

The Effect of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Performance, Green Investment, and Capital Structure on Company Value, with Profitability as a Mediating Variable, Among Listed Companies in the Agricultural Sector

Irham Suharja*, Hakimam Thamrin

Universitas Mercubuana, Indonesia

Email: hardja.irham@gmail.com*, hakimam.thamrin@mercubuana.ac.id

Keywords:	Abstract
ESG; GRI 13; green investment; capital structure; profitability.	This research aims to examine the effect of Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) performance, green investment, and capital structure on firm value, with profitability serving as a mediating variable, among agricultural companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the 2022–2024 period. This research employed a quantitative approach using secondary data obtained from annual reports, sustainability reports, and financial statements. The sample consisted of 34 companies selected through purposive sampling. Panel data regression analysis and the Sobel test were employed to examine both the direct and indirect effects among the variables. The findings indicate that green investment has no direct effect on firm value, whereas ESG performance, capital structure, and profitability have significant direct effects on firm value. The mediation analysis reveals that profitability mediates the relationship between ESG performance and firm value as well as the relationship between green investment and firm value. In contrast, profitability mediates the relationship between capital structure and firm value with a negative indirect effect. These findings suggest that improvements in firm value within the agricultural sector are primarily driven by firms' ability to enhance profitability through ESG implementation and green investment, while capital structure continues to exert direct influence on firm value despite its negative indirect effect through profitability.

INTRODUCTION

The agricultural sector plays a vital strategic role in sustaining national food security and contributing significantly to Indonesia's gross domestic product (GDP). Based on the Macro Statistics Report by the Ministry of Agriculture in 2024, the agricultural sector ranked as the second largest contributor to Indonesia's national GDP at 13.27% in 2024, following the manufacturing and wholesale sectors. In addition to its economic significance, the sector employs approximately 37.81 million workers as of August 2024, representing 26.15% of Indonesia's total workforce of 144.64 million people, making it one of the most labour-intensive sectors in the country.

Despite its strategic importance, the agricultural sector faces complex environmental and social challenges, including land degradation, water pollution, greenhouse gas emissions, and biodiversity loss. The sector is subject to extensive regulatory oversight, including Law No. 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management, Law No. 41 of 2009 on Protection of Sustainable Agricultural Land, and Law No. 22 of 2019 on Sustainable Agricultural Cultivation

Systems. These regulatory dynamics, combined with the sector's high dependency on natural resources and its intensive labour composition, create a unique context in which sustainability performance becomes a critical factor influencing investor perception and firm value.

Firm value in the agricultural sector is typically measured through the Price to Book Value (PBV) ratio, which reflects how the market values a company relative to its book equity. An analysis of PBV trends among agricultural emittents listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) shows that the average PBV increased from 2021 to 2023 but subsequently declined in 2024. Based on the Katadata ESG Index Summary Report 2025, the Plantation Sector recorded the highest sustainability performance index among all sectors for three consecutive years, with environmental disclosure scores of 66.75, social scores of 51.50, and governance scores of 71.67 in 2025. The sector's consistently improving ESG performance contrasts with the PBV decline in 2024, raising important questions about how sustainability dimensions translate into market-recognised firm value.

Table 1. PBV Ratio Trend — Agricultural Sector

Year	2021	2022	2023	2024
PBV	1.15	1.63	1.71	1.47

Source: IDX, processed by researcher.

Table 2. Katadata ESG Sustainability Performance Index – Plantation Sector

Year	Environmental Score	Social Score	Governance Score	Total Score
2023	70.09	46.06	30.33	56.86
2024	71.49	44.80	44.94	57.84
2025	66.75	51.50	71.67	64.60

Source: Katadata ESG Index 2025, processed by researcher.

The relationship between ESG performance and firm value has attracted significant scholarly attention in the context of sustainability-driven investment. According to Stakeholder Theory (Freeman, 1984), companies that adequately address the interests of multiple stakeholders through environmental and social practices tend to enhance their reputation and investor confidence, ultimately increasing firm value. Based Signaling Theory (Spence, 1973) transparent ESG disclosure signals strong governance, sustainability, reduced information asymmetry, boosting investor confidence, share demand, and firm value, long-term prospects. However, evidence on the direct ESG–firm value relationship remains mixed across different sectors and geographies. For the agricultural sector, Cristea et al. (2025) found that ESG dimensions positively influence financial performance and firm value in European agricultural companies. In contrast, Chong and Loh (2023) observed a negative ESG transparency effect on firm valuation in the global palm oil sector, while Septian et al. (2025) found no significant effect of ESG performance on share values of Indonesian plantation companies.

Beyond ESG performance, green investment represents another dimension of corporate sustainability commitment. Green investment, defined as expenditures on activities that conserve energy, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, manage pollution, and minimise waste (Obagbuwa & Chummun, 2024), carries significant implications for corporate performance.

The Legitimacy Theory posits that companies undertake green investment to align with societal norms and maintain their social licence to operate (Deegan, 2002). Agricultural companies in Indonesia are mandated to conduct Environmental Impact Assessments (AMDAL) and manage their environmental liabilities under applicable regulatory frameworks. Prior studies report divergent findings: Obagbuwa and Chummun (2024) and Khalid et al. (2023) found that green investment significantly enhances firm value and profitability, whereas Sion et al. (2026) found no direct or negative effects.

Capital structure, as measured by the Debt to Equity Ratio (DER), represents a key financial determinant of firm value. The Trade

Off Theory suggests that optimal use of debt provides tax shield benefits while managing financial distress risks (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). Among agricultural companies, which are characterised by high capital intensity for land expansion and asset development, capital structure decisions carry particular strategic relevance. The DER of agricultural emittents showed a declining trend from 2021 to 2024, yet empirical evidence on its relationship with firm value remains inconsistent: Monica et al. (2025) found a positive effect, while Hung et al. (2021) reported a negative relationship.

To reconcile these inconsistencies, this study introduces profitability measured by Return on Equity (ROE) as a mediating variable. Sumarno et al. (2023) argue that improvements in ESG performance are not immediately recognised as firm value signals by markets; investors require tangible financial performance indicators such as profitability. Similarly, Tanasya and Handayani (2020) argue that green investment's impact on firm value is indirect, mediated through the profitability it generates. Putro and Risman (2021) underscore that capital structure only meaningfully influences firm value when it supports the effective generation of profit. Empirical support for profitability as a mediator is provided by Putra and Budastra (2024), Pathan and Mohanty (2025), and Sukmana and Suzan (2025).

Several previous studies have examined the relationships among ESG performance, green investment, capital structure, profitability, and firm value. Cristea et al. (2025) found that ESG dimensions positively influence financial performance and firm value in European agricultural companies. Obagbuwa and Chummun (2024) and Khalid et al. (2023) found that green investment significantly enhances firm value and profitability. Monica et al. (2025) found a positive effect of capital structure on firm value, while Hung et al. (2021) reported a negative relationship. Putra and Budastra (2024), Pathan and Mohanty (2025), and Sukmana and Suzan (2025) confirmed profitability as a mediator in these relationships. However, despite these findings, several research gaps remain. Most previous studies were conducted in developed markets or general manufacturing sectors, with limited focus on the Indonesian agricultural sector. The integration of ESG performance, green investment, and capital structure as simultaneous predictors of firm value through profitability has not been extensively examined in the agricultural context. Moreover, research specifically analyzing agricultural companies listed on the IDX with comprehensive ESG disclosure based on GRI 13 standards remains scarce. This study addresses these gaps by providing a comprehensive analysis of these relationships in the Indonesian agricultural sector.

The novelty of this research lies in integrating three key determinants ESG performance, green investment, and capital structure as simultaneous predictors of firm value in a single

research model with profitability as a mediating variable, which has not been extensively examined in the Indonesian agricultural sector. This study employs comprehensive ESG disclosure measurement based on GRI 13 standards (26 indicators), providing a more detailed and standardized assessment compared to previous studies that used aggregate ESG scores or limited indicators. The research specifically focuses on the agricultural sector, which has unique characteristics in terms of natural resource dependency, regulatory intensity, and labour composition, making it a relevant and under-researched context. Additionally, this study uses panel data regression with the Fixed Effect Model to control for company-specific heterogeneity, providing more robust empirical evidence compared to cross-sectional or simple regression approaches, thereby contributing to the limited literature on ESG and firm value in the Indonesian agricultural sector and offering insights for investors, policymakers, and corporate managers in a rapidly evolving sustainability landscape.

This study therefore examines the role of profitability as a mediating mechanism between ESG performance, green investment, capital structure, and firm value in the Indonesian agricultural sector, an area that remains underexplored despite its strategic importance. This study aims to examine the effect of ESG performance, green investment, and capital structure on firm value, with profitability as a mediating variable, among agricultural companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange during the 2022–2024 period. The research offers theoretical contributions by extending Stakeholder, Signaling, Legitimacy, and Trade-Off Theories to the Indonesian agricultural context, while practically providing insights for companies, managers, investors, and policymakers on strengthening ESG disclosure, optimizing capital structure, and developing sustainability strategies to enhance firm value.

METHOD

Research Design and Data

This research employed a quantitative associative-causal research design to examine relationships among ESG performance, green investment, capital structure, profitability, and firm value. Secondary data were obtained from annual reports, sustainability reports, and audited financial statements of agricultural companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange over the period 2022–2024. The three-year observation window was selected to ensure data stability, relevance, and adequate reflection of the dynamics within the post-pandemic period characterised by increasing ESG regulatory attention in Indonesia.

Variable Operationalization

The operational definitions and measurement of all variables used in this study are summarised in Table 2.

Table 2. Variable Operationalization

Variable	Definition	Measurement	Scale
ESG Performance (X1)	Extent of ESG disclosure based on GRI 13 standard (26 indicators)	ESG Score = $\frac{\text{Disclosed Items}}{\text{Total Items}} \times 100\%$	Ratio

Variable	Definition	Measurement	Scale
Green Investment (X2)	Environmental expenditure relative to total assets	GI = Total Environmental Cost / Total Assets × 100%	Ratio
Capital Structure (X3)	Proportion of debt financing relative to equity	DER = Total Debt / Total Equity	Ratio
Profitability / ROE (M)	Return generated on shareholders' equity (mediating variable)	ROE = Net Income / Total Equity × 100%	Ratio
Firm Value / PBV (Y)	Market valuation relative to book value of equity	PBV = Market Closing Price / Book Value per Share	Ratio

Source: GRI 13 (2022), ISO 31000, POJK 51/2017, processed by researcher.

Population and Sample

The population consists of all agricultural sub-sector companies listed on the IDX in 2024, totalling 57 companies. Purposive sampling was employed based on predefined eligibility criteria, resulting in a final sample of 34 companies. This generated 102 firm year observations over the 2022–2024 period. The sample covers two sub-groups: Plantations & Crops and Fish, Meat & Poultry, reflecting the diversity of the agricultural sector in Indonesia.

Data Analysis Method

This study employs panel data regression analysis using EViews version 13. The analysis involves three regression equations: (1) direct effects of ESG, GI, and DER on PBV; (2) effects of ESG, GI, and DER on ROE (profitability); and (3) effects of ESG, GI, DER, and ROE on PBV with profitability as a mediating variable. The appropriate regression model (Common Effect, Fixed Effect, or Random Effect) was determined through Chow and Hausman tests. Mediation effects were examined using the Sobel test (Sobel, 1982), with significance assessed based on t-statistic > 1.96 and p-value < 0.05. Hypothesis testing for direct effects used partial t-tests and simultaneous F-tests, with the coefficient of determination (Adjusted R²) reported to assess model fit.

The three regression equations are formulated as follows:

$$\text{Equation 1: } PBV_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 ESG_{it} + \beta_2 GI_{it} + \beta_3 DER_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

$$\text{Equation 2: } ROE_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 ESG_{it} + \beta_2 GI_{it} + \beta_3 DER_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

$$\text{Equation 3: } PBV_{it} = \alpha + \beta_1 ESG_{it} + \beta_2 GI_{it} + \beta_3 DER_{it} + \beta_4 ROE_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics for all variables used in this study.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics (n = 102 observations, 34 companies, 2022–2024)

Statistic	PBV	ESG	GI	DER	ROE
Mean	1.5360	0.6655	0.000815	1.4142	0.0172
Median	1.1500	0.6923	0.000430	1.0244	0.0701
Maximum	5.6900	0.9615	0.005233	9.9317	0.3118
Minimum	0.1500	0.3077	0.000029	0.0720	−2.7599

Statistic	PBV	ESG	GI	DER	ROE
Std. Dev.	1.2101	0.1825	0.000988	1.4606	0.3499
Observations	102	102	102	102	102

Source: Processed using EViews 13 (2026)

The mean PBV of 1.536 indicates that, on average, agricultural companies in the sample are valued above their book equity, reflecting positive investor expectations. The mean ESG score of 0.666 indicates moderate-to-good sustainability disclosure levels across the sample. Green investment (GI) exhibits a very low mean of 0.000815, suggesting that environmental expenditure as a proportion of total assets remains at an early development stage for most agricultural companies. The average DER of 1.414 indicates that external debt exceeds equity on average, consistent with the capital-intensive nature of agricultural operations. The wide standard deviation in ROE (0.350) and DER (1.461) reflects substantial heterogeneity among sample companies in terms of financial leverage and profitability performance.

The highest PBV of 5.690 was recorded by PT Sawit Sumbermas Sarana Tbk (SSMS) in 2023, attributable to its strong profitability (ROE of 0.2926) and high ESG score of 0.962. PT Sawit Sumbermas Sarana Tbk (SSMS) recorded a high Price-to-Book Value (PBV), primarily driven by its consistently strong and improving profitability (ROE), which signals the company's ability to generate sustainable earnings. The company also demonstrated outstanding ESG performance through its commitment to Net Zero Emissions, energy efficiency, full ISPO and RSPO certifications, and comprehensive supply chain traceability. Its sustainable palm oil downstream strategy further strengthened long-term growth prospects by increasing product value and reducing dependence on commodity prices. Although SSMS maintained relatively high leverage, investors perceived its debt as financing productive expansion, thereby enhancing market confidence and supporting a higher company valuation.

While the lowest PBV of 0.150 was observed for PT Widodo Makmur Unggas Tbk (WMUU) in 2024, coinciding with consecutive years of negative ROE (-0.0075, -0.2260, and -0.1411) and lower ESG score (0.346 and 0.500). PT Widodo Makmur Unggas Tbk (WMUU) recorded a low Price to Book Value (PBV) due to persistent net losses and negative Return on Equity (ROE) throughout 2022–2024, signalling weak financial performance and limited growth prospects. The company also faced significant industry challenges, including poultry oversupply, volatile DOC and live bird prices, and declining consumer purchasing power, all of which reduced operational performance. Increasing leverage further heightened investors' risk perceptions. Although WMUU continued to invest in green initiatives and implemented ESG practices, these efforts remained relatively limited and were insufficient to offset weak profitability. Consequently, the market assigned a lower valuation to the company's shares.

Descriptive statistics provide preliminary evidence that profitability and ESG tend to be positively associated with firm value, while excessively high leverage (DER) may negatively affect firm value.

Panel Data Model Selection

The Chow and Hausman tests were conducted for all three regression equations to determine the most appropriate panel data model. Results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Panel Data Model Selection Results

Equation	Test	Criterion	Prob.	Model Selected
Eq. 1 (ESG,GI,DER→PBV)	Chow Test	Cross-section Chi-sq	0.0000	Fixed Effect
	Hausman Test	Cross-section random	0.0037	Fixed Effect
Eq. 2 (ESG,GI,DER→ROE)	Chow Test	Cross-section Chi-sq	0.0000	Fixed Effect
	Hausman Test	Cross-section random	0.0000	Fixed Effect
Eq. 3 (with ROE→PBV)	Chow Test	Cross-section Chi-sq	0.0000	Fixed Effect
	Hausman Test	Cross-section random	0.0202	Fixed Effect

Source: Processed using EViews 13 (2026)

The Chow test results for all three equations show p-values of 0.0000, rejecting the Common Effect Model. The Hausman test results similarly reject the Random Effect Model across all equations ($p < 0.05$). Consequently, the Fixed Effect Model (FEM) is adopted for all three regression equations, consistent with significant individual company heterogeneity that must be controlled for in the analysis.

Direct Effect of ESG, Green Investment, and Capital Structure on Firm Value (Equation 1)

Table 5 presents the results of the Fixed Effect regression for Equation 1.

Table 5. Regression Results – Equation 1: Direct Effects on Firm Value (PBV)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
Constant	0.2045	0.5161	0.3963	0.6932
ESG Performance	1.5555	0.7156	2.1738	0.0334**
Green Investment (GI)	0.0881	0.6920	0.1273	0.8991
Capital Structure (DER)	0.2109	0.0703	3.0012	0.0038***
R-squared: 0.8619				
Adjusted R-squared: 0.7854				
Prob(F-statistic): 0.0000				

Source: Processed using EViews 13 (2026). ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$.

ESG performance ($\beta = 1.5555$, $p = 0.0334$) shows a positive and significant direct effect on PBV, supporting H1. This finding supports signaling theory, suggesting that strong ESG practices signal long-term sustainability, effective governance, and lower business risk, thereby increasing investor confidence and firm value. It also supports stakeholder theory, which emphasizes that meeting stakeholder expectations strengthens corporate reputation and market valuation. Consistent with Aydogmus et al. (2022), Duan et al. (2023), Almaqtari et al. (2022)

and Cristea et al. (2024), the results indicate that investors in Indonesia's agricultural sector increasingly value sustainability when making investment decisions

Green investment ($\beta = 0.0881$, $p = 0.8991$) does not show a significant direct effect on firm value, leading to the rejection of H2. This suggests that the scale of green investment in the agricultural sector remains insufficient to produce an immediate market signal to investors. This finding also suggests that investors do not yet perceive green investment as a value-enhancing factor in the short term, as its economic benefits are realized over a longer horizon.. Consistent with Hasanah dan Paramita (2025), Yusnia et al. (2024), Juanda and Yumna (2025), Dearani et al. (2025), green investment is more likely to enhance firm value indirectly through financial performance rather than exerting a direct effect on market valuation.

Capital structure (DER) ($\beta = 0.2109$, $p = 0.0038$) has a positive and significant effect on PBV, supporting H3. This finding is consistent with Trade Off Theory suggesting that moderate leverage is perceived positively by investors as a signal of financial efficiency and expansion capacity. This finding also consistent with previous finding: Monica et al. (2025), Bui et al. (2023), Micheli et al. (2019), and Soetjanto & Thamrin (2020) . The Adjusted R² of 0.785 indicates that 78.54% of PBV variation is explained by the model, with the remainder attributable to factors outside the model.

Effects on Profitability (Equation 2)

Table 6 presents the regression results for Equation 2.

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
Constant	−0.0428	0.1158	−0.3691	0.7132
ESG Performance	0.6041	0.1606	3.7614	0.0004***
Green Investment (GI)	0.3872	0.1553	2.4932	0.0152**
Capital Structure (DER)	−0.2487	0.0158	−15.772	0.0000***
R-squared: 0.9168				
Adjusted R-squared: 0.8707				
Prob(F-statistic): 0.0000				

Source: Processed using EViews 13 (2026). ** $p < 0.05$; *** $p < 0.01$.

ESG performance has a positive and significant effect on profitability ($\beta = 0.6041$, $p = 0.0004$), supporting H5. This finding suggests that stronger ESG practices enhance financial performance by improving operational efficiency, stakeholder support, and long-term business sustainability. The results support stakeholder theory, which emphasizes the benefits of meeting stakeholder expectations, and signaling theory, which views ESG disclosure as a positive signal of effective governance and lower business risk. Consistent with previous studies by Shrestha et al. (2023) Cristea et al. (2025), Xu et al. (2025) and Hikmah & Daljono (2023), the findings demonstrate that ESG implementation contributes not only to sustainability objectives but also to improved corporate profitability and long-term competitiveness.

Green investment also shows a positive and significant effect on ROE ($\beta = 0.3872$, $p = 0.0152$), supporting H6. Green investment enhances profitability by improving resource efficiency, reducing environmental and operational costs, and minimizing regulatory and legal risks. The findings support legitimacy theory, suggesting that environmentally responsible practices strengthen corporate reputation, stakeholder trust, and operational efficiency, leading to better financial performance. Consistent with Sukmana & Suzan (2025), the results demonstrate that green investment contributes to higher profitability, particularly in Indonesia's agricultural sector, where environmental compliance and sustainable resource management generate tangible economic benefits.

Capital structure (DER) has a negative and significant effect on ROE ($\beta = -0.2487$, $p = 0.0000$), supporting H7. Excessive leverage imposes high interest burdens that erode net income, consistent with the predictions of Trade Off Theory. The Adjusted R^2 of 0.871 confirms the high explanatory power of the model for profitability variation.

Full Model with Profitability as Mediator (Equation 3)

Table 7 presents the regression results for Equation 3, incorporating profitability (ROE) as a mediating variable.

Table 7. Regression Results – Equation 3: Effects with Profitability as Mediator

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
Constant	0.2750	0.4838	0.5684	0.5717
ESG Performance	0.5602	0.7394	0.7577	0.4514
Green Investment (GI)	0.7261	0.6782	1.0706	0.2884
Capital Structure (DER)	0.6207	0.1446	4.2940	0.0001***
Profitability (ROE)	1.6477	0.5175	3.1840	0.0022***
R-squared: 0.8808				
Adjusted R-squared:				
0.8118				
Prob(F-statistic): 0.0000				

Source: Processed using EViews 13 (2026). *** $p < 0.01$.

After incorporating ROE as a mediating variable, ESG performance ($p = 0.4514$) and green investment ($p = 0.2884$) lose their significant direct effects on PBV, indicating full mediation. Capital structure remains positively significant ($\beta = 0.6207$, $p = 0.0001$), with its coefficient increasing from 0.2109 to 0.6207, reflecting partial mediation. Profitability (ROE) exerts the strongest positive and significant effect on PBV ($\beta = 1.6477$, $p = 0.0022$), confirming that investors primarily respond to bottom-line financial performance. This supports H4 and highlights the pivotal role of profitability as the most influential determinant of firm value in the agricultural sector. The Adjusted R^2 increases to 0.812 with the inclusion of ROE.

Sobel Test – Mediation Analysis

Table 8. Sobel Test Results for Mediation by Profitability (ROE)

Variable	Path a	Sa	Path b	Sb	t-Statistic	p-value
ESG →	0.6041	0.1606	1.6477	0.5175	2.4303**	0.0151
ROE →						
PBV						

Variable	Path a	Sa	Path b	Sb	t-Statistic	p-value
GI → ROE → PBV	0.3872	0.1553	1.6477	0.5175	1.9630**	0.0496
DER → ROE → PBV	-0.2487	0.0158	1.6477	0.5175	-3.1211***	0.0018

Source: Processed using Sobel calculator (2026). **p<0.05; ***p<0.01.

The Sobel test confirms that profitability (ROE) significantly mediates all three indirect relationships. For ESG → ROE → PBV ($t = 2.430$, $p = 0.015$), profitability acts as a full mediator, supporting H8. ESG improvements enhance operational efficiency and stakeholder relationships, which first increase profitability, and investors then respond positively to this financial improvement by bidding up the stock price. This finding is consistent with Sumarno et al. (2023), Zhou et al. (2022), Putra and Budastra (2024), and Pathan and Mohanty (2025). For GI → ROE → PBV ($t = 1.963$, $p = 0.050$), profitability also acts as a full mediator, supporting H9. Green investment reduces regulatory penalties, improves resource efficiency, and strengthens corporate reputation, thereby enhancing profitability before the market responds, aligns with Sukmana and Suzan (2025). For DER → ROE → PBV ($t = -3.121$, $p = 0.002$), profitability mediates the capital structure–firm value relationship with a negative indirect effect, supporting H10 with partial mediation. While debt positively affects firm value directly (likely through tax shield benefits and investor confidence in funded expansion), it simultaneously decreases profitability through higher interest burdens, thus exerting a counteracting indirect negative effect on firm value. This dual-channel finding is consistent with Natsir and Yusbardini (2020) and Hikmah and Daljono (2023).

Summary of Hypothesis Testing

Table 9. Summary of Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis			Result		Conclusion
Hypothesis	Relationship	Direction	Significance	Direction	
H1	ESG → PBV (direct)	Positive	Significant ($p=0.0334$)	Positive	Accepted
H2	GI → PBV (direct)	Positive	Not Significant ($p=0.8991$)	Positive	Rejected
H3	DER → PBV (direct)	Positive	Significant ($p=0.0038$)	Positive	Accepted
H4	ROE → PBV	Positive	Significant ($p=0.0022$)	Positive	Accepted
H5	ESG → ROE	Positive	Significant ($p=0.0004$)	Positive	Accepted
H6	GI → ROE	Positive	Significant ($p=0.0152$)	Positive	Accepted
H7	DER → ROE	Positive	Significant ($p=0.0000$)	Negative	Rejected
H8	ESG → ROE → PBV	Positive	Significant ($p=0.0151$)	Positive	Accepted (Full)
H9	GI → ROE → PBV	Positive	Significant ($p=0.0496$)	Positive	Accepted (Full)

Hypothesis		Result		Conclusion
Hypothesis	Relationship	Direction	Significance	
H10	DER → ROE → PBV	Positive	Significant (p=0.0018)	Negative Rejection (Partial)

Source: Processed by researcher (2026).

CONCLUSION

This study provides several key conclusions regarding the determinants of firm value among agricultural sector companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for 2022–2024. First, ESG performance based on GRI 13 disclosure has a positive and significant direct effect on firm value (PBV), confirming that investors in the agricultural sector recognise and reward companies that demonstrate strong sustainability governance. Second, green investment does not have a significant direct effect on firm value, indicating that the scale of environmental expenditure in the sector remains insufficient to generate immediate market signals. Third, capital structure (DER) has a positive and significant direct effect on firm value, suggesting that investors perceive moderate leverage as a growth enabler rather than a risk factor. Fourth, profitability (ROE) is the most influential determinant of firm value, consistent with signaling theory's prediction that earnings performance constitutes the most credible market signal. Fifth, ESG performance and green investment both positively and significantly enhance profitability, while capital structure exerts a negative and significant effect on profitability through increased interest burdens. On mediation effects, profitability fully mediates the relationships from ESG performance to firm value and from green investment to firm value, confirming that sustainability practices create value primarily by first improving financial performance. Profitability also partially mediates the capital structure–firm value relationship with a negative indirect channel, reflecting a dual effect where debt simultaneously increases firm value directly while reducing profitability indirectly. For managerial implications, agricultural companies should strengthen ESG disclosure quality aligned with GRI 13 standards, increase green investment allocation to improve operational efficiency and avoid regulatory penalties, and maintain optimal capital structure to balance tax shield benefits against profitability erosion. Future research should extend the analysis to longer time horizons, incorporate broader ESG metrics, and explore sector-specific moderation effects.

REFERENCES

- Almaqtari, F. A., Elsheikh, T., Tawfik, O. I., & Youssef, M. A. E. A. (2022). Exploring the impact of sustainability, board characteristics, and firm-specifics on firm value: A comparative study of the United Kingdom and Turkey. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 14(24). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su142416395>
- Aydoğmuş, M., Gülay, G., & Ergun, K. (2022). Impact of ESG performance on firm value and profitability. *Borsa Istanbul Review*, 22, S119–S127. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bir.2022.11.006>
- Chong, T., & Loh, L. (2023). Innovating ESG integration as sustainable strategy: ESG transparency and firm valuation in the palm oil sector. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(22), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su152215943>
- Cristea, M., Noja, G. G., Drăcea, R. M., Iacobuță-Mihăiță, A. O., & Dorożyński, T. (2025). ESG investment strategies and the financial performance of European agricultural

- companies: A new modelling approach. *Journal of Business Economics and Management*, 25(6), 1283–1307. <https://doi.org/10.3846/jbem.2024.23010>
- Deegan, C. (2002). Introduction: The legitimising effect of social and environmental disclosures A theoretical foundation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 282–311. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210435852>
- Duan, Y., Yang, F., & Xiong, L. (2023). Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) performance and firm value: Evidence from Chinese manufacturing firms. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 15(17). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su151712858>
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Hasanah, N. L., & Paramita, V. S. (2025). The influence of environmental social governance, green investment, and profitability on firm value: Study on the SRI-KEHATI Index (2019–2023). *Sinergi International Journal of Economics*, 3(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.61194/economics.v3i1.408>
- Hikmah, N., & Daljono, D. (2023). The impact of ESG disclosure, liquidity, and leverage on firm value mediated by profitability performance. *Kontigensi: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, 11(2), 817–831. <https://doi.org/10.56457/jimk.v11i2.504>
- Hung, D. Van, Nhung, L. T., & Hung, N. T. (2021). The impact of capital structure on firm value in Vietnam. *Advances and Applications in Statistics*, 69(2), 115–132. <https://doi.org/10.17654/as069020115>
- Jensen, M. C., & Meckling, W. H. (1976). Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3(4), 305–360.
- Katadata Insight Center. (2025). *Katadata ESG Index 2025: Indonesia*. Jakarta: Katadata.
- Khalid, F., Naveed, K., Nawaz, R., Sun, X., Wu, Y., & Ye, C. (2023). Does corporate green investment enhance profitability? An institutional perspective. *Economic Research–Ekonomika Istraživanja*, 36(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2022.2063919>
- Monica, A., Putranto, A., & Gunawan, J. (2025). Capital structure and firm value: Cross-country evidence from Indonesia, China, and Thailand. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*, 12(1), 87–96.
- Natsir, K., & Yusbardini. (2020). The effect of capital structure on firm value with profitability as mediating variable. *International Journal of Management and Business Research*, 10(2), 1–14.
- Obagbuwa, O., & Chummun, B. Z. (2024). Green investment and firm value: Evidence from the Johannesburg Stock Exchange. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 16(4). <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16041234>
- Pathan, S., & Mohanty, S. K. (2025). ESG performance and enterprise value: The mediating role of profitability in Indian public companies. *International Journal of Finance & Economics*, 30(1), 132–148.
- Putra, P. E., & Budastra, I. K. (2024). ESG performance, financial performance, and firm value: A multi-country study. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*, 14(2), 215–234.
- Putro, A., & Risman, A. (2021). Capital structure, profitability, and firm value in the manufacturing sector. *Jurnal Keuangan dan Perbankan*, 25(4), 112–127.
- Septian, I., Supriyadi, E., & Fajrillah, F. (2025). ESG disclosure and firm value: Evidence from Indonesian plantation companies. *Journal of Governance and Regulation*, 14(2), 78–89.
- Shrestha, M., Paudel, K., & Chaulagain, D. (2023). ESG performance and firm profitability: An analysis of corporate sustainability. *Sustainable Development*, 31(3), 1025–1038.
- Sion, J., Faridah, L., & Rohman, A. (2026). Green investment and firm value: A negative relationship in the context of emerging markets. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 28(1), 41–58.

- Spence, M. (1973). Job market signaling. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87(3), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1882010>
- Sukmana, R., & Suzan, L. (2025). Green investment and firm value: The mediating role of profitability in the energy sector. *Jurnal Akuntansi dan Keuangan Indonesia*, 22(1), 1–18.
- Sumarno, A., Prasetya, R., & Raharjo, S. (2023). ESG performance, profitability, and firm value: A mediating analysis in the Indonesian manufacturing sector. *Jurnal Keuangan dan Perbankan*, 27(3), 220–238.
- Tanasya, R., & Handayani, S. (2020). Green investment and firm value: Does profitability mediate? *Journal of Indonesian Economy and Business*, 35(2), 168–185.
- Xu, L., Liu, Y., & Chen, Z. (2025). ESG performance and corporate profitability: Evidence from Chinese listed companies. *Finance Research Letters*, 62, 105–118.
- Zhou, G., Liu, L., & Luo, S. (2022). Sustainable development, ESG performance, and company value: Empirical evidence from Chinese companies. *Business Strategy and the Environment*, 31(7), 3606–3621.