



Governance and Sustainability on Global Business Economics

Global Conference on Business and Economics Research (GCBER) 2017
14-15 August 2017, Universiti Putra Malaysia, Malaysia

A Contingency View to Working Capital Management in an Emerging Market

Saheed. A. Nurein^{*}, Salleh. Hj. Din, Suberi Ab. Halim

School of Business Innovation and Technopreneurship, Universiti Malaysia Perlis, Malaysia

Abstract

Despite the acknowledgement and evidence from extant studies that working capital management has influence on firm value there is argument that this relationship is subject to the external environment, internal resources and management decisions of the firm as anticipated by contingency theory. As such, this study aim to examine whether the relationship between working capital management and firm value is moderated by the contingency factors as proxied by competitive intensity, R&D investments, and independent non-executive directors. The sample of 299 non-financial firms listed on the main market of Bursa Malaysia for the period 2006-2015 were applied. By applying Pearson's correlation and panel data approach through fixed effects regression estimation, the main findings showed that the influence of working capital management on firm is significantly moderated by the interaction of firms' contingency variables. This study suggests that aligning working capital management policies toward the environment, internal resources and management decisions can minimize the costs and maximize the advantages of working capital investment because any misalignment might affect the firm value significantly.

Keywords: working capital, firm value, contingency variables, Malaysia firms

1. INTRODUCTION

Aftermath the 2008 global financial crisis, valuable cash of huge firms were tied up in the working capital cycle (Wasiuzzaman, 2015). Due to the obstacle, some of these firms faced serious liquidity problems while some could not survive and went bankrupt (e.g. Bear Stearns, Lehman Brothers, General Motors) (Charitou et al., 2010). In addition, firms with liquidity problems were compelled to cut spending on investment, and those with less access to external financing had to turn to working capital which is often neglected (Campello et al., 2012). Based on this, firms view credit extensions to customers and credit terms extended by suppliers to be imperative in managing business prudently (Yang, 2011). Thus, during the financial crises when there is scarcity of external financial resources, working capital management is a very critical survival tool since it acts as a financial intermediary (Narayanan, 2014). In addition, firms generally may look at the time spent in the management of working capital as less vital in compare to other key decisions such as payout decisions or capital budgeting, but after the financial crisis, enormous awareness was raised among firms to unravel the valuable cash tied up through the working capital cycle (Wasiuzzaman, 2015). This inspired studies on the significance of managing organizational resources judiciously specifically the efficient management of working capital (Charitou et al., 2010) since it played a critical role in firm performance during the financial crises (Claessens et al., 2000) and contributes to business failures (Campello et al., 2012). However, working

^{*}Corresponding author.
E-mail: saheed_nurein@yahoo.com

capital management approaches and practices are different among countries, industries, and firms; these changes occur significantly over time and lead to different influence of working capital management on firms' performance (Filbeck & Krueger, 2005). The obvious reason is that achieving an effective and efficient working capital management does not include only financial perspective but also incorporate other disciplines (Baltes, 2015). This led to the argument that to maximize firm performance there is need for an effective and efficient working capital management to be integrated with business processes since working capital management encompasses the full choices of business processes. (Leavell, 2006)

In addition, studies have suggested and shown that there are some internal and external settings of present-day organizations that directly or indirectly affect working capital management (e.g., Darabi & Toomari, 2012; Enqvist et al., 2014; Kieschnick et al., 2013; Wasiuzzaman, 2015). However, except for Tingbani (2015), these past studies have disregard the interactive influence of these internal and external settings on the relationship between working capital management and firm value. This disregard contributes to lack of understanding of working capital approaches and practices among firms and industries which resulted in variations in working capital performance. Therefore, this study aims to determine whether the relationship between working capital management and firm value in an emerging market may be dependent on the relations of internal and external settings of the firm as anticipated by the framework of contingency theory.

Contingency theory was developed through the functional sociological theory view of organizational structure that gives clear elucidations on the interrelationships that exist among organizational sub-systems, and between organizational system and its environment (Fridman & Ostman, 1989). Based on the theory, there is no single type of organizational strategy that is equally fitting to all organizations (Islam & Hu, 2012). This means that there is no best way of designing an organization in the contingency framework (Scott & Cole, 2000), because the structures and processes of organizations are shaped by their environment (Flynn et al., 2010). There is need for organizations to adopt systems and structures that will match the numerous contingencies of their external environment to improve profitability. Therefore, the more organizations could deal with the demands of the environment they interact with, the better their performance (Burrell & Morgan, 2009).

2. RELATED LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESES

2.1 Literature Review

Working Capital Management and Firm Value

Most of the prior (e.g., Baños-caballero et al., 2014; Deloof, 2003; Falope & Ajilore, 2009; García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2007; Shin & Soenen, 1998) empirical studies have focus on the influence of working capital management on firm's performance since working capital investment impacts on firm's profitability, risk and then its value (Smith, 1987). These prior empirical studies could be categorized into two contending thoughts on working capital investment. According to the first thought, firms increase their sales and acquire better discounts for early payments when they achieve higher working capital levels (Deloof, 2003), and which then may increase their firms' value. The second thought is that achieving higher working capital levels require financing and as a result, firms face further financing expenses that increase their possibility of bankruptcy (Baños-Caballero et al., 2014). In addition, all these prior studies (e.g., Deloof, 2003; Falope & Ajilore, 2009; Shin & Soenen, 1998) are carried out from various environments and they support the traditional assumption on the relationship between working capital and firm value. This traditional believe is that reduction in working capital investment has positive effect on firm performance under aggressive policy. This is done by decreasing the amount of current assets held in total assets. Based on this thought, Autukaite and Molay (2013) stressed that firms can reduce their dependence on external financing, reduce their financing cost and relish financial flexibility. Effective working capital management put firms in a healthier situation to entice cheaper funding from both lenders and shareholders since it improves the risk profile of many firms. Ganesan (2007) also suggests that reduction in working capital investment resulted into less necessity for external financing and reduction in cost of capital, which then increases cash available to the shareholders. However, empirical evidence showed that despite aggressive working capital policy focusing on improving profitability, it neglects some important aspects, which include interruptions in process of production or the risk of losing sales if firms excessively reduce their working capital investment (Baños-caballero et al., 2014)

On the other hand, some of the prior studies (e.g., Garcia-Teruel & Martinez-Solano, 2010; Kieschnick et al., 2013) also support the conservative policy that increasing working capital investment improve sales, increase firm value, and helps to evade risk bankruptcy risk. Conservative working capital policy increases working capital investment because its target is to stimulate sales by increasing levels of trade receivable and inventory so as to increase the firm profitability (Afza & Nazir, 2007). In addition, increasing the level of accounts receivable under conservative policy increases sales since it allows longer payment period to customers (Seifert et al, 2013), leads to reduction in information asymmetry between seller and buyer, and serve as a cheap credit source to customers (Chong et al., 2015). Furthermore, increasing the level of inventory under conservative policy prevents any disruptions in production

(García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2010), lessen the probability of stock-out (Giannetti et al., 2011), and lessen price fluctuation and supply costs (Kollintzas, 2013). However, firms with conservative working capital policy are faced with the challenges of additional financing expenses in order to finance and achieve higher levels of working capital (Afza & Nazir, 2007). These additional financing expenses increase their risk of bankruptcy (Kieschnick et al., 2013). As a result of this, there is need for firms to assess the trade-off between risk and expected firm value before making decision on the optimal investment level on current assets (García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2007). However, recent studies (e.g., Baños-Caballero et al., 2014; Nurein et al., 2015) found that there exists an optimal working capital level through concave relationship between working capital management and firm performance. A positive non-linear relationship is achieved with a low working capital investment level and a negative non-linear relationship occurred when working capital investment level is higher. Hence, firms can increase their profitability and minimize their risk through better understanding of the significance of working capital management.

Contingency Variables and Firm Value

According to Luthans and Stewart (1977)'s contingency theory of management, organizational contingencies are environmental, resource and management variables of the firm. Environmental variables influence the organization but cannot be directly or positively controlled by the resource managers of the organizations (Ambrosini et al., 2009; Flynn et al., 2010). They are refer to as the independent variables or "givens" that form the organizations processes and structures (Flynn et al., 2010). Resource variables could be tangible or intangible factors that are directly controlled by the management and which they use for operating and producing necessary changes in their organizational system or their environmental supra-system (Bilkova et al., 2016; Mol & Wijnberg, 2011). The unique resources of a firm are crucial factors to its firm value. Based on resource-based view, the unique accumulated resources of the firm are costly and difficult to emulate, thus they contribute more to firm value (Demsetz, 1997). Management variables are the techniques and concepts expressed through policies, procedures and practices applied by the manager in operating on the available resource variables to define and accomplish the objectives of the firm (Luo et al., 2014; Zona, 2016).

Multidimensional contingency model is regarded as a systems model that concomitantly incorporates multidimensional concepts of fit (Donaldson, 2001; Sirmon & Hitt, 2009; Sousa & Voss, 2008). It has been argued that numerous multidimensional concepts such as strategy, leadership preference and environment should be incorporated concomitantly to improve fit, which is regarded as efficacy, competences, and feasibility of the firm (Burton & Obel, 2012). Contingency fit ensues when a given set of contingent variables and multiple variables in an organizational design are fit. This contingency fit will link the situational factors of the firm to its structural configuration and its properties. However, a firm is in misfit when its performance is less because of the misalignment. Meanwhile, according to De Ven et al. (1985), understanding context-structure-performance relationships could only improve by concomitantly addressing the various contingencies, performance criteria, and structural alternatives that need to be holistically considered in understanding organizational design. Based on this, the systems approach concept of De Ven et al. (1985) support the necessity to apply multivariate analysis to study the consistency patterns among the dimensions of organizational structure, context and performance. Therefore, the systems approach is adopted in this study in examining consistency patterns among contingency variables, working capital management and its components and how they influence firm value at different interaction levels.

2.2 Hypotheses Development

Soenen (1993) stressed that firms' profitability is determine by the span of the cash conversion cycle (CCC) and firms that maintain shorter CCC achieve higher firm performance. It is also argued that firms that achieve shorter CCC can maximize their profit because of their ability to generate funds internally, which might reduce their dependence on external financing which is always expensive (Autukaite & Molay, 2013; Baños-Caballero et al., 2014). Deloof (2003) showed that firm profitability is significantly and negatively related with CCC, accounts receivable days and inventories. Deloof (2003) suggested that by reducing inventories and account receivable days to a minimum level, managers can create value for their shareholders. In addition, Lazaridis and Tryfonidis (2006) argue in their study that the longer firms delay their account payable, the higher the level of working capital levels reserved and used in increasing profitability. Though, an effort in demanding more credit from suppliers may decrease profitability since the firm could fail to benefit from the discounts, which may exceed 20 per cent depending on the discount rate and discount period allowed (Ng et al., 1999). García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007) also found that account receivable days and inventory days are negatively related with firm profitability, and suggesting that mangers can create value through shortening CCC because it increases the cash flow available to firms in running their day-to-day activities. Thus, this study hypothesized that CCC has relationship with firm value as follows, as in line with previous studies:

H1a: There is a negative relationship between the cash conversion cycle and firm value.

CCC is disintegrated into three components (i.e. accounts receivable management, and accounts payable management and inventory management). For a better understanding of the relationship between working capital management and firm value, it is suggested to disintegrate the individual components of working capital management separately since

they have different implications on firm value (Afrifa, 2013), and a firm can minimize its CCC through the optimization of each of the components (Enqvist et al., 2014). For instance, account receivables serve as short-term loans to customers given by the supplying firm, and a firm value is significantly affected by its accounts receivable policy (García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2010). A reduction in accounts receivable period enhance firm value by increasing cash flow available to a firm. This increase in cash flow will then enable the firm to meet its daily obligations, avoid shortage of cash, benefit from positive speculation and growth opportunities, and reduce the cost of financial distress and transactional cost of paying bills (Petersen & Rajan, 1997). Based on these arguments, this study hypothesized that account receivables period has relationship with firm value as thus:

H2a: There is a negative relationship between the account receivables period and firm value.

Firms are required to keep inventory to safeguard any eventualities due to imperfections, and their firm value is influenced by the level of inventory held (Eroglu & Hofer, 2011). Reduction in inventory level may increase firm value since the untied-up funds in inventory may be invested elsewhere; and it also prevents the firms from seeking short-term credit to finance their investment in inventory (Deloof, 2003). Therefore, this study assumed the following relationship between inventory holding period and firm value:

H3a: There is a negative relationship between the inventory holding period and firm value.

On the other hand, accounts payable is a vital source of short-term funds for many firms. Firms lean towards having an optimal accounts payable policy due to market imperfection, which may influence their firm value (Baños-caballero et al., 2014). Delaying accounts payable helps in improving operational efficiency and firm value by reducing transactional cost, reducing exchange costs, and allows firms to accumulate amounts owing and pay them at a periodic interval per the credit period agreement which help them to overcome financial constraint (Bhattacharya, 2008). Regarding these arguments, it assumed that the relationship between account payable periods and firm value is as follows:

H4a: There is a positive relationship between the accounts payable period and firm value.

The proxies for environmental, resource and management variables used in this study are competitive intensity, R&D investments and Independent Non-Executive directors respectively. In a highly tensed competitive market, firms were challenged by different dimensions of strategy of their competitors. Competitive intensity is one of the external factors influencing working capital management (Darabi & Toomari, 2012; Filbeck & Krueger, 2005). Competitive intensity is a circumstance where there is fierce competition because of the number of competitors in the market and the absence of possible opportunities for more growth (Auh & Menguc, 2005), which then contribute to environmental hostility (Wilden, 2013). As competition intensifies, the outcome of a firm's activities will no longer be deterministic but rather stochastic as its activities are hugely affected by the activities and contingencies undertaken by competitors (Auh & Menguc, 2005). Therefore, certainty and predictability diminish under intensifying competitions. On the other hand, when there is less intensified competition, firms can make use of their existing systems to capitalize fully on the transparent predictability of their behaviour. However, firms need to adapt accordingly when competition is intense. R&D investment is regarded as an intangible assets that contributes to the long-term growth of the firm (Chan et al., 2001). An effective R&D investments leads to an innovative product and services that facilitates the firm to improve its intangible assets, therefore distinguishing itself from other firms (Ehie & Olibe, 2010). Independent non-executive directors is one of the main corporate governance management variables assumed by most research in the contingency framework (Collin, 2008). Independent non-executive directors serve as "professional referees" in a firm board of directors in ensuring that the competition among executive directors stimulates actions that are in line with the maximization of firm value (Fama, 1980). Firms that have high number of independent directors in a board achieve less common financial problems (Fathi & Gueyié, 2001) and it is linked to higher firm value (Mak & Kusnadi, 2005). Moreover, during a deteriorating business environment, firms with high number of independent directors achieve lower risk of bankruptcy (Daily et al., 2003). Based on the argument above regarding the influence of environmental, resource and management variables on working capital and firm value, this study formulate the following hypothesis:

H1b: Firm's competitive intensity, R&D investments and independent non-executive directors significantly moderates the relationship between cash conversion cycle and firm value

H2b: Firm's competitive intensity, R&D investments and independent non-executive directors significantly moderates the relationship between account receivables period and firm value

H3b: Firm's competitive intensity, R&D investments and independent non-executive directors significantly moderates the relationship between inventory holding period and firm value

H4b: Firm's competitive intensity, R&D investments and independent non-executive directors significantly moderates the relationship between accounts payable period and firm value

3. DATA ENVIRONMENT AND VARIABLES DESCRIPTION

3.1 Data environment

The data of 299 non-financial firms listed on the main market of Bursa Malaysia for the period 2006-2015. These firms were selected from “high-tech industries” as categorized by the NIW-ISI-list (Lower Saxony Institute for Economic Research (NIW) and Institute for Systems and Innovation Research (ISI)), and also identified as innovative firms (Gehrke & Grupp, 1994; Grupp, 1995). These industries include automobiles & parts with 20 firms, Chemicals – 29 firms, electronic and electrical equipment – 29 firms, forestry and paper- 15 firms, general industrials – 32 firms, household goods & home construction – 38 firms, industrial metals and mining – 33 firms, industrial engineering – 45 firms, oil equipment and services – 20 firms, technology hardware and equipment – 16 firms.

3.2 Variables Measurement

The dependent variable is firm value and is measured as enterprise value divided by Earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization (EV/EBITDA). Enterprise value is measured as Equity Value + Total Debt– Cash & Cash Equivalents + Preferred Stock + Minority Interest. Previous studies (e.g., DeLoof, 2003; García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2007; Soenen, 1993) have adopted the CCC as the main measure of working capital management. This study also adopts CCC as a proxy for working capital management. CCC measures the time lag between expenditure for the purchase of raw materials and the collection of sales of finished goods; or reveals the time (days) interval needed to convert a dollar invested in current assets into cash (Richards & Laughlin, 1980). Other independent variables are account receivables period, inventory holding period, and account payables period. Moderating variables are competitive intensity, R&D investments, and independent non-executive directors. Control variables applied are firm size, financial leverage, liquidity ratio, assets tangibility, and firm growth. The measurements for the variables are depicted in table 1 below.

Table 1. Variables Measurement

No	Variables	Connotation	Measurement
1.	Firm Value	FV	(Equity Value + Total Debt– Cash & Cash Equivalents + Preferred Stock + Minority Interest)/EBITDA
2.	Cash conversion cycle	CCC	Account receivables period + Inventory holding period - Account payables period. (ARP + IHP – APP)
3.	Account receivables period	ARP	Accounts receivables divided by sales and multiplied by 365 days. (AR/Sales) X 365
4.	Inventory holding period	IHP	Inventory divided by cost of sales and multiplied by 365 days. (INV/COS) X 365
5.	Account payables period	APP	Accounts payables divided by cost of sales and multiplied by 365 days. (AP/COS) X 365
6.	Competitive intensity	C	Firm sales divided by sum of the sales of firms present in the given industry
7.	R&D investments	R	R&D expenditure divided by total sales volume
8.	Independent non-executive directors	N	Number of non-executive directors divided by total board directors
9.	Firm size	SIZE	Natural logarithm of sales
10.	Financial leverage	LEV	Total debt divided by total capital
11.	Liquidity ratio	LIQ	Current assets divided by current liabilities
12.	Assets tangibility	ASTAN	Fixed assets divided by total assets.
13.	Firm growth	GROWTH	(Current sales –previous sales) / previous sales

The following models were estimated to examine the hypotheses:

$$FV_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CCC_{it} + \beta_2 ARP_{it} + \beta_3 APP_{it} + \beta_4 IHP_{it} + \beta_5 SIZE_{it} + \beta_6 LIQ_{it} + \beta_7 LEV_{it} + \beta_8 ASTAN_{it} + \beta_9 GROWTH_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (1)$$

$$FV_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CCC_{it} + \beta_2 ARP_{it} + \beta_3 APP_{it} + \beta_4 IHP_{it} + \beta_5 SIZE_{it} + \beta_6 LIQ_{it} + \beta_7 LEV_{it} + \beta_8 ASTAN_{it} + \beta_9 GROWTH_{it} + \beta_{10} CRN * CCC_{it} + \beta_{11} CRN * ARP_{it} + \beta_{12} CRN * APP_{it} + \beta_{13} CRN * IHP_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

The first equation (1) indicates a direct relationship between working capital management and firm value without any interactive effect (i.e. moderating variables) which is to examine hypotheses H1a to H4a, while the second equation (2) indicates the relationship with the introduction of the interactive term (i.e. moderating variables). Therefore, to examine the estimated models, correlation and OLS fixed effect estimation was applied.

4. ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

4.1 Summary Statistics

The summary of descriptive statistics of the variables are shown in table 2 below.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics

Variable	Observation	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
FV	2990	0.886291	0.425135	0.428418	2.448718	1.461603	3.221545
CCC	2990	142.5112	258.81032	-1451.63	6120.96	9.82445	12.56963
ARP	2990	93.42124	60.62681	-827.2131	986.8120	3.237680	14.57469
IHP	2990	105.1639	132.1765	-0.861811	973.2480	4.247449	16.40312
APP	2990	97.529	162.8761	-925.8677	986.3582	3.869248	14.88867
C	2990	8.993939	5.478927	-1.952122	952.9667	12.72073	138.8686
R	2990	9.781214	14.82568	-89.4	98.65	-0.067189	17.50381
N	2990	4.929719	2.156725	2.56432	7.553535	1.65842	10.83941
SIZE	2990	6.68759	1.43521	-1.751124	8.541723	-1.165822	8.368254
LEV	2990	0.6859837	8.11396	-0.865981	261.2188	26.11288	871.9942
LIQ	2990	1.691388	2.552926	0	87	18.62216	694.4087
ASTAN	2990	8.642576	59.87748	-1.952133	962.9668	14.82074	138.5757
GROWTH	2990	0.5614013	9.712138	-18.64693	298.9791	29.71752	915.3877

Firm value indicates a mean of 88.6%, which implies that the firms have strong firm value during these periods examined. The mean for CCC, account receivables period, inventory holding period, and account payable period are 142 days, 93 days, 105 days, and 27.66 days respectively. This indicates that the number of days to convert sales to cash is averagely longer during these periods. Competitive intensity shows a mean of 8.99, indicating a high intensity of competition among the firms in the industries. R&D investments with mean of 9.78, implying that the firms highly invest in R&D. Independent non-executive directors indicates a mean of 4.93, which implies that the board of directors of each firm averagely consist of 5 independent non-executive directors.

4.2 Correlation Matrix

Table 3. Correlation result of the variables

Variable	FV	CCC	ARP	IHP	APP	C	R	N	SIZE	LEV	LIQ	AST	GRO
FV	1.00												
CCC	-.06***	1.00											
ARP	-.15***	.19***	1.00										
IHP	.06***	.73***	.05**	1.00									
APP	-.02**	.57***	.05**	.06**	1.00								
C	.17***	-.07**	.07**	.03**	.02*	1.00							
R	.40***	-.08**	-.07**	.07*	.05**	-.06**	1.00						
N	-.03	-.01	-.09**	.08*	.04**	-.00	-.06**	1.00					
SIZE	-.10***	.20**	.05**	.05**	.02**	.03**	.07*	-.07*	1.00				
LEV	.06***	.06**	.20**	.06**	.08*	.04**	.04**	.06**	.08*	1.00			
LIQ	.05***	.09**	.06*	-.08*	.03**	.02**	.03**	.04	.03*	.05	1.00		
AST	-.03	.02	.05**	-.03	-.06	-.05**	.05**	-.01	.07**	-.04	.01*	1.00	
GROWT	.04	-.01	.04	-.02	-.04	.03	.08**	.011	.04**	-.08	.06*	.02**	1.00

Significance levels are at 1% (***), 5% (**) and 10% (*)

Table 3 depicts the correlation coefficient among the variables. This is applied to measure the degree of linear relationship that exists between two or more variables. A formal test was used to ascertain that multicollinearity is not present in this analysis by using variance inflation factor (VIF). The largest VIF is 1.322 (LEV), confirming that multicollinearity is not present in the sample, because it is less than 10 (Hair et al., 2006). In addition, the coefficients of the variables are not greater than the 0.87 or 0.97 limit based on Field (2009). The results indicate a negative significant relationship between firm value and CCC, implying that decrease in working capital management increases firm value since firms could convert their inventory into sales in a short period, recover receipts from credit sales and slow down their cash payments. The negative correlation between accounts receivable period and firm value indicates that accounts receivable policy of the firms negatively influence their firm value. Inventory and firm value are negatively correlated, which signifies that the inventory policy of the firms reduce their firm value. A positive relationship between account payable period and firm value indicates that longer payable period increases the firm value.

4.3 Regression Results

Table 4. Fixed Effects regression of the models

	Model 1	Model 2
CCC	-0.258*** (-5.31)	-0.482*** (-8.36)
ARP	-0.389*** (-7.81)	-0.635*** (-9.52)
IHP	-0.032*** (-0.89)	-0.354*** (-7.83)
APP	0.088*** (5.26)	0.092*** (6.41)
CCC*CRN		0.724*** (8.52)
ARP*CRN		0.756***

		(9.15)
IHP*CRN		0.571***
		(8.26)
APP*CRN		0.781**
		(6.62)
SIZE	-0.381***	-0.371***
	(-8.67)	(-8.47)
LEV	-0.010**	-0.021**
	(4.39)	(4.27)
LIQ	-0.052***	-0.076***
	(-3.12)	(-5.61)
ASTAN	-0.002***	-0.005***
	(-9.39)	(-8.82)
GROWTH	0.008**	0.006**
	(1.65)	(1.37)
Constant		-4.216***
		(-12.79)
	C	-0.027**
		(-3.75)
	R	-0.11**
		(-3.92)
	N	-0.035***
Observations	2990	2990
R-SQ	45	67
Akaike Test	8749	7683
Total Effect		0.514

Significance levels are at 1% (***), 5% (**) and 10% (*)

The results of the fixed regression analysis of the models is depicted in table 4. Model 1 presents the regression on the direct relationship between working capital management and firm value, while Model 2 presents the regression on the moderating effect of contingency variables on the relationship between working capital management and firm value. Model 1 shows a significant negative relationship between CCC and firm value at 1% significant level. (at $b = -0.258$, $p < 0.01$). Thus, H1a is accepted, which indicates that with 1% decrease in CCC the firm value will increase by 25.8%. This findings is consistent with study done by García-Teruel and Martínez-Solano (2007). Account receivable period has a negative significant relationship with firm value at 1% significant level. (at $b = -0.389$, $p < 0.01$). Therefore, H2a is accepted, and implies that with 1% decrease in account receivable period the firm value will increase by 38.9%. This supports the argument that keeping a shorter account receivable period untied cash and improve firm value. Also, it is consistent with Padachi (2006) and Deloof (2003). Inventory holding period is significant and negatively related with firm value at 1% significant level. (at $b = -0.032$, $p < 0.01$). Thus, H3a is accepted, which implies that with 1% decrease in inventory holding period the firm value will increase by 3.2%. This also indicates that reducing inventory by converting it into sales in shorter period increases firm value. This finding is also in line with the study of Gill et al. (2010). Account payable period has a positive and significant relationship with firm value at 1% significant level. (at $b = 0.088$, $p < 0.01$). Therefore, H4a is accepted, and signifies that at 1% increase in account payable period the firm value increases by 8.8%. It also implies that delaying payables increases firm value. The finding is consistent with the study of Mathuva (2010) and Raheman et al. (2010).

Model 2 shows that the direct relationship between firm value and all the independent variables are still significant and improved than in model 1. With the inclusion of the moderating variables, 1% decrease in CCC, account receivable period and inventory holding period firm value will increase by 48.2%, 63.5% and 35.4% respectively. Moreover, 1% increase in accounts payable period will increase firm value by 92%. These findings indicate that contingency variables of these firms positively influence their working capital management and firm value relationship. Meanwhile, CCC and the interaction of the contingent variables (CCC*CRN) is significant and has a positive coefficient ($b = 0.724$, $p < 0.01$). Accounts receivable period and the interaction of the contingent variables (ARP*CRN) is significant and has a positive coefficient ($b = 0.756$, $p < 0.01$). Inventory holding period and the interaction of the contingent variables (IHP*CRN) is significant and has a positive coefficient ($b = 0.571$, $p < 0.01$). Accounts payable period and the interaction of the contingent variables (ARP*CRN) is significant and has a positive coefficient ($b = 0.781$, $p < 0.01$). The combine total effect is also significant and positive ($b = 0.514$, $p < 0.0$). This is an indication that interaction of environmental, resources and management variables applied in this study significantly moderates the relationship between working capital management and firm value as anticipated by contingency theory of Luthans and Stewart (1977).

In addition, based on the control variables, there is significant negative relationship between firm size and firm value in the two models at 1% significant level (model 1, $b = -0.381$ $p < 0.01$; model 2, $b = -0.371$ $p < 0.01$). This shows that there is a negative relationship between firm size and firm value. It also implies that larger firms generate more profit than smaller firms since larger firms take advantage of economies of scale to improve their ROA (Bhattacharya, 2014; Hawawini et al., 2003; Serrasqueiro & Nunes, 2008). In regards to leverage, the study found a negative relationship

between financial leverage and firm value at 5% significant level in both models (model 1, $b = -0.010$ $p < 0.05$; model 2, $b = -0.021$ $p < 0.05$). This finding implies that low leverage firms achieved higher firm value during these periods. Moreover, liquidity ratio and firm value are negatively related at 1% significant level (model 1, $b = -0.052$ $p < 0.01$; model 2, $b = -0.076$ $p < 0.01$). This supports the argument that lower liquidity may improve firm value (Hvide & Moen, 2007; Ng & Baek, 2007). Also, assets tangibility and firm value are negatively related at 1% significant level (model 1, $b = -0.002$ $p < 0.01$; model 2, $b = -0.005$ $p < 0.01$). This implies that the higher the level of tangible fixed assets the lower the firm value (Raheman & Nasr, 2007). Finally, Firm growth and firm value are positively related at 5% significant level (model 1, $b = 0.008$ $p < 0.05$; model 2, $b = 0.006$ $p < 0.05$). This indicates that firms with higher firm growth achieve higher firm value due to their higher sales (Bhattacharya, 2014; Hawawini et al., 2003; Serrasqueiro & Nunes, 2008).

5. CONCLUSION

This study examines the moderating effect of contingency variables on the relationship between working capital management and firm value. The evidence presented indicates a significant and negative relationship between working capital management and firm value as consistent with previous studies (Autukaite & Molay, 2013; Kieschnick et al., 2008; Wasiuzzaman, 2015). It also supports the view that reduction in working capital investment improves firm value through reduction in the level of current assets (García-Teruel & Martínez-Solano, 2007). However, the inclusion and the consideration of contingency variables as a moderator between working capital and firm value improves their relationship. This indicates that organizational contingencies moderates working capital management and firm value. The assumption of contingency theory is that the policies of firms changes over time so as to react to the demanding environment (Ambrosini et al., 2009), the available resources (Mol & Wijnberg, 2011) and the capability of the management (Hamza & Jarboui, 2016). Firms that adjust its assets to these contingency variables will improve their firm value. Firms that react to intense competition through investing in R&D that focus on innovating its products, processes and technology will achieve an improvement in their firm value. This is because firm unique or innovative products, processes and technology create superiority and contribute to firm value (Demsetz, 1973).

The implication of this study is that internal and external settings of firms affect the management of working capital towards improving firm value. It is suggested that management should align their working capital management policies towards their contingency factors to improve firm value, as any misalignment will influence firm value negatively. Also, firms need to introduce suitable policies to that fit in to their resources to challenge the opportunities and threats that exist in the environment towards improving their firm value.

This study uses competitive intensity, R&D investments, and independent non-executive directors as main organizational contingencies and as proxies for environmental, resources, management variables respectively. However, there other organizational contingencies that need to be consider as moderating effect on working capital management and firm value. It is recommended that further studies should consider the influence of other organizational contingencies on the relationship between working capital management and firm value.

REFERENCES

- Afrifa, G. (2013). Working Capital Management Practices of UK SMEs: The Role of Education and Experience. *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance & Management Sciences*, 3(4), 185–196.
- Afza, T., & Nazir, M. S. (2007). Is it better to be aggressive or conservative in managing working capital? *Journal of Quality and Technology Management*, III(II), 11–21.
- Ambrosini, V., Bowman, C., & Collier, N. (2009). Dynamic capabilities: An exploration of how firms renew their resource base. *British Journal of Management*, 20(S1), S9–S94.
- Auh, S., & Menguc, B. (2005). Balancing exploration and exploitation: The moderating role of competitive intensity. *Journal of Business Research*, 58(12), 1652–1661. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2004.11.007>
- Autukaite, R., & Molay, E. (2013). Cash Holdings , Working Capital and Firm Value : Evidence From France. In *28th International Conference of French Finance Association, Montpellier*. (Vol. 30, pp. 1–22).
- Baltes, G. (2015). *New perspectives on supply and distribution chain financing: case studies from China and Europe. BoD–Books on Demand*.
- Baños-caballero, S., García-teruel, P. J., & Martínez-solano, P. (2014). Working capital management , corporate performance , and financial constraints. *Journal of Business Research*, 67(3), 332–338.
- Bhattacharya, M. (2014). Business growth, size and age: Evidence from the business longitudinal survey (BLS) data in Australia. *Australian Economic Papers*, 53(3–4), 129–138.
- Bilkova, M., Greco, G., Palmigiano, A., Tzimoulis, A., & Wijnberg, N. (2016). The Logic of Resources and Capabilities. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:1608.02222*, (16).
- Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (2009). *Sociological Paradigms and Organizational Analysis: Elements of the Sociology of Corporate Life*.
- Campello, M., Giambona, E., Graham, J. R., & Harvey, C. R. (2012). Access to liquidity and corporate investment in Europe during the financial crisis. *Review of Finance*, 16(2), 323–346.

- Chan, L. K. C., Lakonishok, J., & Sougiannis, T. (2001). The Stock Market Valuation of Research, *LVI*(6).
- Charitou, M. S., Elfani, M., & Lois, P. (2010). The Effect Of Working Capital Management On Firm's Profitability: Empirical Evidence From An Emerging Market. *Journal of Business & Economic Research*, 8(12), 63–68.
- Chong, B. U., Hwang, I. D., & Kim, Y. S. (2015). Credit Ratings and Short-term Debt Financing: An Empirical Analysis of Listed Firms in Korea. *Asia-Pac. J. Financ. Stud.*, 44(1), 88–128.
- Claessens, S., Djankov, S., & Xu, L. C. (2000). Corporate Performance in the East Asian Financial Crisis. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 15(1), 23–46. <http://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/15.1.23>
- Collin, S.-O. (2008). The boards functional emphasis - A Contingency Approach. *Corporate Ownership & Control*, 6(2), 73–88.
- Daily, C. M., Dalton, D. R., & Cannella Jr., A. A. (2003). Corporate Governance: Decades of Dialogue and Data. *Academy of Management*, 28(3), 371–382. <http://doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2003.10196703>
- Darabi, R., & Toomari, Y. (2012). The Effect of Working Capital Management and Financial Factors on the Competitiveness of the Company. *Journal of Basic and Applied Scientific Research*, 2(10), 10459–10465.
- De Ven, V., Andrew, H., & Drazin, R. (1985). The Concept of Fit in Contingency Theory. *Chapter in B. Staw and L. Cummings. Research in Organizational Behavior*, 7.
- Deloof, M. (2003). Does Working Capital Management Affect Profitability of Belgian Firms? *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, 30(3–4), 573–588. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5957.00008>
- Demsetz, H. (1973). Industry Structure, Market Rivalry, and Public Policy. *Journal of Law and Economics*, Published by: The University of Chicago Press, 16(1), 1–9.
- Demsetz, H. (1997). Industry structure, market rivalry, and public policy. In *Resources, Firms, and Strategies: A Reader in the Resource-based Perspective* (p. 73).
- Donaldson, L. (2001). *The Contingency Theory of Organizations - Lex Donaldson - Google Books*.
- Ehie, I. C., & Olibe, K. (2010). The effect of R&D investment on firm value: An examination of US manufacturing and service industries. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 128(1), 127–135.
- Enqvist, J., Graham, M., & Nikkinen, J. (2014). The impact of working capital management on firm profitability in different business cycles: Evidence from Finland. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 32, 36–49.
- Eroglu, C., & Hofer, C. (2011). Inventory types and firm performance: Vector autoregressive and vector error correction models. *Journal of Business Logistics*, 32(3), 227–239.
- Falope, O. I., & Ajilore, O. T. (2009). Working Capital Management and Corporate Profitability: Evidence from Panel Data Analysis of Selected Quoted Companies in Nigeria. *Research Journal of Business Management*, 3(3), 73–84.
- Fama, E. F. (1980). Agency Problems and the Theory of the Firm. *The Journal of Political Economy*, 88(2), 288–307.
- Fathi, E., & Jean Pierre Gueyié. (2001). Financial distress and corporate governance: an empirical analysis. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, 1, 15–23.
- Field, A. (2009). *Discovering Statistics Using SPSS. SAGE Publications*.
- Filbeck, G., & Krueger, T. M. (2005). An Analysis of Working Capital Management Results Across Industries. *American Journal of Business*, 20(2), 11–20.
- Flynn, B. B., Huo, B., & Zhao, X. (2010). The impact of supply chain integration on performance: A contingency and configuration approach. *Journal of Operations Management*, 28(1), 58–71.
- Fridman, B., & Ostman, L. (1989). *Accounting development-some perspectives. A book in honour of Sven-Erik Jobansson, Stockholm. Economic Research Institute*.
- Ganesan, V. (2007). An analysis of working capital management efficiency in telecommunication equipment industry. *Rivier Academic Journal*, 3(2), 1–10.
- Garcia-Teruel, P. J., & Martínez-Solano, P. (2010). Determinants of trade credit: A comparative study of European SMEs. *International Small Business Journal*, 28(3), 215–233.
- García-Teruel, P. J., & Martínez-Solano, P. (2007). Effects of working capital management on SME profitability. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, 3(2), 164–177.
- Gehrke, B., & Grupp, H. (1994). Innovationspotential und Hochtechnologie, Technologische Position Deutschlands im internationalen Wettbewerb. *Schriftenreihe Des Fraunhofer-Instituts Fuer Systemtechnik Und Innovationsforschung (ISI), Hannover*.
- Giannetti, M., Burkart, M., & Ellingsen, T. (2011). What you sell is what you lend? Explaining trade credit contracts. *Review of Financial Studies*, 24(4), 1261–1298.
- Gill, A., Biger, N., & Mathur, N. (2010). The Relationship Between Working Capital Management And Profitability: Evidence From The United States. *Business and Economics Journal*, 2010, 1–9.
- Grupp, H. (1995). Science, High-Technology and the Competitiveness of EU Countries. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 19(October 1993), 209–223.
- Hair, J. F., Black, B., Babin, B., Anderson, R. E., & Tatham, R. L. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis. Baski. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Prentice Hall*. (Vol. 6).
- Hamza, F., & Jarboui, A. (2016). The role of board independence on R&D investment' choice decided by committed managers: The cognitive management of executives' discretion. *Accounting*, 2, 11–30.

- Hawawini, G., Subramanian, V., & Verdin, P. (2003). Is performance driven by industry - or firm-specific factors? A new look at the evidence. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(1), 1–16. <http://doi.org/10.1002/smj.278>
- Hvide, H., & Moen, J. (2007). Liquidity constraints and entrepreneurial performance.
- Islam, J., & Hu, H. (2012). A review of literature on contingency theory in managerial accounting. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(15), 5159–5164. <http://doi.org/10.5897/AJBM11.2764>
- Kieschnick, R., LaPlante, M., & Mousawwi, R. (2008). *Working Capital Management, Corporate Governance, and Firm Value. University of North Texas Working Paper.*
- Kieschnick, R., Laplante, M., & Moussawi, R. (2013). Working Capital Management and Shareholder Wealth. *Review of Finance*, 17(5), 1827–1852.
- Kollintzas, T. (2013). *The rational expectations equilibrium inventory model: theory and applications. Springer Science & Business Media. (Vol. 322).*
- Lazaridis, I., & Tryfonidis, D. (2006). The relationship between working capital management and profitability of listed companies in the Athens Stock Exchange. *Journal of Financial Management and Analysis*, 30(76), 1–12.
- Leavell, H. (2006). International working capital management. *The Business Review*, 5(1), 233–239.
- Luo, X., Kanuri, V. . ., & Andrews, M. (2014). How does CEO Tenure Matter? The Mediating role of Firm-Employee and Firm-Customer relationships. *Strategic Management Journal*, 37(1), 116–132.
- Luthans, F., & Stewart, T. I. (1977). A General Contingency Theory of Management. *Academy of Management Review*, 2(2), 181–195.
- Mak, Y. T., & Kusnadi, Y. (2005). Size really matters: Further evidence on the negative relationship between board size and firm value. *Pacific Basin Finance Journal*, 13(3), 301–318.
- Mathuva, D. M. (2010). The Influence of Working Capital Management Components on Corporate Profitability: A Survey on Kenyan Listed Firms. *Research Journal of Business Management.*
- Mol, J. M., & Wijnberg, N. M. (2011). From Resources to Value and Back: Competition Between and Within Organizations. *British Journal of Management*, 22(1), 77–95.
- Narayanan, P. (2014). The moderating effect of cost of capital on the relationship between working capital management and financial health in selected Malaysian public listed firms. *DBA Thesis, UUM.*
- Ng, A., & Baek, Y. . H. (2007). Free cash flow, leverage, and performance: evidence from Canadian Acquisitions. *Journal of International Finance and Economics*, 5(1), 11–26.
- Ng, C., Smith, J., & Smith, R. (1999). Evidence on the Determinant of Credit Terms Used in Interfirm Trade. *Journal of Finance*, 54, 1109–1129.
- Nurein, S. A., Din, M. S., & Mohd Rus, R. (2015). Nonlinear Relationship between Investment in Working Capital and Performance : Innovative Evidence from Food and Beverages Industry. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, (77), 63–72.
- Padachi, K. (2006). Trends in working capital management and its impact on firms' performance: an analysis of Mauritian small manufacturing firms. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 2(2), 45–58.
- Raheman, A., Afza, T., Qayyum, A., & Bodla, M. A. (2010). Working capital management and corporate performance of manufacturing sector in Pakistan. ... *Research Journal of ...*, 47(47).
- Raheman, A., & Nasr, M. (2007). Working capital management and profitability—case of Pakistani firms. *International Review of Business Research ...*, 3(1), 279–300.
- Richards, V. D., & Laughlin, E. J. (1980). A Cash Conversion Cycle Approach to Liquidity Analysis. *Financial Management*, 9(1), 32–38. <http://doi.org/10.2307/3665310>
- Scott, W., & Cole, R. (2000). The Quality Movement and Organization Theory. *Sage Publications.*, 6(3).
- Seifert, D., Seifert, R. W., & Protopappa-Sieke, M. (2013). A review of trade credit literature: Opportunities for research in operations. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 231(2), 245–256.
- Sen, M., & Oruç, E. (2009). Relationship between Efficiency Level of Working Capital Management and Return on Total Assets in Ise. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4(10), 109–114.
- Serrasqueiro, Z. S., & Maçãs Nunes, P. (2008). Performance and size: Empirical evidence from Portuguese SMEs. *Small Business Economics*, 31(2), 195–217.
- Shin, H. H., & Soenen, L. (1998). Efficiency of Working Capital and Corporate Profitability. *Financial Practice and Education*, 8(2), 37–45.
- Sirmon, D., & Hitt, M. A. (2009). Contingencies within dynamic managerial capabilities: interdependent effects of resource investment and deployment on firm performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 30(1), 1375–1394.
- Smith, J. K. (1987). Trade credit and informational asymmetry. *The Journal of Finance*, 42(4), 863–872.
- Soenen, L. A. (1993). Cash conversion cycle and corporate profitability. *Journal of Cash Management*, (13), 53–53.
- Sousa, R., & Voss, C. (2008). Contingency research in operations management practices. *Journal of Operations Management*, 26(6), 697–713.
- Studenmund, A. H. (1997). *Using econometrics: A practical guide. New York Addison-Wesley.*
- Tingbani, I. (2015). Working capital management and profitability of UK firms : A contingency theory approach. *PhD Thesis, Centre for Finance and Risk. The Business School, Bournemouth University.*
- Wasiuzzaman, S. (2015). Working capital and firm value in an emerging market. *International Journal of Managerial Finance*, 11(1), 60–79.

- Wilden, R., Gudergan, S. P., Nielsen, B. B., & Lings, I. (2013). Dynamic Capabilities and Performance: Strategy, Structure and Environment. *Long Range Planning*, 46(1–2), 72–96.
- Yang, X. (2011). The role of trade credit in the recent subprime financial crisis. *Journal of Economics and Business*, 63(5), 517–529.
- Zona, F. (2016). Agency models in different stages of CEO tenure: The effects of stock options and board independence on R&D investment. *Research Policy*, 45(2), 560–575.