

# COMPARATIVE STUDY OF CAPITAL STRUCTURE BETWEEN SOME SELECTED GLCs AND NGLCs IN MALAYSIA (1998 – 2012)

# ANITA BT ARIFFIN 2010608336

BACHELOR OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION
WITH HONOURS (FINANCE)
FACULTY OF BUSINESS MANAGEMENT
UNIVERSITI TEKNOLOGI MARA
PERLIS

**JANUARY 2014** 

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

Firstly of all, I would to thank Allah S.W.T for giving me the courage, health, and energy to carry out this study successfully.

I would like to express my thanks to my advisor, Puan Noor Azillah binti Mohamad Ali for her comments, guidance, advice and overall support throughout this study. I also would like to express my appreciation to all lecturers from faculty of business administration, University Technology Mara for their support and ideas in ensuring the success of my study.

Lastly it would be incomplete without extending my gratitude to parents and family for their love, moral support and understanding. Last but not least to my friends and colleagues for their encouragement and assistance during my study.

# **TABLE OF CONTENT**

CHAPTER	SUBJECT	PAGE
	TITLE PAGE DECLARATION OF ORIGINAL WORK LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL ACKNOWLEDGEMENT TABLE OF CONTENT LIST OF FIGURES LIST OF TABLES LIST PF ABBREVIATIONS ABSTRACT	i ii iii iv v,vi vii viii ix x
1.0	INTRODUCTION  1.1 CHAPTER OVERVIEW 1.2 THEORIES EXPLAINING CAPITAL STRUCTURE 1.3 CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY OVERVIEW 1.4 BACKGROUND OF THE COMPANIES 1.5 BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY 1.6 PROBLEM STATEMENT 1.7 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES 1.8 SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 1.8.1 Academicians 1.8.2 Investors 1.8.3 Future researches 1.9 SCOPE OF THE STUDY 1.10 LIMITATION OF STUDY 1.11 STRUCTURE OF THE CHAPTER 1.12 CONCLUSION	1 1-3 4 5-8 9-10 10-11 12 12 12 13 13 13 14
2.0	LITERATURE REVIEW 2.1 CHAPTER OVERVIEW 2.2 CAPITAL STRUCTURE DEPENDENT VARIABLE 2.3 CAPITAL STRUCTURE INDEPENDENT VARIABLES 2.3.1 Profitability 2.3.2 Liquidity 2.3.3 Tangibility 2.3.4 Size 2.4 RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INDEPENDENT VARIABLE AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES 2.5 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK 2.4 HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT 2.5 CONCLUSION	15 15 16-17 17 18 19 20-21 22 23-24 24
3.0	RESEARCH METHODOLOGY 3.1 CHAPTER OVERVIEW 3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN 3.2.1 DATA COLLECTION METHOD	24

	3.2.2 SOURCES OF DATA 3.2.3 TIME FRAME 3.3 DATA ADMINISTRATIVE AND ANALYSIS 3.3.1 Dependent Variables 3.3.2 Independent Variables	26 26 26 27-28
	3.4 DATA ANALYSIS 3.4.1 Multiple Regression Analysis 3.4.2 Pearson Correlation 3.4.3 Hypothesis Testing 3.4.4 Coefficient of Determination 3.4.5 T- Statistic 3.4.6 F- Statistic 3.5 CONCLUSION	28 29-30 31 32 33 34 35
4.0	FINDING AND ANALYSIS 4.1 CHAPTER OVERVIEW 4.2 GRAPH ANALYSIS 4.3 DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS 4.4 COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION – GLCs 4.5 COEFFICIENT OF DETERMINATION – NGLCs 4.6 MULTIPLE REGRESSION – GLCs 4.7 MULTIPLE REGRESSION – NGLCs 4.8 T-STATISTIC GLCs 4.9 T-STATISTIC NGLCS 4.10 F-STATISTIC 4.11 PEARSON CORRELATION – GLCs 4.12 PEARSON CORRELATION – NGLCs 4.13 SUMMARY FINDING 4.14 CONCLUSION	36 37 38-40 40 41 42-43 44-45 46-48 49-50 51-52 53 54 55-57
5.0	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION 5.1 CHAPTER OVERVIEW 5.2 DISCUSSION 5.3 RECOMMENDATION	58 58-59 60
	REFERENCES APPENDICES	61-65

### **ABSTRACT**

This study investigates the comparison of capital structure among publicly listed Government Linked Companies (GLCs) and Non-Government Linked Companies (NGLCs) in Malaysia. A total of 4 companies consist of both two GLCs and NGLCs are analyzed covering the period from 1998 to 2012. This study uses debt ratio as dependent variables and four independent variables that is profitability, liquidity, tangibility and firm's size. Multiple regression analysis and Pearson Correlation was used as a method of analysis. The findings indicates that a significantly positive relationship between debt ratio (DR) and firm's size for GLCs and NGLCs. The result also reveals that profitability, liquidity and tangibility have no influence on the debt ratio (DR) of GLCs and NGLCs. In addition, NGLCs are consistently more heavily levered than GLCs. Generally both GLCs and NGLCs support trade off theory and pecking order theory.