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Abstract—Indonesian stock market are unpopular sources of capital for companies. Stock market have 2 main products that is stock and bond. Bond is much more unpopular than stock. This study will examine the relations between risk, stock return, and bond returns relation in Indonesian Public Companies. Sample are 51 companies that listed in Indonesian Stock Exchange and issues bond during 2011-2018. Risk as endogen variable measured by Altman Z score. Stock values as exogenous variables using stock returns and dividend yields as indicators. Endogen variable bond value having bond returns and Yield to maturity as measurements. Data then analysed using warp PLS. The results shows that stock returns are mediating the relations between bankruptcy risk and bond return in Indonesia. This is consistent with optimal capital structure and financial distress theory. Companies usually choose to issued stock rather than bond. If it choose both, it will be like to use stock rather than bond. Hence, investor also choose in the stock when companies risk is higher rather than bond.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Stock Market usually has two main instrument that is stock and bond. Stock is representation of ownership, while bond is considered as debt. Public companies got it names by issue stock in capital market, but only few of them also issued bond.

Optimal Capital structure suggested that it needs to diversify between asset and debt security in response to bankruptcy risk [1]. Bankruptcy risk is a condition when a companies fail to continue its operations due to financial problems [2]. Share and bond having their own risk and benefit.

Share will traditionally give the holder dividend from issuer companies. Issuing stock considered as cheap source of capital, where companies only pay dividend when they are having free cash flows. If the company do not pay dividend, investor still can return by reselling their share when the price is rising. Higher price usually means higher risk. Once companies paid dividend it could be higher than bond coupon.

Bond, as other types of debt make company have to pay coupon regularly. Instead of that, the holder also has returns by selling their bond at higher price. It makes bond considered as a safer way to investing with fixed income. The higher risk the bigger return and coupon that bondholder get.

A research Bai et al [3] stated that share and bond are competing in the stock market. Indonesia is unique in treating stock and bond market. Stock is traded in Jakarta Stock Exchange as Government Agent, and bond is traded in Surabaya Stock Exchange as Privat Companies before both merging into Indonesian Stock Market. This is why it is important to study in Indonesian context the relation between risk, stock, and bond value.

Optimal capital structure stated that due to bankruptcy risk, it is important for companies to diversify the funding sources into stock and bond [1]. Hence for investor is always a choice according to market condition to diversified risk by mix between stock and bond.

A research Bai et al [3] explain that corporate risk has effect on stock returns. Based on that research, the first hypothesis in this research is:

H1: Corporate Risk has effect on stock value

Some research Bai et al [3] and Franke et al [4] shows that corporates risk has effect on bond returns. Based on these research, the second hypothesis of this study is:

H2: Bankruptcy Risk has effect on bond value

Empirical previous studies by Migiakis and Bekiris [5], Tsai and Wu [6], Cao et al [7] results stated that share returns affecting bond returns. Third hypothesis based on these study is:

H3: Share value affected bond returns
III. METHODOLOGY

This is a quantitative research. Secondary data is taking from Indonesian stock exchange using purposive sampling with criteria as follows. Listed in Indonesian Stock Exchange during 2010-2018, publish complete data and issues bond during that period.

Hypothesis are testing using Partial Least Square using WarpPLS software. There are exogenous and endogenous variables in this research. Exogenous variable is bankruptcy risk using formula [2]:

\[ Z = 0.012 \left( \frac{WC}{TA} \right) + 0.014 \left( \frac{RE}{TA} \right) + 0.033 \left( \frac{EBIT}{TA} \right) + 0.006 \left( \frac{MVE}{BVD} \right) + 0.999 \left( \frac{Sales}{TA} \right) \]

Notes that \( Z \) = Altman Bankruptcy score, \( WC = \) Working Capital, \( RE = \)Retained Earnings, \( EBIT = \) Earnings before Interest and Taxes, \( MVE=\) Market Value Equity, \( BVD = \) Book Value Debt, \( Sales = \) total sales in a year.

There are two endogenous variables in this research. First, Bond Value that using Bond Returns and Bond Value that having stock returns and dividend yield as indicators. Stock returns formula is modified from previous study Bilson et al [8]:

\[ R_t = \left( \frac{P_t - P_{t-1} + D_t}{P_{t-1}} \right) \]

Notes that \( R_t = \) Return per share year \( t, P_t = \) Price per share year \( t, P_{t-1} = \) Price per share year \( t-1, D_t = \) Dividend payment year \( t. \) Dividend yield formula is taken from Chen et al [9] as follow:

\[ DY = \text{Dividend per share} / \text{Price per share} \]

Second, Bond Value that using Bond Returns and Bond Yields as indicators. Bond returns formula modified from Aboody et al [10]:

\[ BR_t = \left( \frac{BP_t - BP_{t-1} + CP_t}{BP_{t-1}} \right) \]

Notes that \( BR_t = \) Bond Return year \( t, BP_t = \) Bond Price year \( t, CP_t = \) Coupon Payment year \( t, BP_{t-1} = \) Bond Price year \( t-1. \) Bond Yields are calculated using [11]:

\[ \text{YTM} = \left( \frac{CFn}{P} \right)^{1/n} \]

Notes that \( \text{YTM} = \) Yields to Maturity, \( CFn = \) Cash Flow from coupon payment, \( n = \) bond age, \( P = \) bond price.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

There are 3 section in this part. First, sample overview and descriptive statistics. Second, hypothesis testing. Third, discussion.

A. Sample Overview and Statistic Description

There are 517 companies in the population. Hence, only 51 that could be taken as samples. Using 8-year data, total polling data is 408. Sample selection can be seen in Table 1.

| Variables | Indicators | Mean | Std. Deviation | K-S |
|-----------|------------|------|----------------|-----|
| Risk      | Z          | 199.60 | 2,381.02       | 0.48 |
| Stock Value | SR        | 1,070,721.19 | 3,812,874.74  | 0.40 |
|           | DY        | 4,700.96 | 66,982.65    | 0.52 |
| Bond Value | BR        | 0.00   | 0.00          | 0.46 |
|           | YTM       | 0.16   | 0.33          | 0.41 |

*normal distribution p-value<0.05

Sources: Data Analysis

B. Hypothesis Testing Results

Hypothesis testing result consist two important step. First, validity and reliability test. Second, structural model test.

1) Validity and reliability tests: There are validity and reliability test for variable indicators. The step are as follows.

a) Validity test: Construct validity consist of convergent and discriminant validity.

- Convergent validity can be seen from loading factor in Table 3. Since there are 408 samples, Loading Factor > 0.30 for samples more than 350 [12]. It means that all indicators in this study is having convergent validity.

| Variables | Indicators | Loading factors |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|
| Risk      | Z          | 1*              |
| Stock Value | SR        | 0.702*          |
|           | DY        | 0.702*          |
| Bond Value | BR        | 1*              |
|           | YTM       | 1*              |

*-loading factor > 0.30

Sources: Data Analysis

- Discriminant Validity can be seen through cross loading. All cross loading indicators are more than 0.7 within 1 variable and meet validity discriminant criteria. The result can be seen in Table 4.

| Indicator | Risk | Stock Value | Bond Value |
|-----------|------|-------------|------------|
| Z         | 1*   | 0           | 0          |
| SR        | 0.13 | 0.702*      | -0.015     |
| DY        | -0.13| 0.702*      | 0.015      |
| BR        | 0    | 0           | 1*         |
| YTM       | 0    | 0           | 1*         |

*cross loading > 0.7

Sources: Data Analysis
b) Reliability test: Reliability are testing using Cronbach alpha and composite reliability. All variable pass cronbach alpha and composite reliability since its value more than 0.6 except for stock value cronbach alpha. But since stock value composite reliability is 0.66 more than 0.6, it still considered passed reliability test. The summary can be seen in Table 5.

| Variable   | Cronbach Alpha | Composite Reliability |
|------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| Risk       | 1*             | 1*                    |
| Stock Value| -0.029         | 0.66*                 |
| Bond Value | 1*             | 1*                    |
| *Cronbach alpha >0.6 |
| **Composite reliability > 0.6 |

2) Structural model tests: Structural Model tests are started with Model Fit dan Quality Indices. Result can be seen in Table 6.

| Indices | Value  | P     | Acceptable if | Notes |
|---------|--------|-------|---------------|-------|
| APC     | 0.289  | <0.001| P ≤ 0.05      | A     |
| ARS     | 0.148  | <0.001| P ≥ 0.05      | A     |
| AARS    | 0.145  | <0.001| P ≤ 0.05      | A     |
| AVIF    | 1.085  | ≤ 5   | ideally ≤3.3  | U     |
| AFVIF   | 1.006  | ≤ 5   | ideally ≤3.3  | U     |
| GoF     | 0.35   | small | ≥0.1; medium  | M     |
| SPR     | 1      | ≥ 0.7 | ideally = 1   | I     |
| RSCR    | 1      | ≥ 0.9 | ideally = 1   | I     |
| SSR     | 0.667  | ≥ 0.7 |               | U     |
| NLBCDR  | 0.5    | ≥ 0.7 |               | U     |

Sources: Data Analysis

Goodness of Fit in this study is 0.35 and considered as medium. Almost 5 out 9 indices are acceptable with three among them are ideal. This is enough to state that research model is fit.

C. Discussions

Three important findings in this research. First, bankruptcy risk has positive effect on share value. It means that the higher bankruptcy risk the more company choose to increase share value by giving dividend. It also means that the higher risk, the more investor chooses to buy share. It consistent previous research Bai et al [3].

Second, financial risk has positive effect on bond value. It means that the higher risk, the bigger coupon payment from companies. Investor also choose higher risk bond to seek higher returns. This is consistent with previous research Bai [3] and Franke et al [4].

Third, risk has negative effect on bond value. It means that if have to choose between the same risky companies, share is the choice for investor and issuer companies rather than bond. This is consistent with previous study Migiakis and Migiakis [5], Tsai and Wu [6], also Cao et al [7].

Additional finding is share value is mediating the relation between bankruptcy risk and bond value. Since risk has effect on share and bond value, and share value has effect on bond value it means that the relation partially mediated [13].

This result consistent with optimal capital structure. This is condition where firms have to make use optimally the mix of ownership and debt securities in the stock market. Hence, the investor in the market also choose to diversified risk between various securities instruments.

V. Conclusion and Future Scope

There are four conclusions in this research. First, there are two limitations of this research and its suggestion for further study. First, only few Indonesian companies that issues bond instead of stock. Further research can use longer year to expand the number of pooling data. The number of samples can also add by using companies that listed in other countries’ stock market. Second, this research using Partial Least Square (PLS), further research can use pooling data analysis method using Eviews.
ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thanks for Faculty of Administrative Sciences for providing funding for this research. The funding schemes is individual research project.

REFERENCES

[1] J. H. Scott Jr. “A Theory of Optimal Capital Structure”, The Bell Journal of Economics, vol. 7, no. 1 Spring, pp. 33-54, 1976.
[2] E.I. Altman. “Financial Ratios, Discriminant Analysis and Prediction of Corporate Bankruptcy”. The Journal of Finance, vol. 23, no. 4, pp. 589-609, 1968.
[3] J. Bai, T.G. Bali, and Q. Wen, “Common risk factors in the cross-section of corporate bond returns,” J. financ. econ., vol. 131, no. 3, pp. 619–642, 2019.
[4] B. Franke, S. Müller, and S. Müller, “The q-factors and expected bond returns,” J. Bank. Financ., vol. 83, pp. 19–35, 2017.
[5] P.M. Migiakis and F.V Bekiris, “Regime switches between dividend and bond yields,” Int. Rev. Financ. Anal., vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 198–204, 2009.
[6] H.-I. Tsai and Y. Wu, “Bond and stock market response to unexpected dividend changes,” J. Empir. Financ., vol. 30, pp. 1–15, 2015.
[7] N. Cao, V. Galvani, and S. Gubellini. “Firm Specific Stock and Bond Predictability: New Evidence from Canada”. International Review of Economics and Finance 51, pp. 174-192, 2015.
[8] J.F.O. Bilson, S.B. Kang, and H. Luo, “The term structure of implied dividend yields and expected returns,” Econ. Lett., vol. 128, pp. 9–13, 2015.
[9] J. Chen, W. Song, and M. Goergen, “Passing the dividend baton: the impact of dividend policy on new CEOs’ initial compensation,” J. Corp. Financ., vol. 56, pp. 458–481, 2019.
[10] D. Aboody, J.S. Hughes, and N.B. Ozel, “Corporate bond returns and the financial crisis,” J. Bank. Financ., vol. 40, pp. 42–53, 2014.
[11] N.M. Saad, M.N. Haniff, and N. Ali, “Corporate governance mechanisms with conventional bonds and Sukuk’ yield spreads,” Pacific-Basin Financ. J., p. 101116, 2019.
[12] J.F. Hair Jr, W.C. Black, B.J. Babin, R.E. Anderson. Multivariate Data Analysis. United States: Seventh Edition”.Pearson. 2014.
[13] R.M. Baron, and D.A. Kenny, “The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations,” Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 1173-1182, 1986.