratio used to measure financial performance. ROA depends on the financial ability to generate interest income, control interest costs and other operational efficiencies. ROA is used to measure the efficiency of using assets in generating profits and the main components in generating profits.

Definition of Current Ratio (CR)

*Current ratio* is the ratio that compares the company's current assets with short-term debt. Current assets here include cash, trade receivables, securities, inventories, and other current assets. Meanwhile, short-term debt includes accounts payable, notes payable, bank loans, wages payable, and debts that must be paid immediately.

#### **Definition of Debt To Total Assets Ratio**

According to Kasmir (2017: 112) the Debt To Assets Ratio is the ratio used to see how much a company's assets are funded by debt or how much the company's debt affects asset management.

*Financial Distress* is a condition in which a company's finances are in an unhealthy or critical state. *Financial Distress* has a close relationship with company bankruptcy because financial conditions that have decreased are at risk of bankruptcy (Yeni Yustika, 2015)

#### Total Asset Turnover (TATO) Indicator

The amount of company profits can be influenced by several factors, one of which is *Total Asset Turnover* (TATO). *Total Asset Turnover* (TATO) shows the level of efficiency in using all of the company's assets in producing a certain sales volume (Mufidah & Azizah, 2018). The reason the researcher chose this ratio is to find out the condition of the company in generating sales using assets which will be shown by TATO calculations.

#### **RESEARCH METHODS**

In this study will use quantitative methods. The quantitative method is called the traditional method, because this method has been used for a long time, so it has become a tradition for research. This method as a scientific/scientific method meets scientific principles, namely concrete/empirical, objective, measurable, rational, and systematic. This method is also called the discovery method, because with this method new science and technology can be discovered and developed. This method is called the quantitative method because the research data is in the form of numbers and the analysis uses statistics (Sugiyono, 2017: 7).

The research object to be analyzed is a case study regarding the effect of *return on assets* (X1), *current ratio* (X2), and *debt total assets* (X3) on *price earning ratio* (Y) moderated *by earnings per share* (Z1), total assets turnover (Z2) in food and beverage sub-sector companies listed on the Southeast Asia Stock Exchange for the 2012-2020 period.

This research was conducted at food and beverage sub-sector manufacturing companies listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange for the 2012-2020 period.

The type of data used in this research is secondary data, which comes from the financial reports of companies in the *food and beverage subsector* that are listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange for the 2012-2020 period.

The population in this study were 26 companies in the *food and beverage subsector* listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange, 17 companies on the Singapore Stock Exchange, 24 companies on the Philippines Stock Exchange, 39 companies on the Malaysia Stock Exchange, and 41 companies on the Thailand Stock Exchange. The total population is 147 companies.

The method used in this research is non-*probability sampling* with *purposive sampling*. Purposive sampling is a sampling method based on certain criteria. The research sample was taken based on the following criteria:

*Food and beverage* sub-sector companies listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange for the 2012-2020 period. Companies in the *food and beverage* subsector that provide complete financial reports and are in accordance with the variables studied during the observation period from 2012-2020.

#### **RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

## **Testing and Results of Data Analysis Descriptive Statistics Test**

Descriptive statistical measurements were carried out on research variables consisting of Return On Assets (ROA), Current Ratio, Debt to Assets Ratio (DAR), Price Earning Ratio (PER), and Earning Per Share (EPS) and Total Assets Turnover (TATO). ). Table 7 below shows the minimum value, maximum value, mean value and standard deviation of each variable.

			Descriptiv	ve Statistical	Test Result	S						
	Descriptive Statistics											
							std.					
	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Me	ans	Deviation	Variances				
	Statistics	Statistics	Statistics	Statistics	Statistics	std. Error	Statistics	Statistics				
ROA	108	25.94	-6.94	19.00	5.1272	.54625	5.67685	32,227				
CR	108	506.67	.61	507.28	80.6674	12.26964	127.50984	16258.761				
DAR	108	1.25	.14	1.39	.4369	.01682	.17481	.031				
PER	108	73.02	-12.25	60.77	20.1720	1.39122	14.45799	209,033				
EPS	108	739.71	-4.71	735.00	110.4033	16.66447	173.18224	29992089				
TATTO	108	2.23	.16	2.39	1.0630	.04385	.45572	.208				
0												
Valid N	108											
(listwise)												

Table 7

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

Based on table 7 above, an explanation regarding the results of the descriptive statistical test is described as follows:

## Return On Assets (ROA)

From Table 7 it can be seen that the variable Return On Assets (ROA) has a minimum value of -6.94 and a maximum value of r 19.00. The lowest value is owned by the company Minor International Public Company Ltd (Thailand). in 2020, the highest value was owned by the company Japan Foods Holding Ltd (Singapore) in 2014. The mean (average) value was 5.1272 and the standard deviation value was 5.67685 with 108 observational data.

## Current Ratio (CR)

From Table 7 it can be seen that the Current Ratio (CR) variable has a minimum value of 0.61 and a maximum value of r 507.28. The lowest value is owned by the company Tipco Foods Public Company Ltd (Thailand). in 2020, the highest value was owned by the company Ultrajaya Milk Industry & Trading Company Tbk (Indonesia) in 2018. The mean (average) value was 80.6674 and the standard deviation value was 127.50984 with 108 observational data.

## Debt To Assets Ratio (DAR)

From Table 7 it can be seen that the Debt To Assets Ratio (DAR) variable has a minimum value of 0.14 and a maximum value of 1.39. The lowest score was owned by the company Ultrajaya Milk Industry & Trading Company Tbk (Indonesia) in 2019, the highest score was owned by the company Tipco Foods Public Company Ltd (Thailand). in 2016. The mean (average) value is 0.4369 and the standard deviation value is 0.17481 with 108 observational data.

## **Price Earning Ratio (PER)**

From Table 7 it can be seen that the Price Earning Ratio (PER) variable has a minimum value of -12.25 and a maximum value of r 60.77. The lowest score was owned by the company Tipco Foods Public Company Ltd (Thailand). In 2018, the highest score was owned by the company Nippon Indosari Corpindo Tbk (Indonesia). in 2017. The mean (average) value is 20.1720 and the standard deviation value is 14.45799 with 108 observational data.

#### **Earning Per Share (EPS)**

From Table 7 it can be seen that the *Earning Per Share* (EPS) variable has a minimum value of – 4.71 and a maximum value of r 735,000. The lowest score belongs to the company Minor International Public Company Ltd (Thailand)..in 2020, the highest score belongs to the company Indofood Sukses Makmur Tbk (Indonesia ). in 2020. The mean (average) value is 110.4033 and the standard deviation value is 173.18224 with 108 observational data.

#### Total Asset Turnover (TATO)

From Table 7 it can be seen that the *Total Asset Turnover* (TATO) variable has a minimum value of 0.16 and a maximum value of r 2.39. The lowest score belongs to the company Minor International Public Company Ltd (Thailand)..in 2020, the highest score belongs to the company Nestle Berhad (Malaysia). in 2012. The mean (average) value is 1.0630 and the standard deviation value is 0.45572 with 108 observational data.

#### Normality test

The normality test aims to test whether in the regression model, the dependent variable has a normal distribution or not. By testing the normality of the residuals, there are two kinds, namely the probability plot and the non-parametric Kolmogorov-Smirnov (KS) statistical test. If the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test show a significant value, which is above 0.05, it can be said that the residual data is normally distributed. However, if the results of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test show a value below 0.05, then the residual data is said to be not normally distributed.

One sample Kolgomorov Smirnov					
One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test					
		Unstandardized			
		Residuals			
N		108			
Normal Parameters <sup>a,b</sup>	Means	.0000000			
	std. Deviation	13.63226925			
Most Extreme Differences	absolute	.066			
	Positive	056			
	Negative	066			
Test Statistics		.066			
asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.200 <sup>c,d</sup>			
a. Test distribution is Norm	nal.				
b. Calculated from data.					
c. Lilliefors Significance C	orrection.				
d. This is a lower bound of	the true signification	ance.			

Table 8 Normality Test Results One sample Kolgomorov Smirnov

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

If seen from table 8 there are 108 samples included for testing with the Kolgomorov-Smirnov method, after testing the results show a value above 0.05, namely 0.200, which means the value is normal distribution.

## Figure 1 Histogram Normality Test Results



Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

The results of the histogram normality test in Figure 9 provide a distribution pattern with a graph that forms a bell, this means that the normality test is fulfilled or the data is normally distributed.



Figure 2 P-Plot Normality Test Results

In Figure 10 the results of the normality test show that the points spread and follow the direction of the diagonal line, so the data is normally distributed.

## **Autocorrelation Test**

The autocorrelation test aims to test whether in the linear regression model there is a correlation between the errors in the use of the t period and the confounding errors in the t-1 (previous) period. The regression model that is categorized as good is a regression that is free from autocorrelation.

	Table 9								
	Autocorrelation Test Results								
	Summary Model <sup>b</sup>								
	Adjusted R std. Error of the								
Model	R	R Square	Square	Estimate	Durbin-Watson				
1	.333 ª	.111	085	13.82749	2033				
a. Predictors: (Constant), DAR, ROA, CR									
b. Depen	dent Variab	le: PER							

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

Autocorrelation test results show a durbin watson (DW) value of 2.033 which indicates that the DW value is between (1.7437) to 4-du(2.2563). The DW value is not in the area where there is autocorrelation or there is no autocorrelation symptom.

#### **Heteroscedasticity Test**

Heteroscedasticity is a condition where the confounding variables do not have the same variance. This test is intended to determine whether there is a deviation from the model because the variance of the disturbance differs from one observation to another. Testing of heteroscedasticity is carried out by plotting residuals by looking at the distribution of residuals for each observation of the predicted value of Y. If it is found that the residual plots form a certain pattern, symptoms of heteroscedasticity occur. The results of the heteroscedasticity test can be shown in the following figure:



Figure 3 Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Based on Figure 3 above, it can be seen that in both regression models the data spreads both above and below point 0 and does not form a specific pattern. Thus the regression model proposed in this study does not show symptoms of heteroscedasticity.

#### **Multicollinearity Test**

The multicollinearity test aims to test whether in the regression model a correlation is found between the independent (independent) variables. A good regression model should not have a correlation between the independent variables. A good regression model should not have a correlation between the independent variables. The multicollinearity test can be seen from the Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) values.

			Municon	intearity rest Ke	suits					
	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
				Standardized						
Unstandardized Coefficients				Coefficients			Collinearity	Statistics		
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.	tolerance	VIF		
1	(Constant)	8,489	4,400		1929	056				
	ROA	085	.288	033	293	.770	.668	1,497		
	CR	038	013	.338	2,926	.004	.640	1,562		
	DAR	20,655	8,216	.250	2,514	013	.866	1.154		
a. Depe	ndent Variable	: PER								

Table 10
Multicollinearity Test Results

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

e-ISSN: 2963-7643; p-ISSN: 2963-8194, Hal 66-83

Based on table 10 it can be concluded that the results are met because each variable has a greater tolerance value >0.10 and a VIF value below <10. This means that there are no symptoms of multicollinearity.

#### Moderating Regression Analysis (MRA)

*Moderating Regression Analysis* (MRA) aims to find out whether the moderating variable will strengthen or weaken the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable.

# Model 1 (*Earning Per Share is able to* moderate the effect of *Return On Assets* (ROA) on the Price Earning Ratio)

Y = a1 + b1x1(ROA)

Y = a1 + b1x1 + b2Z(EPS)

Y = a1 + b1x1 + b2ZX(EPS) + b3x1\*Z

a. If equations (2) and (3) are not significantly different or b3 = 0 (not significant);  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is not a moderator variable

b. If equations (1) and (2) are not different but different from equation (3), b2 = 0 (not significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is the pure moderator variable

c. If equations (1), (2) and (3) are all significant,  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is a quasi moderator variable

#### The results of the model hypothesis 1

Hypothesis : EPS moderates the effect of ROA on PER.

# Table 11Regression Results Model 1

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
				Standardized					
		Unstandardized	d Coefficients	Coefficients					
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.			
1	(Constant)	17,901	1938		9,238	.000			
	ROA	083	.252	.033	.331	.741			
	EPS	.017	008	.200	2019	046			
D	1 4 3 7 . 11	DED							

a. Dependent Variable: PER

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

#### Table 12

#### Results of Moderating Regression Analysis (MRA) Model 1

	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
				Standardized						
		Unstandardize	d Coefficients	Coefficients						
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.				
1	(Constant)	16.104	2035		7,912	.000				
	ROA	.440	.287	.173	1,531	.129				
	EPS	.049	.016	.593	3.133	002				
	X1Z1	004	002	504	-2,416	.017				
a. Depe	ndent Variabl	e: PER								

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

From the two table model 1 above, we get the results of the effect of EPS (Z 1) on PER (Y) in the first output ( significant ) because the sig. 0.046 < 0.05 and the interaction effect of MRA 1 ( ROA \* EPS ) on the second output is significant because of the sig. 0.017 < 0.05, it can be stated that in model 1 EPS (Z 1) is the moderator variable.

# Model 2 ( *Earning Per Share is able to* moderate the effect of the *Current Ratio (CR)* on the Price Earning Ratio)

$$\begin{split} Y &= a2 + b1x2(\ CR\ ) \\ Y &= a2 + b1x2 + b2Z(\ EPS\ ) \\ Y &= a2 + b1x2 + b2ZX(\ EPS\ ) + b3x2*Z \end{split}$$

a. If equations (2) and (3) are not significantly different or b3 = 0 (not significant);  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is not a moderator variable

b. If equations (1) and (2) are not different but different from equation (3), b2 = 0 (not significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is the pure moderator variable

c. If equations (1), (2) and (3) are all significant,  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is a quasi moderator variable

Table 13

## The results of the model hypothesis 2

Hypothesis : EPS moderates the effect of CR on PER.

		Mode	el 2 Regression	Results					
	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>								
				Standardized					
		Unstandardized	d Coefficients	Coefficients					
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.			
1	(Constant)	17,361	1696		10,234	.000			
	CR	.020	012	.174	1,660	.100			
	EPS	011	.009	.132	1,261	.210			
a. Depe	ndent Variabl	e: PER							

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

Table 14

## Results of Moderating Regression Analysis (MRA) Model 2

	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
				Standardized						
		Unstandardize	d Coefficients	Coefficients						
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.				
1	(Constant)	15,294	1,644		9.305	.000				
	CR	058	014	.514	4,100	.000				
	EPS	.065	.015	.783	4,346	.000				
	X2Z1	.000	.000	934	-4,288	.000				
a Dene	ndent Variabl	e· PFR								

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

From the two model tables 2 above, we get the results of the effect of EPS (Z 1) on PER (Y) in the first output (not significant) because the sig. 0.210 > 0.05 and the effect of the interaction of MRA 2 (CR \* EPS) on the second output is significant because of the sig. 0.000 < 0.05, it can be stated that in model 2 **EPS (Z 1) is the Moderator variable.** 

Model 3 ( *Earning Per Share is able to* moderate the effect of the *Debt To Assets Ratio (DAR)* on the **Price Earning Ratio**) Y = a3 + b1x3(DAR)

Y = a3 + b1x3 + b2Z(EPS)

Y = a3 + b1x3 + b2ZX(EPS) + b3x3\*Z

a. If equations (2) and (3) are not significantly different or b3 = 0 (not significant);  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is not a moderator variable

b. If equations (1) and (2) are not different but different from equation (3), b2 = 0 (not significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is the pure moderator variable

c. If equations (1), (2) and (3) are all significant,  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is a quasi moderator variable

## The results of the model hypothesis 3

Hypothesis : EPS moderates the effect of DAR on PER.

			Table 15						
	Model 3 Regression Results								
	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>								
				Standardized					
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Coefficients					
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.			
1	(Constant)	13,903	3,725		3,733	.000			
	DAR	10.186	7,865	.123	1,295	.198			
	EPS	.016	008	.197	2074	040			
D	1 4 3 7 1 1	DED							

a. Dependent Variable: PER

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing Table 16

	Results of Moderating Regression Analysis (MRA) Model 3									
	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
				Standardized						
		Unstandardized	d Coefficients	Coefficients						
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.				
1	(Constant)	16,567	4,255		3,893	.000				
	DAR	3,930	9,235	048	.426	.671				
	EPS	023	032	272	720	.473				
	X3Z1	086	.067	.498	1,282	.203				
a Dene	ndent Variabl	e PFR								

Dependent Variable: PER

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

From the two model tables 3 above, we get the results of the effect of EPS (Z 1) on PER (Y) in the first output ( significant ) because the sig. 0.040 < 0.05 and the interaction effect of MRA 3 ( DAR \* EPS ) on the second output is not significant because the sig. 0.203 > 0.05, it can be stated that in model 3 EPS (Z 1) is not a moderator variable.

# Model 4 (*Total Assets Turnover is able to* moderate the effect of *Return On Assets (ROA)* on the Price Earning Ratio)

Y = a3 + b1x3(ROA)

Y = a3 + b1x3 + b2Z(TATTOO)

Y = a3 + b1x3 + b2ZX(TATTOO) + b3x3\*Z

a. If equations (2) and (3) are not significantly different or b3 = 0 (not significant);  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is not a moderator variable

b. If equations (1) and (2) are not different but different from equation (3), b2 = 0 (not significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is the pure moderator variable

c. If equations (1), (2) and (3) are all significant,  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is a quasi moderator variable

### The results of the hypothesis model 4

Hypothesis: TATO moderates the effect of ROA on PER.

## Table 17

	Model 4 Regression Results									
	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
				Standardized						
		Unstandardized	d Coefficients	Coefficients						
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.				
1	(Constant)	19,796	3,770		5,251	.000				
	ROA	.221	.248	087	.894	.373				
	TATTOO	714	3,084	023	231	.817				
. D	a dant Vaniahl									

a. Dependent Variable: PER

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

#### Table 18

#### Results of Moderating Regression Analysis (MRA) Model 4

	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>									
				Standardized						
		Unstandardize	d Coefficients	Coefficients						
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.				
1	(Constant)	18,095	4,649		3,892	.000				
	ROA	.610	.667	.240	.915	.362				
	TATTOO	.716	3,840	.023	.187	.852				
	X1Z2	331	.526	171	629	.531				
a. Deper	ndent Variabl	e: PER								

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

From the two model tables 4 above, the results of the effect of TATO (Z 2) on PER (Y) in the first output (not significant) are obtained because the sig. 0.817 > 0.05 and the interaction effect of MRA 4 (ROA \* TATO) on the second output a is not significant because the value is sig. 0.531 > 0.05, it can be stated that in model 4 TATO (Z 2) is not a Moderator variable.

Model 5 (*Total Assets Turnover is able to* moderate the influence of the *Current Ratio (CR)* on the Price Earning Ratio)

Y = a2 + b1x2(CR)

Y = a2 + b1x2 + b2Z (TATTOO)

Y = a2 + b1x2 + b2ZX(TATTOO) + b3x2\*Z

a. If equations (2) and (3) are not significantly different or b3 = 0 (not significant);  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is not a moderator variable

b. If equations (1) and (2) are not different but different from equation (3), b2 = 0 (not significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is the pure moderator variable

c. If equations (1), (2) and (3) are all significant,  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is a quasi moderator variable

## The results of the model hypothesis 5

Hypothesis: TATO moderates the effect of CR on PER.

## Table 19

## Model 5 Regression Results

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>

e-ISSN: 2963-7643; p-ISSN: 2963-8194, Hal 66-83

				Standardized				
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Coefficients					
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.		
1	(Constant)	17,231	3,788		4,549	.000		
	CR	.027	011	.237	2,448	.016		
	TATTOO	.731	3,065	.023	.239	.812		
a. Deper	a. Dependent Variable: PER							

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

Table 20
Results of <i>Moderating Regression Analysis</i> (MRA) Model 5

	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>							
				Standardized				
		Unstandardized	d Coefficients	Coefficients				
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.		
1	(Constant)	15,853	3,995		3,968	.000		
	CR	.069	040	.606	1,700	092		
	TATTOO	1902	3,250	.060	.585	.560		
	X2Z2	043	040	379	-1,077	.284		
a. Deper	ndent Variabl	e: PER						

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

From the two model tables 5 above, the results of the effect of TATO (Z 2) on PER (Y) in the first output (not significant) are obtained because the sig. 0.812 > 0.05 and the effect of the MRA interaction is 5 (ROA \* TATO) on the second output a is not significant because the sig. 0.284 > 0.05, it can be stated that in model 5 **TATO (Z 2) is not a Moderator variable.** 

# Model 6 (*Total Assets Turnover is able to* moderate the effect of *Debt To Total Assets Ratio (DAR)* on Price Earning Ratio)

Y = a3 + b1x3(DAR)

Y = a3 + b1x3 + b2Z(TATTOO)

Y = a3 + b1x3 + b2ZX(TATTOO) + b3x3\*Z

a. If equations (2) and (3) are not significantly different or b3 = 0 (not significant);  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is not a moderator variable

b. If equations (1) and (2) are not different but different from equation (3), b2 = 0 (not significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is the pure moderator variable

c. If equations (1), (2) and (3) are all significant,  $b2 \neq 0$  (significant);  $b3 \neq 0$  (significant) then Z is a quasi moderator variable

Table 21

## The results of the hypothesis model 6

Hypothesis: TATO moderates the effect of DAR on PER.

	Model 6 Regression Results							
	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>							
Standardized								
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Coefficients				
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.		
1	(Constant)	14,938	5,427		2,752	007		
	DAR	11,749	8,111	.142	1,449	.150		
	TATTOO	095	3,111	003	.030	.976		
a. Depei	ndent Variable	e: PER						

			Table 22					
	<b>Results of <i>Moderating Regression Analysis</i> (MRA) Model 6</b>							
			Coefficients	a				
				Standardized				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Coefficients				
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.		
1	(Constant)	44,412	10,666		4,164	.000		
	DAR	-43,211	19,022	522	-2,272	.025		
	TATTOO	-25,906	8,737	817	-2,965	.004		
	X3Z2	49,187	15,534	1006	3.166	002		
a. Dep	endent Variab	le: PER						

#### Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

#### Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

From the two model tables 6 above, the results of the effect of TATO (Z 2) on PER (Y) in the first output (not significant) are obtained because the sig. 0.976 > 0.05 and the effect of the interaction of MRA 6 (DAR \* TATO) on the second output is significant due to the sig. 0.002 < 0.05, it can be stated that in model 6 **TATO (Z 2) the Moderator variable.** 

#### **Hypothesis testing**

#### **Determination Coefficient Test (R2)**

The coefficient of determination is used to determine how much the independent variable is capable of explaining the dependent variable. The determination value is determined by the Adjusted R Square value. The value of this coefficient is between 0 and 1, if the results are closer to 0 it means that the ability of the variables is very limited. But if the results are close to number 1, it means that the independent variables provide almost all the information needed to predict the variation of the dependent variable.

Table 23

<b>Determination Coefficient Test Results</b>								
Summary models								
			Adjusted R	std. Error of the				
Model	R	R Square	Square	Estimate				
1	.333 ª	.111	085	13.82749				
a. Predictors: (Constant), DAR, ROA, CR								

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

Based on the table above, the PER variable is influenced by all ROA, CR and DAR variables by 85 %, the remaining 15% is influenced by other variables outside this study such as debt and interest rates. **Multiple Linear Regression Analysis Test** 

To determine the effect of the independent variable debt to asset ratio (DAR), cash flow, and managerial ownership on financial distress as the dependent variable, it is analyzed using multiple linear regression.

			Table	24					
	Multiple Linear Regression Test Results								
	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>								
				Standardized					
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Coefficients					
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.			
1	(Constant)	8,489	4,400		1929	056			
	ROA	085	.288	033	293	.770			

e-ISSN: 2963-7643; p-ISSN: 2963-8194, Hal 66-83

	CR	038	013	.338	2,926	.004
	DAR	20,655	8,216	.250	2,514	013
Dana	ndont Variable	DED				

a. Dependent Variable: PER

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

Based on the table above, the regression equation can be compiled:

 $\mathbf{Y} = \alpha + \beta_1 X_1 + \beta_2 X_2 + \beta_3 X_3 + \mathbf{e}$ 

Y = 8.489-0.085ROA + 0.038CR + 20.655DAR + e

From the regression equation that has been compiled above, it can be interpreted as follows:

1. The value of  $\beta 0$  or a constant of 8.489 indicates that if the independent variable is zero (0) or omitted, then the PER is 8.489.

2. ROA coefficient is -0.085 indicating that for each decrease in ROA by one unit, it will be followed by a decrease in PER of -0.085.

3. CR coefficient of 0.038 indicates that for every addition of CR by one unit, it will be followed by an increase in the PER value of 0.038.

4. DAR coefficient of 20.655 indicates that for each addition of one unit of DAR, it will be followed by an increase in the PER value of 20.655.

## Individual Parameter Significance Test (Statistical Test t)

The t test serves to test the effect of each independent variable, namely Debt to Asset Ratio (DAR), cash flow and managerial ownership on financial distress. The degree used is 0.05. If the significance value is less than the degree of confidence, then we accept the alternative hypothesis, which states that an independent variable partially affects the dependent variable. The results of the t test can be seen in the table below:

	individual l'allameter Significance Test (Statistical Test t)								
	Coefficients <sup>a</sup>								
				Standardized					
		Unstandardize	d Coefficients	Coefficients					
Model		В	std. Error	Betas	t	Sig.			
1	(Constant)	8,489	4,400		1929	056			
	ROA	085	.288	033	293	.770			
	CR	038	013	.338	2,926	.004			
	DAR	20,655	8,216	.250	2,514	013			
a. Depe	ndent Variabl	e: PER							

 Table 25

 Individual Parameter Significance Test (Statistical Test t)

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

Based on the results of the t test calculations, it shows that the calculated t value is smaller than t table in hypothesis 1, namely -0.293 < 1.98326 while in hypotheses 2 & 3 the t count is greater than t table (2.926 and 2.514 > 1.98326) the significance value is smaller of 0.05 in hypotheses 2 & 3 (0.004 and 0.013 < 0.05) means that hypotheses 2 & 3 are accepted/supported, while hypothesis 1 has a significant value greater than 0.05, namely 0.770, meaning hypothesis 1 is not accepted/not supported.

## Simultaneous Significant Test (Test F)

The F test was conducted to test whether the model used in this study was a feasible model or not. The F test is used to determine whether the independent variables simultaneously have a significant effect on the dependent variable. The degree of confidence used is 0.05. If the calculated F value is greater than the F value according to the table, then the alternative hypothesis states that all independent variables simultaneously have a significant effect on the dependent variable. In the table it can be seen the results of the F test carried out.

	ANOVA <sup>a</sup>							
Model		Sum of Squares	df	MeanSquare	F	Sig.		
1	Regression	2481,822	3	827,274	4,327	.006 <sup>b</sup>		
	residual	19884.748	104	191,199				
	Total	22366.570	107					
a. Depe	a. Dependent Variable: PER							
b. Predi	ictors: (Constar	nt), DAR, ROA, C	CR					

Simultaneous Significant Test (Test F)

Source: Results of IBM SPPS V2 6 data processing

Based on the table above, the F test results show that the calculated F value is smaller than the F table value, namely 4.327 < 2.69 and its significance value is smaller than 0.05 (0.006 < 0.05). meaning that all variables ROA, CR and DAR have a significant effect simultaneously on the PER variable.

## 4.3 Discussion of Data Analysis Results (Hypothesis Proof)

Table 27Hypothesis Testing Results

No	hypothesis	Results	Accepted/Rejected
H1	Return On Assets (ROA) has a positive effect on the Price Earning Ratio	Value of t = -293 with sig 0.77 > 0.05	Rejected
H2	<i>Current Ratio</i> (CR) has a positive effect on the Price Earning Ratio	The value of t = 2.926 with sig 0.04 <0.05	Be accepted
H3	Debt to Assets Ratio (DAR) has a positive effect on the Price Earning Ratio	The value of t = 2.514 with sig 0.013 <0.05	Be accepted
H4	Return On Assets (ROA), Current Ratio (CR), Debt to Assets Ratio (DAR) have a positive effect on the Price Earning Ratio	F value = 4.327 with as big sig 0.006 < 0.05	Be accepted
Н5	Earning Per Share is able to moderate the effect of <i>Return On Assets</i> (ROA) on the Price Earning Ratio	Value of t = -2.416 with sig 0.017 <0.05	Be accepted
H6	Earning Per Share is able to moderate the effect of the <i>Current Ratio</i> (CR) on the Price Earning Ratio	Value of t = -4.288 with sig 0.000 <0.05	Be accepted
H7	Earning Per Share is able to moderate the influence of the <i>Debt to Assets Ratio</i> (DAR) on the Price Earning Ratio	The value of t = 1.282 with sig 0.203 > 0.05	Rejected
H8	Total Assets Turnover is able to moderate the effect of <i>Return On Assets</i> (ROA) on the Price Earning Ratio	Value t = -0.629 with sig 0.531> 0.05	Rejected
Н9	Total Assets Turnover is able to moderate the influence of the <i>Current Ratio</i> (CR) on the Price Earning Ratio	Value of t = -1.077 with sig 0.284 > 0.05	Rejected

e-ISSN: 2963-7643; p-ISSN: 2963-8194, Hal 66-83

	Total Assets Turnover is able to moderate the	The value of $t =$	
H10	influence of the Debt to Assets Ratio (DAR) on the	3.166 with sig 0.002	Be accepted
	Price Earning Ratio	< 0.05	

Source: Data processed in 2022

## Effect of Return On Assets (ROA) on Price Earning Ratio (H1)

The first hypothesis is to determine whether there is an effect of *Return On Assets* (ROA) on the Price Earning Ratio. From table 4.24, the t <sub>count</sub> is -293 and the t <sub>table</sub> value is 1.98326. Its significance value is 0.77. So it can be concluded that Ha is rejected and Ho is accepted, namely the variable *Return On Assets* (ROA) to the Price Earning Ratio in other words H1 has no effect.

The results of the I Made Adi Gunawan test are not in line with the test results of Rusli Moch (2019), Thomas Avero (2020) with the results of previous research stating that return on assets does not affect the price earning ratio. This shows that a high return on asset variable is unable to guarantee the ability the company makes a profit. Therefore, the size of the company's return on assets does not have a high impact. In addition, for investors who want to see the condition of a company in a state of financial distress, there is no need to take return on assets as a consideration. This is because the level of financial distress has no effect on the size of the return on assets.

## Effect of Current Ratio (CR) on Price Earning Ratio (H2)

The second hypothesis is to find out whether there is an effect of the *Current Ratio* on the Price Earning Ratio. From table 4.24, the t <sub>count</sub> is 2.926 and the t <sub>table</sub> value is 1.98326. The significance value is 0.04. So it can be concluded that Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected, namely the *Current Ratio variable* has a significant effect on the Price Earning Ratio.

This is inversely proportional to research conducted by Rusli Moch (2019) and Thomas (2022) which say that the current ratio has a negative effect on the price earning ratio. This shows that the current ratio has decreased, which means the company is unable to meet its current liabilities with the company's current assets. The lower the liquidity ratio, the higher the value of the company's price earning ratio. This happens because the company has the opportunity to grow properly by using its funds to pay off short-term debt.

## Effect of Debt to Assets Ratio (DAR) on Price Earning Ratio (H3)

The third hypothesis is to find out whether there is an effect of the *Debt to Assets Ratio* on the Price Earning Ratio. From table 4.24, the t <sub>count</sub> is 2.514 and the t <sub>table</sub> value is 1.98326. Its significance value is 0.013. So it can be concluded that Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected, namely the *Debt to Assets Ratio variable* has a significant effect on the Price Earning Ratio.

The results of testing Ardina (2018) and Rusli Moch (2019) with the results of previous research state that the *Debt to Assets Ratio* has an effect on the price earning ratio. This can be interpreted that the company has a dependency on capital from outside parties, so that the burden that will be borne by the company will also be higher. If a company bears a debt burden with a high value, it can be interpreted that investors are willing to pay for their shares.

# *Effect of Return On Assets* (ROA), *Current Ratio* (CR), *Debt to Assets Ratio* (DAR) has a positive effect on the Price Earning Ratio

The fourth hypothesis is to find out whether there is a positive effect of *Return On Assets* (ROA), *Current Ratio* (CR), *Debt to Assets Ratio* (DAR) on the Price Earning Ratio. Based on table 4.24. obtained f <sub>count</sub> of 4.327 smaller than the value of f <sub>table</sub> of 2.69. So it can be concluded that Ha is accepted and Ho is rejected simultaneously with the variables *Return On Assets* (ROA), *Current Ratio* (CR), *Debt to Assets Ratio* (DAR) have a positive effect on the Price Earning Ratio.

The results of testing Ardina (2018), Rodrigo (2019), and Rusli Moch (2019) This is also supported by the signal theory that if the size of the company's return on assets does not have an impact on height. *Current Ratio* which has a low value can cause an increase in the Price Earning Ratio. Because it can be interpreted as the company's ability to meet its short-term obligations. If a company has a high *Debt To* 

*Assets Ratio*, it can be interpreted that the company is dependent on capital from outsiders, resulting in a higher burden on the company. If a company bears a debt burden with a high value, it can be interpreted that exceeding the company's own capital will cause an increase in the Price Earning Ratio. Earnings per share shows the company's ability to generate profits. The size of the profit level between one company and another can be different.

# The effect of Earning Per Share is able to moderate the *Return On Assets* (ROA) on the Price Earning Ratio

The fifth hypothesis is to find out whether there is an effect of *Earning Per Share* as a moderating variable in the relationship between *Return On Assets* and price earning ratio. Based on table 4.24 it can be concluded that the variable *Return On Assets* is a moderator variable. It can be interpreted that any increase in *Return On Assets* will result in an increase in *Earning Per Share* and will result in an increase in the Price Earning Ratio. Because the company will have a good rating in the eyes of investors. Where when the value of *Return On Assets* and *Earning Per Share* in a company increases, the company will be efficient in managing sales, assets, and investment in its operating activities to gain profit.

This is in line with previous research conducted by Rodrigo (2019) in his research which said that *Return On Assets* (ROA) is able to moderate the effect of Earning Per Share on the Price Earning Ratio. **The effect of Earning Per Share is able to moderate the** *Current Ratio* (*CR*) to the Price Earning **Ratio Ratio** 

The sixth hypothesis is to find out whether there is an effect of *Earning Per Share* being able to moderate the *Current Ratio* to the Price Earning Ratio. Based on table 4.24 it can be concluded that the *Current Ratio* variable is a moderator variable. It can be interpreted that any increase in the *Current Ratio* will result in an increase in *Earning Per Share* and will result in an increase in the Price Earning Ratio. Because the company will have a good rating in the eyes of investors. Where when the value of the *Current Ratio* and *Earning Per Share* in a company increases, the company will be efficient in managing sales, assets, and investment in its operating activities to gain profit.

This is in line with previous research conducted by Imade (2018), Ardina (2018), Thomas (2020) in his research saying that the *Current Ratio* (*CR*) is able to moderate the effect of Earning Per Share on the Price Earning Ratio.

# *The effect* of Earning Per Share is being able to moderate the *Debt to Assets Ratio* (DAR) to the Price Earning Ratio

The seventh hypothesis is to find out whether there is an effect of Earning Per Share being able to moderate the *Debt to Assets Ratio* (DAR) on the Price Earning Ratio. Based on table 4.24 it can be concluded that the *Debt to Assets Ratio* variable is not included in the moderator variable. It can be interpreted that any decrease in the *Debt to Assets Ratio* will result in a decrease in *Earning Per Share* and will result in a decrease in the Price Earning Ratio. Because the company will have a good rating in the eyes of investors. Where when the value of the *Debt to Assets Ratio* and *Earning Per Share* in a company drops, the company will be considered inefficient in managing sales, assets, and investment in its operating activities to gain profit.

This is not in line with previous research conducted by Mahdi Salehi (2017) in his research which said that the *Debt To Assets Ratio* has a positive and significant effect on Earning Per Share with the moderating variable Price Earning Ratio.

# The effect of Total Assets Turnover is able to moderate the Return On Assets (ROA) on the Price Earning Ratio

The eighth hypothesis is to find out whether there is an effect of *Total Assets Turnover in* being able to moderate *Return On Assets* (ROA) on the Price Earning Ratio. Based on table 4.24 it can be concluded that the variable *Return On Assets* (ROA) is not included in the moderator variable. It can be interpreted that any decrease in *Return On Assets* will result in a decrease in *Total Assets Turnover* and will result in a decrease in the Price Earning Ratio. Because the company will have a good rating in the eyes of

e-ISSN: 2963-7643; p-ISSN: 2963-8194, Hal 66-83

investors. Where when the value of *Return On Assets* and *Total Assets Turnover* in a company decreases, the company will be considered inefficient in using company assets in generating a certain sales volume.

This is not in line with previous research conducted by Ahmad Abbas (2019) in his research which said that *Return On Assets* has a positive and significant effect on *Total Assets Turnover* with the moderating variable Price Earning Ratio.

# *The effect of Total Assets Turnover is* able to moderate the effect of the *Current Ratio* (CR) on the Price Earning Ratio

The ninth hypothesis is to find out whether there is an effect of *Total Assets Turnover* being able to moderate the effect of the *Current Ratio* (CR) on the Price Earning Ratio. Based on table 4.24 it can be concluded that the *Current ratio* variable does not include moderator variables. It can be interpreted that any decrease in the *Current ratio* will result in a decrease in *Total Assets Turnover* and will result in a decrease in the Price Earning Ratio. Because the company will have a good rating in the eyes of investors. Where when the value of the *Current ratio* and *Total Assets Turnover* in a company goes down, the company will be judged to be inefficient in using the company's assets in generating a certain sales volume.

This is not in line with previous research conducted by Sri Mangesti Rahayu (2018) in his research saying that the *Current ratio* has a positive and significant effect on *Total Assets Turnover* with the moderating variable Price Earning Ratio.

# *The effect of Total Assets Turnover is* able to moderate the *Debt to Assets Ratio* (DAR) to the Price Earning Ratio

The tenth hypothesis is to find out whether there is an effect of *Total Assets Turnover in* being able to moderate the *Debt to Assets Ratio* to the Price Earning Ratio. Based on table 4.24 it can be concluded that the *Debt to Assets Ratio* variable is a moderator variable. It can be interpreted that any decrease in the *Debt to Assets Ratio* will result in an increase in *Total Assets Turnover* and will result in an increase in the Price Earning Ratio. Because the company will have a good rating in the eyes of investors. Where when the value of the *Debt to Assets Ratio* and *Total Assets Turnover* in a company increases, the company will be assessed as efficient use of company assets in generating a certain sales volume.

This is in line with previous research conducted by Nurani (2019) and Zulkifli (2020) in their research which said that the *Debt to Assets Ratio* has a positive and significant influence on *Total Assets Turnover* with the moderating variable Price Earning Ratio.

#### CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Conclusion

This study aims to determine the effect of *Return On Assets, Current Ratio*, and *Debt to Assets Ratio* on *Firm Value* which is moderated by *Financial Distress and Total Assets Turnover* in the food and beverage sub -sector which is listed on the Southeast Asian Stock Exchange for the 2012-2020 period. Based on the data analysis that has been done, the following conclusions can be drawn: *Return On Assets* has no partial effect on the Price Earning Ratio; *Current Ratio, Debt to Assets Ratio* has a significant effect on the Price Earning Ratio; *Return On Assets, Current Ratio, Debt to Assets Ratio* has a significant effect on the Price Earning Ratio; *Earning Per Share* is able to moderate *Return On Assets, Current Ratio* to the Price Earning Ratio; *Total Assets Turnover* is not able to moderate *Return On Assets, Current Ratio* to Price Earning Ratio; *Total Assets Turnover* is able to moderate the *Debt to Assets, Current Ratio* to Price Earning Ratio; *Total Assets Turnover* is able to moderate the *Debt to Assets, Current Ratio*.

#### Recommendation

Judging from the results of research that has been done previously, the authors can suggest for further research, as follows: For companies, the size of *Return On Assets* does not have a high impact and does not need to be used as a consideration in making investment decisions and has the opportunity to develop properly use the funds to pay off short-term debt. as well as those who bear a high debt burden, it can be interpreted that investors are willing to pay for their shares. *Return On Assets, Current Ratio, Debt Assets* 

*Ratio* can be taken into consideration for making an investment because the *Price Earning Ratio* is likely to be high as expected if the value of the liquidity ratio, ratio leverage, the profitability ratio looks good and the condition is running stably. For companies, an increase in *Return On Assets* will result in an increase in *Earning Per Ratio* and *Price Earning* Ratio will make a good assessment in the eyes of investors. and has efficiency value in managing asset sales, as well as investment in its operational activities to obtain good profits. Companies can pay more attention to improving good judgment in the eyes of their investors so that companies are considered effective in managing asset sales, as well as investing to make a profit. Companies can pay more attention to the efficient use of company assets in generating certain sales volumes. Companies can pay more attention to measuring the ability to pay short-term obligations and the efficient use of assets in order to attract potential investors. For companies, the efficient use of company assets are funded by debt.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Suripto. (2015). Financial Management: Corporate Value Creation Strategy Through Economic Value Added Approach. 1st Edition. Bandung: Alphabet.
- Eduardus Tandelilin., (2017), Capital Market Portfolio & Investment Management, Depok: PT. Canisius.
- Fahmi, Irham. (2015). Introduction to Financial Management Theory and Questions and Answers. Bandung: Alphabet.
- Fahmi, Irham. (2016). Introduction to Financial Management. Bandung : ALPHABETA
- Fahmi, Irham. (2017). Financial Statement Analysis. Bandung: Alphabet.
- Ghozali, Imam. (2018). Multivariate Analysis Application with IBM SPSS 25 Program. Diponegoro University Publishing Agency: Semarang
- Harry. (2016). Financial Statement Analysis. Integrated and Comprehensive Edition. Jakarta: Grasindo
- Harry. (2018). Introduction to Management. First Print. PT Grasindo. Jakarta.
- Indonesian Bankers Association. (2016). Bank Risk Management Strategy. Jakarta: Main Library Gramedia.
- Kamaludin. (2015). Merger and Acquisition Restructuring. Bandung: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Cashmere. (2015). Financial Statement Analysis. Edition One. Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Cashmere. (2016). Financial Statement Analysis. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Cashmere. (2017). Financial Statement Analysis. Jakarta: PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Sianturi, M Wanti Ernita. (2015). The Influence of Financial Performance on the Value of Manufacturing Companies in the Consumer Goods Industry Sector on the IDX. eJournal of Business Administration, Volume 3, Number 2
- Sugiyono. (2017). Quantitative Research Methods, Qualitative, and R&D. Bandung : Alfabeta, CV.
- Yustika, Yeni. (2015). The Influence of Liquidity, Leverage, Profitability, Operating Capacity and Managerial Agency Costs on Financial Distress (Empirical Study of Manufacturing Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2011-2013). Let's FEKON Vol. 2 No. October 2, 2015.

#### **Journal Source:**

- Abbas, A., & Arizah, A. (2019). Marketability, profitability, and profit-loss sharing: evidence from sharia banking in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Accounting Research, 4* (2), 315–326. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJAR-08-2019-0065
- Averio, T. (2020). The analysis of influencing factors on the going concern audit opinion a study in manufacturing firms in Indonesia. *Asian Journal of Accounting Research*, 6 (2), 152–164. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJAR-09-2020-0078
- Fajaria, AZ (2018). The Effect of Profitability, Liquidity, Leverage and Firm Growth of Firm Value with its Dividend Policy as a Moderating Variable. *International Journal of Managerial Studies and Research, 6* (10), 55–69. https://doi.org/10.20431/2349-0349.0610005

e-ISSN: 2963-7643; p-ISSN: 2963-8194, Hal 66-83

- Fatma, N., & Hidayat, W. (2019). Earnings persistence, earnings power, and equity valuation in consumer goods firms. Asian Journal of Accounting Research, 5 (1), 3–13. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJAR-05-2019-0041
- Gunawan, IMA, Pituringsih, E., & Widyastuti, E. (2018). the Effect of Capital Structure, Dividend Policy, Company Size, Profitability and Liquidity on Company Value (Study At Manufacturing Companies Listed on Indonesia Stock Exchange 2014-2016). *International Journal of Economics, Commerce and Management United Kingdom, VI* (2017), 107–117. http://ijecm.co.uk/
- Mangesti Rahayu, S. (2019). Mediation effects of financial performance toward influences of corporate growth and assets utilization. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 68 (5), 981–996. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-05-2018-0199
- Moch, R., Prihatni, R., & Buchdadi, AD (2019). The effect of liquidity, profitability and solvency to the financial distress of manufactured companies listed on the Indonesia stock exchange (IDX) period of year 2015-2017. Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal, 23 (6), 1–16.
- Rangkuti, Z. (2020). The effects of Tier-1 capital to risk management and profitability on performance using multiple fixed effect panel data models. *Measuring Business Excellence, 25* (2), 121–137. https://doi.org/10.1108/MBE-06-2019-0061
- Salehi, M., Lotfi, A., & Farhangdoust, S. (2017). The effect of financial distress costs on ownership structure and debt policy: An application of simultaneous equations in Iran. *Journal of Management Development*, 36 (10), 1216–1229. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMD-01-2017-0029
- Scalzer, RS, Rodrigues, A., Macedo, M. Á. da S., & Wanke, P. (2019). Financial distress in electricity distributors from the perspective of Brazilian regulation. *Energy Policy*, 125 (August 2018), 250– 259. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2018.10.018

#### **Other Sources:**

www.idx.co.id www.set.or.th www.sgx.com www.bursamalaysia.com www.pse.com.ph