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#### Abstract

The idea of this study related to the explore of the effect of the liquidity stocks on the firm value. By using a sample data of 65 companies listed in Iraqi stock exchange (ISE) during 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012, I find that firms with liquid stocks have better firm value as measured by Tobin's Q as a function of firm value. This result holds even when I include firm fixed effects, control for idiosyncratic risk, and control for endogenous liquidity with instrumental variables. Result using panel data regression shows, also, that high liquid firm tends to have more equity in their capital structure and more operating profitability in their statement of account.
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## 1. Introduction

The marketability of the stocks in financial markets plays a central role in the valuation of the firms. On the one hand because liquidity is the lifeforce of security markets from the stand point of an investors, traders and other parties, a company's securities that is more liquid attracts more investors who trade with an aim to profit from the price appreciation caused by low cost, on other hand, the lower the liquidity, the higher the required rate of returns this higher return is to compensate investors for bearing the illiquid risk. This higher required rate of returns implies a lower market value for illiquid companies. The primary purpose of this study is to examine the relation between stock liquidity and firm value. An interesting question that arises is whether 2 variables are related, in the full sense of the word, is whether and how the development of stock markets can translate into firm value. Using a sample of firm level data listed in ISE over the period 2008-2012, this study concentrates on stock liquidity to evaluate their direct effects on firm value. I hypothesize a positive relationship between stock liquidity and firm value because there are strong theoretical reasons to support that market liquidity will positively affect firm value, this study included 5 sections, the first of which was devoted to introduction while the second section to review the literature, the third section has included the definition previous studies and methodology. Section 4 contains my empirical tests while section 5 concludes.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1 Liquidity

Liquidity appears to have a lot in common, because this thesis will focus on stock liquidity, the concept of this term will only be discussed in relation to stocks and stock markets. Liquidity refers to the ease by which an asset can be sold immediately after purchase without lowering the price and without incurring transaction cost(1) (Dalgaard,2009:9), in the same sense, (Gopalan et at, 2012:333)define the liquid assets(An assets is liquid if it can be converted into cash quickly and at a low cost). The liquidity of a stock is a measure of the ease with which cash can convert to an investment in the stock or vice versa. Illiquidity is driven by the explicit and implicit costs of buying or selling the stock. It is convenient to represent the cost of liquidity as the sum of three components: adverse selection cost, opportunity cost, and direct costs (commissions and fees) (Amihud \& Mendelson, 2000:11)

### 2.1.1 The Importance of Liquidity

Mang (1998) and khan and Winton (1998) suggest that greater liquidity can be an opportunity for large shareholder to increase their profit by monitoring the firms management. The greater the liquidity, the more shares can be bought in the market due to lower transaction costs. Thus, a higher concentration of ownership on a firm's market

Liquidity and value (Uno and Kamiyama, 2010:3), furthermore, Liquidity has wide ranging effects on financial markets; liquidity can explain the time series relationship between liquidity and securities returns (Amihud et al, 2006:272). Liquidity can help explain a number of
(1) Damodaran (2005) describes the cost of illiquidity as the cost of buyer's remorse, where you want to reverse your decision and sell what you just bought (Damordan2005: 20).
puzzles, such as why small stocks that are typically illiquid earn high returns (the small firm effect), liquidity improves operating performance or valuation based (taimur, 1998:155) liquidity is also an important consideration in trading. A liquid position in an asset is one that can be unwound at short notice. As the market for an asset became less liquid, traders are more likely to take losses because they face bigger bid-offer spread (Hull, 2010:385)

In sum, a company intent on increasing the liquidity of its stock should consider attempts to increase its investor base. (Amihud et al, 2008:24-26).

### 2.1.2 Measuring Liquidity.

There is no unanimity in the literature on how to empirically measure stock liquidity because stock liquidity is difficult to measure by its very nature (lesmond, 2005;Korajczykand sadka, 2008), due to define and measure the transaction costs, Bernstein, 1987:54-62, verify that "no signal measure tells the whole story a bout liquidity and that perhaps liquidity is in the eye of the beholder" (amihud, 2002:31-56) concludes that calculations of more fine measures of illiquidity require microstructure of data on transactions, which has no been available so far. In view of the Iraqi stock exchange (ISEs) is different from that in the most other markets because not only has small transactions, but there is also a low frequency daily stock trading, and, in order to properly capture stock liquidity, in this study, according to the rules of scientific research, I will review the most popular measures of stock liquidity. The first is the illiquidity measure proposed by Amihud (2002) (so named illiquidity ratio, illiq), * illiq shows the relation between price change and volume (Rubin, 2007:220-240). Amihud measure is the average ratio of the daily absolute return divided by the daily dinnar volume. I eliminate stock traded less than 15 days per month and use the average relative illiquidity as flow:-
(Dass et al, 2011:7) (Lilian, 2011:q) (Liang \&Wei, 2012:3278).
Each stock I the annual average is:-

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Avg ILLIQiy }=1 / \text { Diy } \sum_{\mathrm{t}=1}^{\text {Diy }} \frac{\text { Riyd }}{\text { VolEiyd }} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where Diy is the number of trading days for stock $_{\mathrm{i}}$ during year $_{\mathrm{y}}$, Riyd is the return on stock ${ }_{i}$ on day $_{d}$ of year ${ }_{y}$ and VolEiyd is the respective daily volume in the Iraqi dinnar.

The second measure of stock liquidity is the turnover ratio, defined as the number of shares traded divided by the number of shares outstanding for each stock, Its often used to compare liquidity across markets. At that, datar, Naik and Radcliff(1998) state that the use of trading volume as a proxy for liquidity is not adequate, since it dose not consider the differences in the number of shares outstanding, Moreover, the measure content with ex post liquidity and this is not necessarily a good indication of what will be traded in the future.
(Hedander,2005:30). The turnover is calculated as:- (Dass et al, 2011:7)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { Turnover }_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{t}}=\frac{1}{12} \sum_{n=1}^{12} \frac{\text { Voli, } \mathrm{tm}^{\text {shoruti,tm }}}{\text { and }} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Where Vol $_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{tm}} \&$ shorut $_{\mathrm{i}, \mathrm{t}}$ are the shares traded and number of shares outstanding of firm (or sector ${ }_{\mathrm{i}}$ ) in month of fiscal year. As the proxy for the above formula, he Jia and Kong Xiang (2003) modify the liquidity indicator for Chinese security market. The new definition eliminates the influence caused by equity scale differences, covers both price and volume

[^0]information has attainable data and adapts to the characteristics of Chinese market, the liquidity is calculated as:-
(chen et al, 2011:7-11)
$\mathrm{Liq}=\frac{\ln P n / P n-1}{N T n / n}$
Where Pn is the closing price on the nth day, $\mathrm{Pn}-1$ is the closing price on the ( $\mathrm{n}-1$ ) the day, NTn is the trading volume on the nth day and N is the total outstanding shares. In the other words, denominator of this liquidity indicator (Liq) is turnover while number of Liq is the natural logarithm of expected returns during this period. The less the indicator is, the more unit changes in turnover, meaning the stock is more liquid, after the fashion of he dander and Chen et al, cooper, Growth, and a Vera ranked the stocks by the market value of their outstanding common stock and grouped them into deciles of market value. In order to measure the ability to absorb large transactions, cooper et al, calculated the following liquidity ratio:
(Cooper et al, 1985:21-33)

Total dollar volume of the stock trated in the last 4 weeks
Absolote value of daily \%price change of the stock in the last 4 weeks

The final measure of stock liquidity is: proportion of zero daily stock returns, I follow Lesmond, Ogden, and Trzcinka (1999), construct the proportion of zero stock returns which is equal to the proportion of days with zero stock returns divided by the total number of non missing trading days in a given year (Hhuaang et al, 2012:7) for each stock year, ZR is calculated as the number of trading days with zero daily return and positive trading volume divided by the number of annual trading days over the firms fiscal year, if the number of missing daily returns in a firm-
year exceeds $80 \%$ of the annual trading years for a firms fiscal year, the firms year is dropped from the sample.

### 2.2 Firm Value

It is important to know that when we refer to value, we mean the worth of the expected future cash flows stated in a given currency- that is, a firm value is a function of the cash flows it is expected to generate in the future and the rate of return at which investors are willing to provide funds to the firm for the purpose of financing and growth (Besley \& Brigham, 2008:15), at least up until now the traditional theory of finance has been based on the idea that a company's market value is determined by just two variables: the company's expected cash after tax operating cash flows and the risk associated with producing them, in this research, I argue that there is another important factor affecting a firms value: the liquidity. In studying the association between liquidity and firm's value, I rely on a proxy for Tobin's Q as the most popular tool to measure value. The founder of theory is James Tobin in 1969 (Miller, 2000:33). Tobin's $Q$ is a ratio between the market value and replacement value of the same physical asset. The ratio tells the nexus between financial markets and markets for goods and services. If the market value reflected solely the recorded assets of a company, Tobin Q would be 1.0. If Tobin's Q is greater than 1.0 , then the market value is greater than the value of company's recorded assets. High Tobin Q values encourage companies to invest more in capital because they are "worth" more than the price they paid for them. On the other hand, if Tobin's $Q$ is less than 1 , the market value is less than the recorded. Value of the assets of the company (Tieting et al, 2011:2). To calculate numerical of Q , the market value of the firm, I first sum the book value of firm's assets and the market value of firm's common equity, which is equal to the number common shares outstanding times the price of the end of the duration. I then subtract the
sum of the book value of firm's common equity and the balance sheet deferred taxes from this estimate. The ratio is calculated as follows :-
(Fang et al, 2008:9)(Fang et al, 2009:155)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{it}}=\frac{\text { Market value of assets }}{\text { Book value of assets }} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here the Qit is depending variable; another formula can used is approximate Q which is introduced by (Chang and Pruitt, 1994:70-74). As follows:-

Approximate $\mathrm{Q}=\frac{M V E+P S+D E B T}{T A}$

Where:-

MVE: The product of firm's share price and the number of common stock shares outstanding.

PS: The Liquidity value of firm's outstanding preferred stock.

DEBT: The value of firm's short-term liabilities net of its short-term assets, plus the book value of the firm's long-term debt.

TA: The book value of the total assets of the firm.

I contemplate use market to book ratio to clarify the relation between stocks liquidity and firm value, the market / book ratio split into three components: price-to-operating earning, financial leverage, and operating profitability. The operating earning-to-price ratio, OIP, is equal to operating income after depreciation divided by market value of common equity. The financial leverage ratio, LEVERAGE. Is the fraction of the value of firm's assets coming from common equity, operating income on assets, OIOA, is equal to operating income after depreciation divided by book value of assets. Q and its 3 companies are all measured at a firm's fiscal year end. Other things held constant, the higher $\mathrm{M} / \mathrm{B}$ ratio means
the stocks of firm's earn high rates of return on their assets and sell for prices well in excess of their book values. For every successful firm's, the M/B ratio can be as high as 10-15 (Besley \& Brigham, 2008:61).

## 3. Previous Studies and Methodology

### 3.1 Previous Studies

Few empirical studies in some markets around the world examined the relationship between liquidity and firm's valuation, among which, Amihud and Mendelson (1986), (Fang et al, 2009:150-169), (Lins, 2003:159-184), (Tao et al, 2001:1-38) and (Shilvia \& Kim, 2013:1-11). While another studies such as Dater, Naik and Radcliffe (1998), Chan and Faff (2005) and Archarya and Pedersen (2005), examined the relation between liquidity and stock pricing as the proxy for the firm's value (1). All these studies, no matter what is used to measure the stocks liquidity, found a statistically and economically significant relationship between stock's liquidity and firm value. The same conclusion follows when they used quoted spread (or the difference between lowest ask price and highest bid price divided by the mid-price of the quotes). Fang Neo and Tice (2009) also stated that liquidity affects a firm's value positively. There study showed that liquidity affects firm performance positively when performance is measured with a firm's Tobin's $q$ ratio. These findings may be due to the fact that the large numbers of previous studies have been carried out in developed markets. Our paper differs from theirs in the following regards:-

First:- Iraq stock exchange (ISE) is different from that in most other markets because not only has a limited transaction, but there is also

[^1]relatively small. Listed companies are few and most stocks are infrequently traded and trading volume is low, furthermore, the ISE has been going through substantial changes started with the Iraqi invasion of Kuwait in 1990 until the second gulf war in 2003, these conditions in itself, to justify the need for this research and this is just what I wanted.

Second:- Ceteris paribus, developed markets are characterized by high liquidity, few institutional hindrances, reliable information, and sophisticated investors. Under developing markets are characterized by low liquidity, thin trading, and unreliable information and less informed investors. These factors form a crucial difference than those in the developed markets and add another reason to take into account in testing the impact of liquidity on the firm value, in emerging market.

### 3.2 Data Sources and Population of the Study.

This study utilities data from two sources. The first sources are Iraqi Stock Exchange (ISE). The second source is the statistical\& research department in the central bank of Iraq. Statistical society of the study include (65) listed firms in ISE during 2008_2012 with some consideration is the firm that recorded at ISE at least 2006, its stocks must have at least 120 trading days in a fiscal year, and allow access to the final counts such as statement account and balance sheet.

### 3.3 Study Objectives

The main objectives of current study as follows:

- Clarifying relationship of stock liquidity and the value of the firm.
- Partly, test the relationship between idiosyncratic risk and the required rate of return (RRR) because the decline $R R$ demanded by investors necessarily indicates the high value of the firm.


### 3.4 The Problem of the Study.

This study aims to fill the gap in the domestic literature by examining whether and why liquidity affects firm value. The assessment of the aim of determining the effect of liquidity on firm value raises a number of questions. These questions are stated below:-

- How should liquidity be valued?
- How can liquidity be measured?
- How can the value of the firm measured.
- What is liquidity in relation to firms value

The conclusion will sum up the answers and it will be explained what these answers imply regarding the relationship between stock liquidity and firm value in Iraq.

### 3.5 Hypotheses

H 1 : stock liquidity increase firm value.

H0: stock liquidity doesn't increase firm value.

### 3.6 Variables definitions

Table 1 shows variable definitions that use in this study :-

## Table 1 variable definitions

| 1- Firm value measure: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tobin Q | The dependent variable for the firm proxy for firm <br> value |
| Leverage (LEVs) | Market value of equity/ Market value of assets |
| Log BVTA | Natural logarithm of book value of asset measured <br> at fiscal year end. |
| Log AGE | Natural logarithm of firm age which is <br> approximated of the number of year listed to fiscal <br> year. |
| OIP | Operation income after depreciation / market <br> value of equity. |
| OIOA | Operation income on assets after depreciation / <br> book value of assets. |
| DUMLQ3 | A dummy variable indicating inclusion LQ30 |
| IDIORISK | Standard division of OIS OLS regression <br> 2 - Liquidity Measures of Stock Markets Residuals: <br> (illiq)Amihud's (2002) measure(The absolute value of <br> stock return /Iraqi dinnar trading volume on a <br> given day in a given year |
| Stock trading <br> turnover (STT) | Log of total number of shares traded scaled by the <br> number of shares outstanding in a given year |
| Proportion of <br> zero stock returns <br> (ZR) | The proportion of the number of days with zero <br> stock returns to the total number of days with non- <br> Missing stock return in a given year |

In selection of control variables, this study pays close attention for the firm characteristics that may drive the relationship between firm value and stock liquidity, specifically, the study control profitability using the operation income on assets and, finally, it control for other unobservable firm characteristics using the firm age.

## 4. Empirical Results

### 4.1 Correlations

I began my empirical analysis by testing whether on average there are appositive or negative correlations among the key variables in my analysis. Table 2 present Pearson and spearman rank correlations among 3 liquidity measures, firm value measure, and all control variables used in my baseline specification. As expected, the 3 measures of stock liquidity are positively correlated with each other. As shown in table2, the 3 liquidity measures has significantly positive person and spearman correlations with five firm value: Q, leverage OIP, and OIOA, Generically speaking, firm with liquid stocks tend to have better value. Many of control variables are also significantly correlated with the stock liquidity measures albeit relatively weak coefficients as a STT with OIP (0.03), Log age with ILLQ (0.28) and Log BVTA with three measures each on secession.

## Table 2 Correlations

This table reports Pearson correlation coefficients of variables used in this study. All variables are defined in table 1. This sample includes all firms with financial data during the year 2008-2012.

|  | ILLQ | STT | ZR | Q | LEV. | LOG <br> BVIA | LOG <br> AGE | OIP | OIOA | IDIO <br> RISK | DUM <br> Q30 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ILLQ | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| STT | 0.71 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ZR | .68 | .62 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Q | 0.31 | 44 | .36 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LEV | .087 | .21 | .55 | .57 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOGBVTA | .011 | .21 | .03 | .17 | .28 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| LOGAGE | 0.28 | -.07 | .022 | -.06 | .01 | -30 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| OIP | .002 | .03 | .28 | .14 | .11 | -.008 | .07 | 1 |  |  |  |
| OIOA | .22 | .028 | .33 | .36 | .30 | .41 | .21 | .17 | 1 |  |  |
| IDioRisk | -.22 | .17 | -.18 | .23 | .16 | -.31 | .15 | .20 | .33 | 1 |  |
| DUMLQ30 | 0.31 | .08 | .14 | .22 | .09 | .16 | .08 | .21 | .18 | .16 | 1 |

### 4.2 Baseline Specification

To assess whether stock liquidity increase, or has no effect on firm value, at that, to test my first hypothesis (HI) that stock liquidity increase firm value, I regress a proxy for Tobin's Q on my liquidity measure and several control variables. Formally, I specify the ordinary least squares (OIS) regression model as below:-

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { Tobin'sQ }=\alpha+\mathrm{b} \text { stock liquidity } \mathrm{it}_{\mathrm{it}}+\mathrm{c}^{\operatorname{logBVTA}_{i t}}+\mathrm{d}^{\text {DUMLQ }}{ }_{30 i t}+ \\
& \text { ElogAGE }_{i t}+\mathrm{F}^{\text {logIDORISK }_{i t}}+\mathrm{IND}_{\mathrm{j}}+\mathrm{YR}_{\mathrm{t}}+\text { error }_{\mathrm{it}} \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

Definitions of all variables are listed in table1, while $\operatorname{INDj}$ is an unobserved industry effect for industry; and YRt is an unobserved year effect for year. Tobin Q , as a proxy for firm value, and stock liquidity alternatively represents several liquidity proxies including Amihud's illiquidity, stock trading turnover (STT) and proportion of zero stock returns (ZR). As the table 3 indicates, the coefficient on the liquidity measure, Log ILLIQ, is negative and significantly affect Q . the marginal effects from the pooled specification suggest that a decrease in illiquidity, illiQ, of .05 leads to an increase in Q of (.095)(-.05*-1.91) and lead to an increase in OIP of (.054)(-.05*-1.08)

Also, a decrease in illiquidity of .05 leads to decrease in leverage of (.06)(.05*1.28) . This results support hypotheses $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ since higher stock liquidity (low value of Amihud illiquidity) leads to increase firm value.

All of the control variables in the regression are significant. LOGBVT has significant negative coefficients which imply that small companies have higher values. LOGAGE has significant positive coefficients. This suggests that older firms tend to have higher firms value, in other words, younger firms tend to have lower firms value. DUMLQ30 has significant
positive coefficients. This mean that LG30 companies have higher values. IDIORISK has significant negative coefficients; it means that stocks with high idiosyncratic risk have higher required returns. To gain further insight into the source of higher firm value with high liquidity, I break the firm value measure, Q , into three components, operating income to price ratio (OIP). Operating income to assets ratio (OIOA), and financial leverage ratio (LEVERAGE). I use operating income instead of net income to eliminate the impact of financial leverage on the results. The coefficients estimates are shown in colum 2 shows the liquidity measure (LOGILLIQ) negative and significant affect operating income to price ratio (OIP) in column2 in table 3 and it is also negative and significant affect (OIOA) in column3

## Table 3

Result of ordinary least squares regressions: because specifications (Eq.6)

| Dependent <br> Variables | Q | OIP | OIOA | LEVERAGE |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERCEPT |  | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| LOGILLIQ | -1.91 | -1.08 |  | .86 |
| LOGBVTA | .04 | .07 | .015 | 1.28 |
| DUMLQ30 | .11 | .07 | .02 | -.06 |
| LOGAGE | .06 | .14 | .10 | -.03 |
| LOGIDIORISK | 0.03 | 0.02 | 0.13 | -.09 |

Significant at level 5\%
Table 3, this results indicate that stock with high liquidity tend to have higher operating profitability. The marginal effect from the pooled specification suggest that a decrease in illQ (LOGilliQ) of 0.05 leads to an increase in OIP by $(0.054)\left(-.05^{*}-1.08\right)$ and decrease of 0.05 in this measure (9LogiLLiQ) leads to an increase in OIOA by (.058) or ( $-0.5 *-1.15$ ).

Of the four dependent variables in the regressions LEVERAGE in column 4 has positive and significant affect with the liquidity measure; this means that
stock with high stock liquidity (low illiquidity of Amihud) tend to have better firm value (higher firm Q), more equity in their capital structure (or low financial leverage). This finding shows that the cost of issuing equity is significantly lower for firms with more liquid stock. Thus, firms with liquid stocks may choose to issue equity as opposed to dept.

### 4.3 Influences on Valuation after Control Endogeneity

To add more reliability on the results and previous tests, I will use in this section an instrument variables procedure as an additional test control for the possibility that stock market liquidity is endogenous. One of the most important benefits of this test is that an unobservable dose not have to be constant across time. Two stag least squares is used to control endogenous. Two stages (LS) estimation is needed because the main liquidity measure (LOGILLIQ) is endogenous variables with the firm value measures, Q , OIP, OIOA, and Leverage. Using one lag of the above stock liquidity measure of two firms in firm i's industry that have the closest size (market value of equity) to firm i (Z1) as exogenous variables that are correlated with liquidity but uncorrelated with the error term. The first stage regression using pooled data is shown below as Eq. (7) and the second stage regression is shown below as Eq. (8)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { LOGILLIQ }_{\text {IT }}=\alpha+\mathrm{b}^{\text {LOGILLIQ }}{ }_{\mathrm{t}-1}+\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{zt}}{ }_{\mathrm{it}}+\mathrm{d}^{\text {LOGBVTA }}{ }_{\mathrm{it}}+\mathrm{e}^{\text {DUMLQ }}{ }_{30 \mathrm{it}}+\mathrm{f}^{\mathrm{LOGAGE}}{ }_{0 \mathrm{it}}+ \\
& \mathrm{g}^{\text {LOGIDIORISK }_{i t}}{ }_{\mathrm{it}} \mathrm{IND}_{\mathrm{j}}+\mathrm{YR}_{\mathrm{t}}+\text { error }_{\mathrm{it}} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{it}}\left(\mathrm{OIP}_{\text {it }} \text { or } \text { OIOA }_{i t}\right. \text { or LEVERAGE } \\
& \text { it })=\alpha+\mathrm{b}^{\text {LOGILLIQ }}{ }_{i t}+\mathrm{c}^{\text {LOGBVTA }}{ }_{\mathrm{it}}+  \tag{8}\\
& \mathrm{d}^{\text {DUMLQ }}{ }_{30 \mathrm{it}}+\mathrm{e}^{\text {LOGAGE }_{i t}} \mathrm{f}^{\text {LOGIDIORISK }}{ }_{i t}+\mathrm{IND}_{\mathrm{j}}+\mathrm{YR}_{\mathrm{t}}+\text { error }_{i t}
\end{align*}
$$

Table four presents the regression coefficients were obtained by using equations 7 and 8 above, where the first stage coefficients are shown in column 1 of table 4 . The coefficient on the second stage is shown in columns
from 2 to 5 . It appears from results that the coefficient on the liquidity measure, ILLIQ, is still negative and statistically significant at the $5 \%$ level, similarly, the results using the components of Q as the dependent variable are also robust. These result confirm that the high liquidity stock have higher firm Q, less financial leverage and higher operating profitability after controlling endogeneity of a firm's stock liquidity, alone, LEVERAGE as the dependent variable, based on two stages least square estimation on table 4 shows positive and significant influence with the liquidity variable, LOGILLIQ. This result confirms that high liquidity firms tend to give a greater weight of ownership in the structure of funding. Overall, these finding provide a logical base for acceptance of the hypothesis Hi , or the rejection of the null hypothesis H 0 .

Table 4
Two - stage least squares Regression
Results in table outcome of the use of equations 7 and 8, taking into consideration that INDj is an unobserved industry effect for industry j and $\mathrm{YR}_{\mathrm{t}}$ is an unobserved year effect for year ${ }_{t}$

| Dependent Variables | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { LOGILLIQ } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{Q} \\ & 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline \text { OIP } \\ 3 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { OIOA } \\ 4 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { LEVERAGE } \\ 5 \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| INTERCEPT | 1.21 | 1.74 | . 33 | . 11 | -1.09 |
| LOGILLIQ |  | -0.63 | -1.09 | -1.24 | 0.06 |
| LOGILLIQ $_{\text {t-1 }}$ | . 73 |  |  |  |  |
| Zi | -. 16 |  |  |  |  |
| LOGBVTA | . 004 | . 09 | . 16 | . 03 | . 09 |
| DUMLQ30 | . 18 | . 61 | . 11 | . 22 | . 23 |
| LOGAGE | . 27 | . 15 | . 08 | -. 06 | -. 41 |
| LOGIDIORISK | 0.31 | 0.03 | 0.01 | 0.001 | -. 04 |

Significance at level 5\%

## 5. Summery and Conclusion

This study explores whether stock liquidity has positive affect with firm value in Iraq Stock Exchange (ISE) measured by firm's Tobin's Q. I find that higher stock liquidity have higher firm value. Liquidity also positively impacts operating profitability. This study shows that stock with high liquidity have more equity in their capital structure (Low Financial leverage). In each case, I also find evidence that liquidity decline the RR demanded by investors, thus, reflected positively of the firm value.
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[^0]:    * I use this tool in my analysis as a measure of liquidity because the data can be obtained easily from daily stock data for long periods of time in ISE, in one hand, and the intuition behind this measure as follows:- a stock is liquid if it has a low value of Amihud illiquidity and illiquid if it has a high value of the equation when the stock's prices move a lot in response to little volume, in the other hand.

[^1]:    (1) No matter what method is used, firm's value is necessarily the market price of the firm's stock multiple by the number of outstanding stocks.

