BUKTI KORESPONDENSI

JUDUL ARTIKEL:
An exploration of sustainable innovation investment in emerging markets: An archival study

JURNAL :
International Journal of Management and Sustainability 2024 Vol. 13, No. 4, pp. 963-975

PUBLISHER **:**
Conscientia Beam

LINK :
https://www.conscientiabeam.com/journal/11

KRONOLOGIS

No	Keterangan	Tanggal
1	Submit Artikel via OJS Submission	03 Januari 2024
2	Konfirmasi dari editor jurnal bahwa artikel yang disubmit sudah diterima pihak jurnal melalui OJS (*Article has been received*)	03 Januari 2024
3	*Major Revision Required*	17 Maret 2024
4	Permintaan waktu tambahan kepada editor	31 Maret 2024
5	Mengirim revisi kepada editor jurnal via email dan OJS dan konfirmasi dari editor bahwa revisi sudah diterima oleh mereka.	22 April 2024
6	Editorial Decision: "*Congratulations*" *Accepted* & Permintaan membayar *processing fee*	10 Mei 2024
7	Informasi bahwa *processing fee* sudah dibayar dan mengirim *ethical approval*.	13 Mei 2024
8	*Payment Confirmation* dari editor	14 Mei 2024
9	Permintaan *Final checking* dari editor (Revisi Akhir)	18 Mei 2024

No	Keterangan	Tanggal
10	Mengirim revisi akhir kepada editor via email	19 Mei 2024
11	Konfirmasi dari editor (telah menerima artikel *final checking*)	20 Mei 2024
12	Permintaan koreksi bahasa Inggris dan review konsistensi serta saran mengubah judul artikel dari editor.	26 Juni 2024
13	Mengirim revisi koreksi bahasa dan review konsistensi serta pengubahan judul kepada editor.	26 Juni 2024
14	Konfirmasi dari editor jurnal (telah menerima artikel koreksi Bahasa Inggris) dan dikirimkan kepada editor akademik.	26 Juni 2024
15	Publish **https://archive.conscientiabeam.com/index.php/11/article/view/3982**	21 November 2024

BUKTI

1. Submit Artikel via OJS Submission	**03 Januari 2024**



2. Konfirmasi dari editor jurnal bahwa artikel yang disubmit	**03 Januari 2024**



3. Major Revision Required	**17 Maret 2024**



4. Permintaan waktu tambahan kepada editor	**31 Maret 2024**



4. Response to Revision	22 April 2024



URL: http://www.conscientiabeam.com/journal/11
Article title: An exploration of sustainable innovation investment in emerging markets: An archival study

Article No: 1628-IJMS

Comments of reviewer	Author response
Is this article according to the scope of this journal? Yes.	Thank you for the feedback
Abstract *The abstract includes the following details: Purpose, Design/Methodology/Approach, Findings, and Conclusion. The abstract should be revised. The abstract must start with the aim of the study.* *The abstract needs to be improved by including the objective of the study. The policy implication/ contribution should be explained in the Abstract*	We have revised the abstract.

Comments of reviewer	Author response
Introduction: Does the first paragraph serve as a good introduction? Please add recent references to support your claim in the introduction section. The introduction is very short. The problem, objective and aim must be discussed clearly in the introduction section. The introduction is too short, please explain the clear purpose in the first paragraph of the introduction and add research significance and research questions in the introduction. To identify and justify the problem of the study, please include references in the introduction. It is required to add the last paragraph that contains the outline of the study such as after section 1, section 2 contains ……., the section 3 explains……	We have revised the introduction.
Review of literature The literature review will be enhanced by including a discussion on recent past studies. The section on the literature review seems short. Authors are required to incorporate some recent studies. Moreover, the literature review section should be written systematically. Also, the research gap should be a part of the literature review. The research gap should be discussed at the end of the LR section. Last paragraph of the literature review, you must provide the hypotheses of your study. Rewrite the methodology section to include the following in a detailed manner: research design, research population, sampling method, and adopted instrument/ estimation technique with their validity and reliability tests.	We have revised the literature.

Comments of reviewer	Author response
Methodology This study used secondary panel data and an archival asymmetric cost behavior model. Clearly explain the sampling technique and adopted estimation methods. Also, justify your choice of sampling method and estimators to perform the analysis Also, justify the implementation of the mixed method to perform the analysis.	. We have revised the methodology.
Results This section is acceptable but seems very short. Authors are suggested to explain the outcomes in a proper form.	We have revised the result.
Discussion The discussion section is very short. Please extend the size of this section. Also, the outcomes are not discussed properly. Add recent inline and contradictory studies in the discussion section to support your findings.	We have revised the discussion.
Conclusion The conclusion is required to be revised. Moreover, the limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are also necessary to be incorporated in the conclusion section. The conclusion section is very short. Please extend the length of this section.	We have revised the conclusion.
Policy Suggestion The policy suggestions should be elaborately defined/ explained at the end of the conclusion or through research.	We have revised the policy suggestion.
Bibliography/References References are required to be checked carefully. Reference style should be adjusted as per journal format.	We have revised the bibliography/references.
Others 1. **This article is very short and contains 3,678 words including references. Authors must increase the length of the paper. A good article contains 7000 to 8000 words. The author must enhance the paper's quality and length.** 2. This paper requires proofreading. 3. The abbreviations should be explained	We have revised the others.

Comments of reviewer	Author response
with their full-form word when used the first time.	
Decision	**Requires Major Revision**

Sustainable Innovation Investment: An Archival Study in Emerging Market

Se Tin[1]
Riki Martusa[2*]
Meythi Meythi[3]
[1,2,3]Department of Accounting Universitas Kristen Maranatha Bandung, Indonesia
[*]Corresponding Author: riki.martusa@eco.maranatha.edu

Abstract

This study aims to examine the relationship between asymmetric cost behavior and innovation of listed firm in emerging market, i.e. listed firms of Indonesia Capital Market. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) topic has become a hot issue in the worldwide. The sustainable innovation, as a part of SDGs, is prerequisite to reduce the carbon emission in a country, including the listed firms on the Indonesia Capital Market. We use sustainable innovation scores from Thomson Reuters to investigate the investment of sustainable innovation from the Indonesia listed firms. Our study use asymmetric cost behavior model to examine the investment from the firms We apply archival study method to examine the model. The finding is the sustainable innovation influences asymmetric cost behavior. This study also performs robustness check regarding the empirical model. The result exhibits that the model is robust. We give contribution to the literature of sustainability accounting and the literature of capital market. The implication of this study gives the information to investors related the development of sustainability in emerging market. The emerging market is a promising investment for the investor from the worldwide. This study also gives the feedback to regulator related with the development of sustainable innovation in emerging market, particularly Indonesia Capital Market.

Commented [RM1]: Purpose of this study

Commented [RM2]: Contribution and implication of this study

Keywords—sustainable innovation, sustainable development goals, Indonesia capital market, asymmetric cost behavior.

Introduction

This study aims to investigate whether asymmetric cost behavior influences sustainable innovation of listed firms in Indonesia Capital Market. The concept of sustainable innovation suggested that the firms integrate between the development of innovation and environmental, economic, and social objectives (Cillo, Petruzzelli, Ardito, & Del Giudice, 2019). The issue of sustainable innovation has been attentive of the stakeholders in the worldwide. But a few of studies that examines the determinants of sustainable innovation. The previous studies have examined the sustainable innovation related to cross-country analysis (Doluca, Holzner, & Wagner, 2019), literature review approach (Cillo et al., 2019), Sustainable

Development Goals (SDGs) framework (Fernández & Lucena, 2022), social enterprises (Harsanto, Mulyana, Faisal, & Shandy, 2022), market orientation and marketing capabilities (Kamboj & Rahman, 2017), business model innovation (Kneipp, Gomes, Kruglianskas, Motke, & Frizzo, 2021), appropriation mechanism (Morales, Flikkema, Castaldi, & Man, 2022), and market-based capabilities (Weidner, Nakata, & Zhu, 2021). However, a few of studies examined between the relationship of performance firm and sustainable innovation (Cillo et al., 2019). We motivated to explore whether the firms invest in sustainable innovation, i.e. how the firms make an eco-friendly designed product in achieving green profitability goal.

Commented [RM3]: the objective of this study and supporting argument

Cost behavior concept stated that costs behaves according to the firm activities . It means that costs fluctuate with the magnitude of operational activities from the firms. There is the role of firm manager in deciding to invest or cut cost related with the firm activities. The decision of manager generated the asymmetry between the direction of costs and the fluctuation of sales prediction. The literature calls the pattern of cost as asymmetric cost behavior (Banker & Byzalov, 2014). We predict that when the firms invest in sustainable innovation, the costs change according the future sales prediction. The decision manager able to lead asymmetric cost behavior.

A numbers of prior studies has examined the association between asymmetric cost behavior[1] and the various factors. We divided the factors associated in three aspect, i.e. Economic, Country and Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG). First, the economic factors consist of conservatism appraisal (Banker, Basu, Byzalov, & Chen, 2016), competition features (Cheung, Kim, Kim, & Huang, 2018), earnings predictions error (Ciftci & Salama, 2018), issuance of profit estimates (Dai, Huang, & Yan, 2018), the gauge of sales change (Ciftci & Zoubi, 2018), the prediction of management (Chen, Kama, & Lehavy, 2019), labor adjustment cost (Golden, Mashruwala, & Pevzner, 2020), earnings quality (Martusa, Meythi, & Dharmawan, 2022), and stock price crash risk (Tang, Huang, Liu, & Wan, 2022). Second, the country factors comprise culture (Kitching, Mashruwala, & Pevzner, 2016), local government level (Cohen, Karatzimas, & Naoum, 2017), municipal setting (Bradbury & Scott, 2018), state ownership and socio-political factors (Prabowo, Hooghiemstra, & Van Veen-Dirks, 2018), and tax evasion (Xu & Zheng, 2018). Finally, the ESG factors are Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (Habib & Hasan, 2019), charity sector (Habib & Huang, 2019), institutional shareholder (Chung, Hur, & Liu, 2019), stakeholder orientation (Liu, Liu, & Reid, 2019), sustainability factors (Golden, Kohlbeck, & Rezaee, 2020). But limited study investigates the relationship between investment decision of firms

[1] The concept of asymmetric cost behavior consists of sticky and anti-sticky cost, but we use asymmetric cost behavior in this study to substitute sticky cost for consistency.

manager and sustainable innovation, i.e. eco-friendly designed product in which the study uses listed firms in emerging market, essentially in Indonesia Capital Market.

The demands of sustainability practices have pressured business organization in the worldwide, including Asia. In 2009, the Group of Twenty (G20) countries made a commitment to reduce carbon emissions in Pittsburg summit, USA (G20, 2009). As a member of G20, Indonesia release SDGs program to develop the integration of economic, environmental, social and governance in all of areas including the capital market. The Financial Services Authorities has issued the regulation of sustainable finance and sustainability reporting toward the listed firms in Indonesia Capital Market (OJK, 2017). The listed firms are driven by the regulation to perform a green business in day to day operation. Therefore, this study predict that the listed firms in Indonesia Capital Market will invest in environmental, social and governance, essentially sustainable innovation. However, will the firms invest in sustainable innovation? Do the magnitude of investments changes lead to asymmetric cost behavior?

Commented [RM4]: Research question and research significance

The previous study stated that the stream of studies for sustainable innovation topic able to be classified by three perspective, i.e. internal-managerial perspective, external-relational perspective and performance evaluation perspective (Cillo et al., 2019). But a few of studies to investigate sustainable innovation based on performance evaluation. This study uses innovation score as one of categories from environmental score to measure eco-performance of the firm. We intend to verify how much the firms decide to invest its strategic resources based on sustainable innovation. Based on asymmetric cost behavior model, our study examines whether manager of the firms decide to invest to sustainable innovation in the firms. Certainly, if managers invest the resources in sustainable innovation, they will retain slack resources in the sales decreases. It lead to asymmetric cost behavior. If The firms higher invest to Environmental Social and Governance (ESG) expenditure, They will higher adjust to resources costs and it lead to asymmetric cost behavior (Golden, Kohlbeck, et al., 2020).

This study utilizes asymmetric cost behavior model to measure how much the firms invest to resources related with sustainable innovation. This study employs innovation score from Thompson Reuters to quantify how far the firms perform the innovation. The finding of our study show that the association of sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior in emerging market are supported. We also check the robustness of empirical model from this study according to study of (Habib & Hasan, 2019). The result indicates that the model is robust to examine this study.

This study extends the literature of sustainable innovation the following. First, this study investigates the sustainable innovation of the listed firms in the emerging countries, particularly Indonesia. Second, this study examines the sustainable innovation of the firms in related with SDGs

program. Third, this study describes the G20 countries, particularly Indonesia, to reduce carbon emission as a part of its commitment toward United Nations program (Bebbington & Unerman, 2017). This study also contribute to literature of asymmetric cost behavior in related with sustainability factors (Golden, Kohlbeck, et al., 2020) and CSR (Habib & Hasan, 2019).

The reminder of this study is divided into three sections to investigate the association of sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. The literature review and hypothesis development section explore the previous studies that have examined sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. Then the section also explains signaling and stakeholder theory to develop our hypothesis. The both of theories are collaborated with the prior studies to build argument in supporting the hypothesis. The method section describe the empirical model of this study. Certainly, the dependent and independent variables are used by this study. We also show how to select our samples. The next section analyze the result of this study and discuss regarding the relationship of the result and the prior literatures. The last sections conclude the result of this study and the contribution to the literatures and the practices.

Commented [RM5]: outline of this study

Literature Review and Hypothesis Development

The concept of business sustainability is hot topic in the international. But the concept is not only branding and greenwashing from the firms. In last decade, the stakeholder require sustainability being strategic imperative of the business firms in the worldwide. The sustainable innovation perspective has been important issue among the firms, investor, creditor, government, customer and society. Study of Cillo et al. (2019) stated that there are three research frameworks related with sustainable innovation. The frameworks comprise internal-managerial, external-managerial and performance evaluation.

In mixed frameworks, i.e. internal and external managerial, Doluca et al. (2019) perform exploratory analysis to examine whether time, country, industry specific differences influence the relationship between corporate sustainability and environmental innovation. The study has given empirical evidence that management system and country effect influence sustainable innovation activities. They employ data survey from European Business Environment Barometer in 2001 and European Business Sustainability Barometer in 2016. The samples of study are manufacturing firms in German and United Kingdom. The study compares the development of sustainable innovation from the firms during fifteen year in two European countries. There is three environmental activities that are added recently in 2016 in the both of German and United Kingdom firms. The activities are biodiversity conservation, biodiversity restoration and emissions offsetting.

Furthermore, they also observe the differences of German and United Kingdom regarding environmental operational activities. The firms in German tend to focus on efficient product but the United Kingdom firms focus on recycling. Yet the both of German and United Kingdom firms have similar trend in which the firms tend to increase in performing process and product environmental. Therefore, in average, the firms of German and United Kingdom adopted environmental managerial activities rather than environmental operational activities. But the average German firms took up more environmental managerial activities than the average United Kingdom firms.

In case of eco-label, the firms of German have upper trend than the firms of United Kingdom in adoption level. However, the German firms greater use environmental performance indicators and drive the supplier to employ environmental activities while the United Kingdom firms push on the integration of environmental data with the annual report. Afterwards, in both countries, the firms size correlated with the increasing trend of implementation for sustainability and environmental innovation. During fifteen year, there are a rising trend from small and medium-sized firms in utilizing environmental managerial activities. Based on external-managerial framework, the German firms are more collaboration level with supplier and customer than the British firms do in environmental innovation. But in social activities, the both countries firms have the same level in treatment to the employee. Yet the British firms tend to focus on child care support than the German firms.

Study of Fernández and Lucena (2022) highlighted that sustainable innovation is a part of Sustainability Development Goals that are pronounced by United Nation toward the countries in the worldwide. Based on Sustainability Development Goal 9, the study showed that there are two important things that are done by academics and industrial firms related with sustainable innovation. The enhancing of scientific research and upgrading technological capabilities should be done in developing countries. Therefore the regulator should support the policy of technological development, research and innovation. Finally, how the firms of developing countries build sustainable innovation in facing pandemic Covid-19.

The previous study suggested that sustainable innovation able to be practiced by social enterprises (Harsanto et al., 2022). The enterprises give scholarship for students and provide social services for the surrounding communities. The study employ qualitative method with semi-structured interview to respondents. The respondents come from social enterprises of education sector in Indonesia. The prior study has examined the association among market orientation, marketing capabilities, and sustainable innovation that are mediated by sustainable consumption and competitive advantage (Kamboj & Rahman, 2017). The study divided the construct of marketing capabilities into product development,

communication, channel linking, and pricing. The study also separated the construct of sustainable innovation into technical innovation and non-technical innovation. The study found the relationship of the variables as the following. First, there are the relationship between market orientation and market capabilities. Second, product development affect technical innovation. Third, the impact of channel linking capabilities on technical innovation. Fourth, pricing capability influence non-technical innovation. Fifth, the effect non-technical innovation on sustainable consumption. Sixth, technical and non-technical innovation have an competitive advantage of the firms. Overall, they also found that the relationship between sustainable innovation and competitive advantage are mediated partially by market capabilities. The study screens the financial and services firms in India based on sales and revenue data that including in top fortune India 500 list. They perform survey to marketing managers in the firms. The managers are sent questionnaire on a five-point Likert scale.

The study of Kneipp et al. (2021) stated that the firms that have high level of innovation in their business perspectives invest in strategic sector of sustainable innovation. They utilize 256 firms that originate from the Brazilian National Association of Research and Development of Innovative Companies and respondents of MERCOPAR (Latin America's subcontracting and industrial innovation fair). The questionnaire comprises closed questions and employed an interval scale that show the agreement of respondent related with sustainable innovation practices performed by the firms in a range between 1 (lower level of agreement) and 5 (maximum level of agreement) and in relation to the level of innovation in firms' business perspectives in the range between 1 (incremental) and 10 (radical). The category of firms in the study is a micro-, small-, medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Brazil.

Prior study has analyzed the association of between appropriation mechanisms of informal & formal and commercial success of sustainable innovation from small-, medium-sized enterprises (Morales et al., 2022). The result finds that appropriation mechanisms related with the commercial success of sustainable innovation from small-, medium-sized enterprises. The appropriation mechanisms, as independent variable, consist of patent, trademark, secrecy, confidentiality agreement, lead time advantage, and complexity Then the study measures extended possibilities of new service performance as dependent variable. They use samples of two competition sustainable innovation in Netherland, i.e. the Blue Tulip Awards and the Innovation Top 100. The potential respondents of the study are sent questionnaire through email and phone.

The study of Weidner et al. (2021) also have examined the relationship of antecedents and consequences for sustainable innovation. The antecedents of sustainable innovation comprise market-based sustainability, public ownership, organizational learning and organizational unlearning. Whereas

the consequences of sustainable innovation consist of triple-bottom lines, i.e. environmental, social and economic performances from the firms. Thus the implementation of sustainable innovation for the firms are affected by the capabilities of the firms. But the capabilities of the firms are contingent on public ownership, organizational learning and unlearning. Because the firms of public ownership are more exposed to stakeholders than the private ownership. Therefore, the organizational learning lead to the firms study the turbulence of stakeholders demand to the organization. The firms able to invent a new way according to their relationship with the stakeholders. However, the firms also able to choose unlearning about the relationship of stakeholders. The option of learning or unlearning of organization impact to the implementation of sustainable innovation for the firms. Finally, the outcome of sustainable innovation for the firms is triple-bottom lines because the outcome must meet its stakeholders, i.e. environmental, economic, and social.

Commented [RM6]: Rewrite the methodology section to include the following in a detailed manner: research design, research population, sampling method, and adopted instrument/ estimation technique with their validity and reliability tests

International society have demanded that business reveal the impact of their economic activity on environmental and social The scholars declare that the business firms in capital market which get capital from public society and the firms should disclose the impact of its economic activities toward Environmental Social and Governance (ESG) which affect the surrounding communities (Rezaee, Tsui, Cheng, & Gaoguang, 2019). The firms disclose that its operational business have implemented sustainable innovation, as an information signal, to its stakeholders (Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Reutzel, 2011).

Signaling theory suggested that when there is asymmetry information between investors and firms in capital market, the firms deliver credible information to the stakeholders (Hahn & Kühnen, 2013). The firms that implement sustainable innovation tend to invest in Economic, Environmental and Social. This study analogizes that the firms able to disclose the information of its investment about sustainability innovation to the stakeholders. Consequently, The stakeholders will choose the firms where invest in sustainable innovation.

The listed firms in worldwide and Asia in particular have demanded to integrate ESG issue in its operational business while they must focus to sustainable finance (Rezaee et al., 2019). The literature of sustainable innovation suggested that there are the three perspectives which relate with sustainable innovation in the firms, i.e. internal-management, external-relational, and performance evaluation (Cillo et al., 2019). Based on performance evaluation approach, the firms able to achieve economic and sustainable advantage through the cooperation with the parties who stake in the organization (Rauter, Globocnik, Perl-Vorbach, & Baumgartner, 2019).

The literature of asymmetric cost behavior suggested that the asymmetric cost behavior are affected by economic factors (Anderson, Banker, & Janakiraman, 2003), local government level (Cohen et al., 2017), management's issuance of earnings forecasts (Dai et al., 2018), tax avoidance (Xu & Zheng, 2018), board characteristics (Ibrahim, 2018), competition factors (Cheung et al., 2018), the magnitude of sales change (Ciftci & Zoubi, 2018), corporate social responsibility (Habib & Hasan, 2019), charity sector (Habib & Huang, 2019), institutional investors (Chung et al., 2019), and sustainability factors (Golden, Kohlbeck, et al., 2020). In asymmetric cost behavior concept, the managers of the firms decide to invest in committed resources but they must adjust the cost of the resources in the stochastic of sales demand (Anderson et al., 2003). The firms have initiatives ESG lead to the high of adjustment cost (Golden, Kohlbeck, et al., 2020). This study hypothesizes that the firms which invest ESG in strategic resources lead to asymmetric cost behavior.

The studies of sustainable innovation stated that there are factors that influenced sustainable innovation, i.e. enterprises characteristics (Wei, Li, Liu, & Du, 2022), SDGs (Fernández & Lucena, 2022), industrial transformation and upgrading (Wang, Xu, Zhou, & Cheng, 2022), innovation of business model (Kneipp et al., 2021), market orientation and marketing capabilities (Kamboj & Rahman, 2017). In emerging countries, innovation technology relate with management innovation (Henao-García & Montoya, 2023). But study of (Cillo et al., 2019) described that the firms able to integrate economic and sustainable through sustainable innovation (Cillo et al., 2019). The one of factors affected sustainable innovation are Sustainable Development Goals.

As members of G20, Indonesia apply Sustainable Development Goals program in the various sector, particularly in listed firms of capital market. In economic factor, earnings quality influence asymmetric cost behavior in the listed firm of Indonesia Capital Market (Martusa et al., 2022). Based on the regulation of Indonesia Financial Services Authorities (OJK, 2017), this study expected that the listed firms of Indonesia will also invest in ESG voluntarily. Therefore, the listed firms that apply sustainable innovation in committed resources lead to asymmetric cost behavior. Based on above argument, the following hypotheses are advanced in this study.

H1: sustainable innovation associated with asymmetric cost behavior.

Commented [RM7]: research gap and hypothesis developement

Method

This study employs purposive sampling method. The population of this study is the listed firm of Indonesia Capital Market during 2010-2019. We begin with initial sample of 7500 firm-year observations from 2010-2019 are provided from Thomson Reuters database. This study screens the samples data observed based on it has the innovation scores, the value of revenue, earnings before extraordinary items, operating income after depreciation. After we decrease the data observed that do not have the innovation scores and the financial value are 7250 firm-year observations. Finally, the total of our data are 250 firm-year. We utilize the panel data to investigate our hypotheses.

Commented [RM8]: This study used secondary panel data and an archival asymmetric cost behavior model. Clearly explain the sampling technique and adopted estimation methods.

This study uses archival technique to examine our empirical model. The model employs regression test to examine our panel data. The empirical model to measure asymmetric cost behavior of the observation firm-year according to the model is used by the study of Habib and Hasan (2019) as the following.

$$ln\frac{OC_{i,t}}{OC_{i,t-1}} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 ln\left[\frac{R_{i,t}}{R_{i,t-1}}\right] + \gamma_2 DD_{i,t} \times ln\left[\frac{R_{i,t}}{R_{i,t-1}}\right] + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

The equation model (1) utilizes operating costs as dependent variables. OC is sales revenues subtract earnings before extraordinary items for firm i in year t. Sales revenue (Ri,t) is employed in this study as a proxy for firm i in year t. This study also assumes that operating costs that include expenses related to innovation in which the activities cost fluctuate according to the changes of sales. When year t of sales revenue is less than year t-1 of sales revenue, Decrease Dummy ($DD_{i,t}$) is 1, otherwise it is 0. For every 1% rise in sales revenue, coefficient 1 shows the percentage increase in operating costs (OC). The total coefficients (γ_1+γ_2) show the percentage drop in OC resulting from a 1% drop in sales revenue. Asymmetric cost behavior is confirmed by a positive coefficient for $\gamma 1$ and a negative value for γ_2. Habib and Hasan (2019) use the asymmetric cost behavior model to investigate Corporate Social Responsibility activities that are performed by the firms. With the same model, this study also investigate sustainable innovation activities are performed by the firms. The differences are study of Habib and Hasan (2019) are done in developed country and this study is performed in developing country.

This study uses innovation score from Thomson Reuters database. The scores measure sustainable innovation related with environmental and green revenue. Thomson Reuters is a provider Corporate Social Responsibility database that give valuable information to the stakeholders of the firms (de Villiers, Jia, & Li, 2022). This study splits the firms according to its innovation scores. Based on the scores averaged, we divide the firms in two groups. The firms that have score less than the mean of

innovation score are included into low sustainable innovation group and the others are included into high sustainable innovation. Afterwards, this study examines the both of group employing asymmetric cost behavior model respectively. The last, the result of the both groups would be done t-test for comparing coefficient across regression according to equation model from study of Clogg, Petkova, and Haritou (1995) as the following.

$$z = \frac{(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)}{\sqrt{SE_1^2 + SE_2^2}} \quad (2)$$

Where SE_1^2 and SE_2^2 are the standard errors of the squared regression coefficients from each sample groups and γ_1 and γ_2 are the regression coefficients of each sample groups. The equation model is employed by this study to examine whether there are a differences of asymmetric cost behavior level between low sustainable innovation group and high sustainable innovation.

Result and Discussion

A. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics of the variables used from the association between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. The variables consist of operating cost, sales revenue, and asymmetric cost behavior. We use mean, median, quartile 1 & 3 and observation numbers.

Table I. Descriptive Statistics

High Sustainable Innovation					
Variables	***Mean***	***Median***	***Quartile 1***	***Quartile 3***	***Numbers***
Operating Cost	0.004	-0.013	-0.064	0.080	140
Sales Revenue	-0.018	-0.013	-0.070	0.049	140
Asymmetric Cost Behavior	-0.020	0	0	0	140
Low Sustainable Innovation					
Variables	***Mean***	***Median***	***Quartile 1***	***Quartile 3***	***Numbers***
Operating Cost	-0.026	-0.021	-0.111	0.051	110
Sales Revenue	-0.026	-0.020	-0.096	0.037	110
Asymmetric Cost Behavior	-0.018	0	0	0	110

The mean and median values of operating cost and sales revenue variables have a slightly range for the both of High Sustainable Innovation and Low Sustainable Innovation. This shows that the distribution of

the variable values for the both is normal. On the other hand, the mean and median values of asymmetric cost behavior are very close to zero. The values describe that relatively balanced of distribution of firms with negative and positive sustainable innovation performance.

The result of correlation analysis from the variables used is provided by table II. According to the result, all of the variables have significant correlation values at conventional level. Overall, there is significant positive correlation among the variables, i.e. operating cost, sales revenue and asymmetric cost behavior. We removed the extreme values observed from the estimation by using interquartile range method according the study of Vinutha, Poornima, and Sagar (2018). This study is excluding the value observed when the values are below the lower and upper bound of interquartile formula. The all variables also comply the classical assumption test. Thus, this study states that the all variables value observed are best linear unbiased estimation.

Commented [RM9]: revision

Table II. Correlation Analysis

High Sustainable Innovation			
	Operating Cost	***Sales Revenue***	***Asymmetric Cost Behavior***
Operating Cost	1.000	0.733**	0.391**
Sales Revenue	0.733**	1.000	0.594**
Asymmetric Cost Behavior	0.391**	0.594**	1.000
Low Sustainable Innovation			
	Operating Cost	***Sales Revenue***	***Asymmetric Cost Behavior***
Operating Cost	1.000	0.845**	0.452**
Sales Revenue	0.845**	1.000	0.521**
Asymmetric Cost Behavior	0.452**	0.521**	1.000

Note. **ρ< 0.01 (*one tailed*); *ρ< 0.05 (*one tailed*).

B. Result and Robustness Test

Table III provides the result of regression test regarding the impact of sustainable innovation on asymmetric cost behavior. The regression results show that the changes of operating cost related with the changes of sales revenue are significant at 0.05 percent in the both of samples, i.e. High Sustainable Innovation and Low Sustainable Innovation. Based on the High Sustainable Innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_1= 0.943 with t statistic= 14.417 shows that operating cost rose 0.94% per 1% grow in sales revenue. Then based on the Low Sustainable Innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_1=

0.955 with t statistic= 13.808 refers that operating cost raised 0.96% per 1% enhance in sales revenue. However, the values of interaction, i.e. asymmetric cost behavior, is not supported in both the samples. Based on the High Sustainable Innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_2= -0.139 with t statistic= -1.281. But based on the Low Sustainable Innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_2= 0.035 with t statistic= 0.274. Although the predicted value of the both of samples are not supported but the sign of the value from High Sustainable Innovation and Low Sustainable Innovation samples are different. The predicted value of High Sustainable Innovation sample denotes negative sign but the other of the predicted value indicates positive sign. Moreover, the result of Z test refers that there are significant differences between the both group regarding the values of asymmetric cost behavior. The value of -2.123 > 1,651 (t table) indicate that the differences of the both samples are significant at 0.05. This designates that even though the investment of sustainable innovation from the firms are small but there are differences of the investment between the firms which have high invest and the firms which have low invest.

Table III. Result

Variable	**Operating Cost**	
	High Sustainable Innovation	***Low Sustainable Innovation***
Sales Revenue	0.943** (14.417)	0.955** (13.808)
Asymmetric Cost Behavior	-0.139 (-1.281)	0.035 (0.274)
Constanta	0.009 (1.568)	-0.001 (-0.106)
Observation	240	110
Adjusted R Squared	0.536	0.709
Z Tests	-2.123**	

Note. Robust t statistics in brackets. **ρ< 0.01 (*one tailed*); *ρ< 0.05 (*one tailed*).

The empirical model in Table IV is also subjected to a robustness test in this study. This test examines the same empirical model with the before but this test uses the different version to measure operating cost, i.e. sales revenues subtract operating incomes after depreciation. The predicted values of the both respectively, i.e. High Sustainable Innovation and Low Sustainable Innovation samples are γ_1= 0.830 with t statistic= 11.398 and γ_1= 0.845 with t statistic= 9.735. These results of the both samples are significant at conventional. However, the predicted values of the interactions from the both samples are

not supported. But there are the differences of sign between the predicted value of High Sustainable Innovation and Low Sustainable Innovation samples. The result of the test is consistent with the result of empirical model above. So we conclude that the empirical model of this study is robust.

Table IV. Robustness Test

Variable	**Operating Cost**	
	High Sustainable Innovation	***Low Sustainable Innovation***
Sales Revenue	0.830** (11.398)	0.845** (9.735)
Asymmetric Cost Behavior	-0.162 (-1.340)	0.050 (0.313)
Constanta	0.007 (1.071)	0.003 (0.417)
Observation	240	110
Adjusted R^2	0.411	0.549
Z Tests	-1.061*	

Note. Robust t statistics in brackets. **ρ< 0.01 (*one tailed*); *ρ< 0.05 (*one tailed*).

C. Discussion

This study explores the association of between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. We intend to investigate whether the firm's investment of sustainable innovation causes asymmetric cost behavior. Even though the studies of sustainable innovation are growing, the literatures able to be grouped in three perspective, i.e. internal-managerial, external-relational and performance evaluation (Cillo et al., 2019). One perspective stated that there is a relationship between the management capabilities (Barney, 1991; Wernerfelt, 1995; Teece, 1998) and sustainable innovation implementation. The later perspective holds that the role of stakeholders involvement (Freeman, 1984) are related with the application of sustainable innovation. The other view declares that the firms which perform innovation, sustainable innovation, and non-financial disclosure are respected by the market and in turn enhance in value. Because of the firms give a signal to the stakeholders in which they perform better sustainable innovation than the other firms (Connelly et al., 2011).

Among three perspectives above, A few of studies that investigates sustainable innovation related with performance (Cillo et al., 2019). Because of it is important to explore whether the firms invest the resources according to sustainable innovation. Cost behavior concept able to describe the patterns of sustainable innovation investment. Thus the concept stated that a changes of sustainable innovation are proportionate with a changes of activity. But in actual, the patterns of sustainable innovation investment

are likely to be complicated. Because sustainable innovation involvement should be committed resources of the firms related with a long-term investment. As a result, the firms will make signal to the stakeholders in which they have the better performance than the others.

Commented [RM10]: Add recent inline and contradictory studies in the discussion section to support your findings.

This study argue when a manager decide to invest in sustainable innovation costs, the manager adjusts the resources in the fluctuation of sales demand. But the managers will not cut the investment when the sales demand is decrease. However, the managers will add the investment when the sales demand is recovery. So the managers retain the sustainable innovation investment when the sales demand is fall but they will develop the investment when the sales demand climbs up. Furthermore, the managers must manage the slack resources and lastly it is likely to be asymmetric cost behavior.

Employing innovation score of Thompson Reuters database, this study indicates that the cost of sustainable innovation reveal there are a differences of the firms that have high sustainable innovation investment with the firms that have the low investment. The firms that have the high investment getting near to asymmetric cost behavior but the otherwise firms do not. This show that the sustainable innovation involvement of listed firms in emerging market, particularly Indonesia Capital Market are still low. This result is highlighted by the study of Loh and Thomas (2018) in which the listed firms of Indonesia have the low score in related sustainability among the ASEAN countries.

This study also gives empirical evidence that there are two groups of the firms related with investment of sustainable innovation in emerging market. The first group is the firms have high sustainable innovation performance. The second group is the firms have low sustainable innovation performance. Although the results of regression tests from the both of groups are not statistically significant, there are significant differences between the both groups. The first group show that even though the finding is not supported but the sign of coefficient is negative. Based on sustainable innovation, this exhibits that the high performance firms have invested it but it is a preliminary level. However, the low performance firms have not yet invested it. This result describes that the high performance firms provide signal to the stakeholders that they perform better than the other firms. The result of this study is different from prior studies in developed countries (Habib & Hasan, 2019; Golden, Kohlbeck, et al., 2020; Weidner et al., 2021).

Commented [RM11]: Add recent inline and contradictory studies in the discussion section to support your findings.

We argue that even though the development of sustainability performance in average from the Indonesia lower than the other ASEAN countries (Loh & Thomas, 2018) but there is a progression of the investment in sustainability including in sustainable innovation. The Financial Services Authorities of Indonesia has regulated sustainable finance and sustainability reporting for the Indonesia listed firms

(OJK, 2017). As a result, although not all of the Indonesia listed firms invest in sustainable innovation yet but the several firms that have invested it in beginning stage.

The findings of this study imply that the public firms of Indonesia have prepared to compete in sustainable innovation in the worldwide. Even the government have integrated the blue and green program (environmental) with digital economic to support not only the listed firms of capital market but the small and medium enterprises. The government also release the program to facilitate collaboration between the academics of university and the firms to develop sustainable innovation. In the future, the Indonesia firms will be ready in sustainability competition across the business firms in the worldwide.

Conclusion

This study examines the association between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. We use innovation scores of Thompson Reuters database that measure performance of the firms related with environmental innovation. This study also employs asymmetric cost behavior model in quantifying investment of the firms from sustainable innovation. This study finds that overall, sustainable innovation influences asymmetric cost behavior are not supported. However, the finding partially also show that a few of the firms have invested in sustainable innovation but it is a preliminary stage. Although in average, sustainability performance of Indonesia firms are lower than the firms of others countries in ASEAN (Loh & Thomas, 2018) but there is a development of sustainability according to the implementation of Sustainability Development Goals in Indonesia Capital Market.

This study contribute to the literatures of sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. This study also extends the concept of asymmetric cost behavior to relate with sustainability factors particularly in emerging country. Our study uses signaling theory to explain performance of the firms related with sustainable innovation. The limitation of this study is a few of firms that have innovation score in emerging market, particularly Indonesia Capital Market. So we only investigate a little of the firms in sustainable innovation performance. This study suggests that the future study able to investigate sustainable innovation in the disclosures of the firms, i.e. sustainability reporting. In the future, the study also able to investigate sustainable innovation in internal-managerial or external-relational framework in related with asymmetric cost behavior.

Commented [RM12]: The conclusion is required to be revised. Moreover, the limitations of the study and recommendations for future research are also necessary to be incorporated in the conclusion section. The conclusion section is very short. Please extend the length of this section.

Acknowledgements:

Our study is funded by Maranatha Christian University.

References

Anderson, Mark C., Banker, Rajiv D., & Janakiraman, Surya N. (2003). Are Selling, General, and Administrative Costs "Sticky"? Journal of Accounting Research, 41(1), 47-63. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/1475-679X.00095

Banker, Rajiv D., Basu, Sudipta, Byzalov, Dmitri, & Chen, Janice Y. S. (2016). The Confounding Effect of Cost Stickiness on Conservatism Estimates. Journal of Accounting and Economics, 61(1), 203-220. Retrieved from http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0165410115000488

Banker, Rajiv D., & Byzalov, Dmitri. (2014). Asymmetric Cost Behavior. Journal of Management Accounting Research, 26(2), 43-79. 10.2308/jmar-50846

Barney, Jay. (1991). Firm Resources and Sustained Competitive Advantage. Journal of Management, 17(1), 99. 10.1177/ 014920639101700108

Bebbington, Jan, & Unerman, Jeffrey. (2017). Achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals: An Enabling Role for Accounting Research. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 31(1), 2-24. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-05-2017-2929

Bradbury, Michael E., & Scott, Tom. (2018). Do Managers Forecast Asymmetric Cost Behaviour? Australian Journal of Management, 43(4), 538-554. 10.1177/0312896218773136

Chen, Jason V., Kama, Itay, & Lehavy, Reuven. (2019). A Contextual Analysis of the Impact of Managerial Expectations on Asymmetric Cost Behavior. Review of Accounting Studies, 24(2), 665-693. 10.1007/s11142-019-09491-2

Cheung, Joonhei, Kim, Hyunpyo, Kim, Seungjun, & Huang, Rong. (2018). Is the Asymmetric Cost Behavior Affected by Competition Factors? Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting & Economics, 25(1-2), 218-234. 10.1080/16081625.2016.1266271

Chung, Chune Young, Hur, Seok-Kyun, & Liu, Chang. (2019). Institutional Investors and Cost Stickiness: Theory and Evidence. The North American Journal of Economics and Finance, 47, 336-350. 10.1016/j.najef.2018.05.002

Ciftci, Mustafa, & Salama, Feras M. (2018). Stickiness in Costs and Voluntary Disclosures: Evidence from Management Earnings Forecasts. Journal of Management Accounting Research, 30(3), 211-234. 10.2308/jmar-51966

Ciftci, Mustafa, & Zoubi, Taisier A. (2018). The Magnitude of Sales Change and Asymmetric Cost Behavior. Journal of Management Accounting Research, 0, 1-39. 10.2308/jmar-52331

Cillo, Valentina, Petruzzelli, Antonio Messeni, Ardito, Lorenzo, & Del Giudice, Manlio. (2019). Understanding Sustainable Innovation: A Systematic Literature Review. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 26(5), 1012-1025. 10.1002/csr.1783

Clogg, Clifford C., Petkova, Eva, & Haritou, Adamantios. (1995). Statistical Methods for Comparing Regression Coefficients Between Models. The American Journal of Sociology, 100(5), 1261-1293. 10.1086/230638

Cohen, Sandra, Karatzimas, Sotirios, & Naoum, Vassilios-Christos. (2017). The Sticky Cost Phenomenon at the Local Government Level: Empirical Evidence from Greece. Journal of Applied Accounting Research, 18(4), 445-463. 10.1108/JAAR-03-2015-0019

Connelly, Brian L., Certo, S. Trevis, Ireland, R. Duane, & Reutzel, Christopher R. (2011). Signaling Theory: A Review and Assessment. Journal of Management, 37(1), 39-67. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419

Dai, Jing, Huang, Rong, & Yan, Yan. (2018). Cost Stickiness and Management's Issuance of Earnings Forecasts. The Journal of Applied Business and Economics, 20(6), 40-56. Retrieved from https://search.proquest.com/docview/2124046280?accountid=13771

de Villiers, Charl, Jia, Jing, & Li, Zhongtian. (2022). Corporate social responsibility: A review of empirical research using Thomson Reuters Asset4 data. Accounting & Finance, 62(4), 4523-4568. 10.1111/acfi.13004

Doluca, H., Holzner, B., & Wagner, M. (2019). Corporate Sustainability and Environmental Innovations: Practical Implications From a Cross-Country Analysis Over 15 Years. IEEE Engineering Management Review, 47(2), 115-122. https://doi.org/10.1109/EMR.2019.2903007

Fernández, Ignacio Aldeanueva, & Lucena, Fernando Navarro. (2022). Sustainable Innovation: An Essential Paradigm in the Sustainable Development Goals Framework. In Claudia Nelly Berrones-Flemmig, Francoise Contreras, & Utz Dornberger (Eds.), *Business in the 21st Century* (pp. 177-189): Emerald Publishing Limited.

Freeman, R. Edward. (1984). *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Pitman, Boston: Pitman Publishing Inc.

G20. (2009). Leaders' Statement The Pittsburgh Summit. Retrieved from https://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/g20_leaders_declaration_pittsburgh_2009.pdf.

Golden, Joanna, Kohlbeck, Mark, & Rezaee, Zabihollah. (2020). Is Cost Stickiness Associated with Sustainability Factors? Advances in Management Accounting, 32, 35-73. https://doi.org/10.1108/S1474-787120200000032002

Golden, Joanna, Mashruwala, Raj, & Pevzner, Mikhail. (2020). Labor Adjustment Costs and Asymmetric Cost Behavior: An Extension. Management Accounting Research, 46, 1-10. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2019.07.004

Habib, Ahsan, & Hasan, Mostafa Monzur. (2019). Corporate Social Responsibility and Cost Stickiness. Business & Society, 58(3), 453-492. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650316677936

Habib, Ahsan, & Huang, Hedy Jiaying. (2019). Cost Stickiness in the New Zealand Charity Sector. The International Journal of Accounting, 54(03), 1950012. https://doi.org/10.1142/S1094406019500124

Hahn, Rüdiger, & Kühnen, Michael. (2013). Determinants of Sustainability Reporting: A Review of Results, Trends, Theory, and Opportunities in an Expanding Field of Research. Journal of Cleaner Production, 59, 5-21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.005

Harsanto, Budi, Mulyana, Asep, Faisal, Yudi Ahmad, & Shandy, Venny Mellandhia. (2022). Open Innovation for Sustainability in the Social Enterprises: An Empirical Evidence. Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity, 8(3), 160. https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8030160

Henao-García, E. A., & Montoya, R. A. Cardona. (2023). Management Innovation in an Emerging Economy: An Analysis of Its Moderating Effect on the Technological Innovation–Performance Relationship. IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management, 70(1), 128-141. https://doi.org/10.1109/TEM.2021.3052746

Ibrahim, Awad Elsayed Awad. (2018). Board Characteristics and Asymmetric Cost Behavior: Evidence from Egypt. Accounting Research Journal, 31(2), 301-322. https://doi.org/10.1108/ARJ-11-2015-0148

Kamboj, Shampy, & Rahman, Zillur. (2017). Market Orientation, Marketing Capabilities and Sustainable Innovation. Management Research Review, 40(6), 698-724. https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2014-0225

Kitching, Karen, Mashruwala, Raj, & Pevzner, Mikhail. (2016). Culture and Cost Stickiness: A Cross-country Study. The International Journal of Accounting, 51(3), 402-417. 10.1016/j.intacc.2016.07.010

Kneipp, Jordana Marques, Gomes, Clandia Maffini, Kruglianskas, Isak, Motke, Francies Diego, & Frizzo, Kamila. (2021). Sustainable Innovation Practices and the Degree of Innovation of

Business Models in Brazilian Industrial Companies. World Journal of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development, 18(3), 221-238. https://doi.org/10.1108/WJSTSD-02-2021-0019

Liu, Xiaotao, Liu, Xiaoxia, & Reid, Colin D. (2019). Stakeholder Orientations and Cost Management. Contemporary Accounting Research, 36(1), 486-512. 10.1111/1911-3846.12389

Loh, Lawrence, & Thomas, Thomas. (2018). *Sustainability Reporting in ASEAN Countries: Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand*. Retrieved from Singapore: https://www.asean-csr-network.org/c/images/Resources/Reports/2018_Sustainability_Reporting_in_ASEAN_Countries.pdf

Martusa, Riki, Meythi, Meythi, & Dharmawan, Laurensia Vina. (2022). Earnings Quality and Asymmetric Cost Behavior: A Study of Indonesia Capital Market. International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Economy, 38(2), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijite/30062022/7843

Morales, Pablo, Flikkema, Meindert, Castaldi, Carolina, & Man, Ard-Pieter de. (2022). The Effectiveness of Appropriation Mechanisms for Sustainable Innovations from Small and Medium-Sized Enterprises. Journal of Cleaner Production, 374, 133921. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133921

OJK. (2017). *POJK No. 51/pojk.03 tentang Penerapan Keuangan Berkelanjutan bagi Lembaga Jasa Keuangan, Emiten, dan Perusahaan Publik*. Retrieved from https://www.ojk.go.id/id/kanal/perbankan/regulasi/peraturan-ojk/Documents/Pages/POJK-Penerapan-Keuangan-Berkelanjutan-bagi-Lembaga-Jasa-Keuangan,-Emiten,-dan-Perusahaan-Publik/SAL%20POJK%2051%20-%20keuangan%20berkelanjutan.pdf

Prabowo, Ronny, Hooghiemstra, Reggy, & Van Veen-Dirks, Paula. (2018). State Ownership, Socio-Political Factors, and Labor Cost Stickiness. European Accounting Review, 27(4), 771-796. Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180.2017.1329659

Rauter, Romana, Globocnik, Dietfried, Perl-Vorbach, Elke, & Baumgartner, Rupert J. (2019). Open Innovation and Its Effects on Economic and Sustainability Innovation Performance. Journal of Innovation & Knowledge, 4(4), 226-233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2018.03.004

Rezaee, Zabihollah, Tsui, Judy, Cheng, Peter, & Gaoguang, Zhou. (2019). *Business Sustainability in Asia: Compliance, Performance, and Integrated Reporting and Assurance*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Tang, Liang, Huang, Yiyang, Liu, Jiali, & Wan, Xiangyu. (2022). Cost Stickiness and Stock Price Crash Risk: Evidence from China. Emerging Markets Finance and Trade, 58(2), 544-569. 10.1080/1540496X.2020.1787148

Teece, David J. (1998). Capturing Value from Knowledge Assets: The New Economy, Markets for Know-How, and Intangible Assets. California Management Review, 40(3), 55-79. 10.2307/41165943

Vinutha, H. P., Poornima, B., & Sagar, B. M. (2018). *Detection of outliers using interquartile range technique from intrusion dataset*, Singapore.

Wang, Di, Xu, Deyi, Zhou, Na, & Cheng, Yue. (2022). The Asymmetric Relationship between Sustainable Innovation and Industrial Transformation and Upgrading: Evidence from China's Provincial Panel Data. Journal of Cleaner Production, 378, 134453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134453

Wei, Jie, Li, Yong, Liu, Xuzhi, & Du, Ying. (2022). Enterprise Characteristics and External Influencing Factors of Sustainable Innovation: Based on China's Innovation Survey. Journal of Cleaner Production, 372, 133461. 10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133461

Weidner, Kelly, Nakata, Cheryl, & Zhu, Zhen. (2021). Sustainable Innovation and the Triple Bottom-Line: A Market-Based Capabilities and Stakeholder Perspective. Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice, 29(2), 141-161. 10.1080/10696679.2020.1798253

Wernerfelt, Birger. (1995). The Resource-Based View of the Firm: Ten Years After. Strategic Management Journal (1986-1998), 16(3), 171. 10.1002/smj.4250160303

Xu, Shawn, & Zheng, Kenneth. (2018). Tax Avoidance and Asymmetric Cost Behavior. Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance, 0148558X18793757-10148558X18793757. https://doi.org/10.1177/0148558X18793757

5. Editorial Decision: "Congratulations" ***Accepted &*** **Permintaan membayar processing fee**	**10 Mei 2024**



6. Informasi bahwa processing fee sudah dibayar	**13 Mei 2024**



7. Payment Confirmation dari editor	**14 Mei 2024**



8. Permintaan Final checking (Revisi Akhir)	**18 Mei 2024**



10. Mengirim revisi akhir kepada editor via email	**19 Mei 2024**



Journal: International Journal of Management and Sustainability
URL: http://www.conscientiabeam.com/journal/11
Please e-mail your responses and any corrections to: articlestatus@conscientiabeam.com

Dear Author,

Please check your proof carefully and make all changes in attached MS-Word file of the article, where you highlight the changes. Please do not change the format of the article, and missing references send us in separate sheet or write in the email text. **To certify fast publication of your paper please return your corrections within 48 hours.**

Author query form

Query-No.	Questions	Answers
1	Please Check that given the names and surnames of the authors have been recognized properly and are presented in the preferred order.	The names and surnames of our first author should be presented as SeTin SeTin and the other authors have been presented properly in the preferred order.
2	Please complete properly the cited references of book review, working paper and conference paper. You will need to properly check the publisher, publisher country name, page no. **List of References** Fernández, I. A., & Lucena, F. N. (2022). Sustainable innovation: An essential paradigm in the sustainable development goals framework. In Claudia Nelly Berrones-Flemmig, Francoise Contreras, & Utz Dornberger (Eds.), Business in the 21st Century. In (pp. 177-189). Emerald Publishing Limited.	We have completed properly the cited references of book review. Fernández, I. A., & Lucena, F. N. (2022). Sustainable innovation: An essential paradigm in the sustainable development goals framework. In Claudia Nelly Berrones-Flemmig, Francoise Contreras, & Utz Dornberger (Eds.), Business in the 21st Century. Emerald Publishing Limited, Leeds, pp. 177-189. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80382-787-220221014.
3	Please check heading and sub heading numbers.	We have check it and have presented properly.
4	Please check again the table numbers and equations order	We have check it and have presented properly.
5	If the research article is funded by university/institute, please provide us fund number with other detail.	We have filled in the grant number, i.e. 023/SK/ADD/UKM/V/2024).

Commented [A13]: Grant number of the funding source is missing. Please provide.

Commented [RM14R13]: We have filled in our grant number.

Author query form		
Query-No.	**Questions**	**Answers**
6	Your abstract should not exceed 250 words.	The abstract in our article has 200-250 words.
7	You should present 6 to 10 keywords after the abstract.	Our abstract have presented 6 keywords
8	Please send us the ORCID profile link of all authors. If you don't have ORCID profile, please open the given link (www.orcid.org), create and profile, and send us the link. We also require email ID's and phone numbers of all authors and a **picture of only the corresponding author.** It's compulsory for our new format to add the picture of the corresponding author.	SeTin SeTin: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7065-1093 email: setin@eco.maranatha.edu HP: +6281320111120 Riki Martusa: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9779-5828 email: riki.martusa@eco.maranatha.edu (corresponding author). HP: +628978571574 The picture of corresponding author:  Meythi Meythi: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0262-0268 email: meythi@eco.maranatha.edu HP: +8156125788

International Journal of Management and Sustainability
2024 Vol.x, No.x, pp.xx-xx
ISSN(e): 2306-0662
ISSN(p): 2306-9856
DOI:

SUSTAINABLE INNOVATION INVESTMENT: AN ARCHIVAL STUDY IN EMERGING MARKET

Se Tin[1]
Riki Martusa[2+]
Meythi Meythi[3]

[1,2,3]*Department of Accounting Universitas Kristen Maranatha Bandung, Indonesia.*

(+ Corresponding author)

Article History
Received: xxxxxxxxx
Revised: xxxxxxxxx
Accepted: xxxxxxxxx
Published: xxxxxxxxx

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the relationship between asymmetric cost behavior and innovation of listed firm in emerging market, i.e. listed firms of Indonesia Capital Market. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) topic has become a hot issue in the worldwide. The sustainable innovation, as a part of SDGs, is prerequisite to reduce

Commented [A15]: The journal accepts the abstract of 200 to 250 words. Revise the abstract in the structured abstract style. Avoid using headings and follow the sentence structure of Purpose, Design/Methodology/Approach, Findings, and Practical Implications.

Keywords
Asymmetric cost behavior
Indonesia capital market
Sustainable development goals
Sustainable innovation.

the carbon emission in a country, including the listed firms on the Indonesia Capital Market. We use sustainable innovation scores from Thomson Reuters to investigate the investment of sustainable innovation from the Indonesia listed firms. Our study use asymmetric cost behavior model to examine the investment from the firms We apply archival study method to examine the model. The finding is the sustainable innovation influences asymmetric cost behavior. This study also performs robustness check regarding the empirical model. The result exhibits that the model is robust. We give contribution to the literature of sustainability accounting and the literature of capital market. The implication of this study gives the information to investors related the development of sustainability in emerging market. The emerging market is a promising investment for the investor from the worldwide. This study also gives the feedback to regulator related with the development of sustainable innovation in emerging market, particularly Indonesia Capital Market.

Contribution/Originality:

Commented [A16]: In this section you need to specify what makes this study original. What have you done differently that hasn't been done before? Your contribution shouldn't be more than 50 words.

1. INTRODUCTION

This study aims to investigate whether asymmetric cost behavior influences sustainable innovation of listed firms in Indonesia Capital Market. The concept of sustainable innovation suggested that the firms integrate between the development of innovation and environmental, economic, and social objectives (Cillo, Petruzzelli, Ardito, & Del Giudice, 2019). The issue of sustainable innovation has been attentive of the stakeholders in the worldwide. But a few of studies that examines the determinants of sustainable innovation. The previous studies have examined the sustainable innovation related to cross-country analysis (Doluca, Holzner, & Wagner, 2019) literature review approach (Cillo et al., 2019) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) framework (Fernández & Lucena, 2022) social enterprises (Harsanto, Mulyana, Faisal, & Shandy, 2022) market orientation and marketing capabilities (Kamboj & Rahman, 2017) business model innovation (Kneipp, Gomes, Kruglianskas, Motke, & Frizzo, 2021) appropriation mechanism (Morales, Flikkema, Castaldi, & de Man, 2022) and market-based capabilities (Weidner, Nakata, & Zhu, 2021). However, a few of studies examined between the relationship of performance firm and sustainable innovation (Cillo et al., 2019). We motivated to explore whether the firms invest in sustainable innovation, i.e. how the firms make an eco-friendly designed product in achieving green profitability goal.

Cost behavior concept stated that costs behaves according to the firm activities . It means that costs fluctuate with the magnitude of operational activities from the firms. There is the role of firm manager in deciding to invest or cut cost related with the firm activities. The decision of manager generated the asymmetry between the direction of costs and the fluctuation of sales prediction. The literature calls the pattern of cost as asymmetric cost behavior (Banker & Byzalov, 2014). We predict that when the firms invest in sustainable innovation, the costs change according the future sales prediction. The decision manager able to lead asymmetric cost behavior.

A numbers of prior studies has examined the association between asymmetric cost behavior[2] and the various factors. We divided the factors associated in three aspect, i.e. Economic, Country and Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG). First, the economic factors consist of conservatism appraisal (Banker, Basu, Byzalov, & Chen, 2016) competition features (Cheung, Kim, Kim, & Huang, 2018) earnings predictions error (Ciftci & Salama, 2018) issuance of profit estimates (Dai, Huang, & Yan, 2018) the gauge of sales change (Ciftci & Zoubi, 2019) the prediction of management (Chen, Kama, & Lehavy, 2019) labor adjustment cost (Golden, Mashruwala, & Pevzner, 2020) earnings quality (Martusa, Meythi, & Dharmawan, 2022) and stock price crash risk (Tang, Huang, Liu, & Wan, 2022). Second, the country factors comprise culture (Kitching, Mashruwala, & Pevzner, 2016) local government level (Cohen, Karatzimas, & Naoum, 2017) municipal setting (Bradbury & Scott, 2018) state ownership and socio-political factors (Prabowo, Hooghiemstra, & Van Veen-Dirks, 2018) and tax evasion (Xu & Zheng, 2020). Finally, the ESG factors are Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (Habib & Hasan, 2019) charity sector (Habib & Huang, 2019) institutional shareholder (Chung, Hur, & Liu, 2019) stakeholder orientation (Liu, Liu, & Reid, 2019) sustainability factors (Golden & Kohlbeck, 2020). But limited study investigates the relationship between investment decision of firms manager and sustainable innovation, i.e. eco-friendly designed product in which the study uses listed firms in emerging market, essentially in Indonesia Capital Market.

The demands of sustainability practices have pressured business organization in the worldwide, including Asia. In 2009, the Group of Twenty (G20) countries made a commitment to reduce carbon emissions in Pittsburg summit, USA (G20, 2009). As a member of G20, Indonesia release SDGs program to develop the integration of economic, environmental, social and governance in all of areas including the capital market. The Financial Services Authorities has issued the regulation of sustainable finance and sustainability reporting toward the listed firms in Indonesia Capital Market (OJK, 2017). The listed firms are driven by the regulation to perform a green business in day to day operation. Therefore, this

[2] The concept of asymmetric cost behavior consists of sticky and anti-sticky cost, but we use asymmetric cost behavior in this study to substitute sticky cost for consistency.

study predict that the listed firms in Indonesia Capital Market will invest in environmental, social and governance, essentially sustainable innovation. However, will the firms invest in sustainable innovation? Do the magnitude of investments changes lead to asymmetric cost behavior?

The previous study stated that the stream of studies for sustainable innovation topic able to be classified by three perspective, i.e. internal-managerial perspective, external-relational perspective and performance evaluation perspective (Cillo et al., 2019). But a few of studies to investigate sustainable innovation based on performance evaluation. This study uses innovation score as one of categories from environmental score to measure eco-performance of the firm. We intend to verify how much the firms decide to invest its strategic resources based on sustainable innovation. Based on asymmetric cost behavior model, our study examines whether manager of the firms decide to invest to sustainable innovation in the firms. Certainly, if managers invest the resources in sustainable innovation, they will retain slack resources in the sales decreases. It lead to asymmetric cost behavior. If The firms higher invest to Environmental Social and Governance (ESG) expenditure, They will higher adjust to resources costs and it lead to asymmetric cost behavior (Golden & Kohlbeck, 2020).

This study utilizes asymmetric cost behavior model to measure how much the firms invest to resources related with sustainable innovation. This study employs innovation score from Thompson Reuters to quantify how far the firms perform the innovation. The finding of our study show that the association of sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior in emerging market are supported. We also check the robustness of empirical model from this study according to study of Habib and Hasan (2019). The result indicates that the model is robust to examine this study.

This study extends the literature of sustainable innovation the following. First, this study investigates the sustainable innovation of the listed firms in the emerging countries, particularly Indonesia. Second, this study examines the sustainable innovation of the firms in related with SDGs program. Third, this study describes the G20 countries, particularly Indonesia, to reduce carbon emission as a part of its commitment toward United Nations program (Bebbington & Unerman, 2018). This study also contribute to literature of asymmetric cost behavior in related with sustainability factors (Golden & Kohlbeck, 2020) and CSR (Habib & Hasan, 2019).

The reminder of this study is divided into three sections to investigate the association of sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. The literature review and hypothesis development section explore the previous studies that have examined sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. Then the section also explains signaling and stakeholder theory to develop our hypothesis. The both of theories are collaborated with the prior studies to build argument in supporting the hypothesis. The method section describe the empirical model of this study. Certainly, the dependent and independent variables are used by this study. We also show how to select our samples. The next section analyze the result of this study and discuss regarding the relationship of the result and the prior literatures. The last sections conclude the result of this study and the contribution to the literatures and the practices.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

The concept of business sustainability is hot topic in the international. But the concept is not only branding and greenwashing from the firms. In last decade, the stakeholder require sustainability being strategic imperative of the business firms in the worldwide. The sustainable innovation perspective has been important issue among the firms, investor, creditor, government, customer and society. Study of Cillo et al. (2019) stated that there are three research frameworks related with sustainable innovation. The frameworks comprise internal-managerial, external-managerial and performance evaluation.

In mixed frameworks, i.e. internal and external managerial, Doluca et al. (2019) perform exploratory analysis to examine whether time, country, industry specific differences influence the relationship between corporate sustainability and environmental innovation. The study has given empirical evidence that management system and country effect influence sustainable innovation activities. They employ data survey from European Business Environment Barometer in 2001 and European Business Sustainability Barometer in 2016. The samples of study are manufacturing firms in German and United Kingdom. The study compares the development of sustainable innovation from the firms during fifteen year in two European countries. There is three environmental activities that are added recently in 2016 in the both of German and United Kingdom firms. The activities are biodiversity conservation, biodiversity restoration and emissions offsetting.

Furthermore, they also observe the differences of German and United Kingdom regarding environmental operational activities. The firms in German tend to focus on efficient product but the United Kingdom firms focus on recycling. Yet the both of German and United Kingdom firms have similar trend in which the firms tend to increase in performing process and product environmental. Therefore, in average, the firms of German and United Kingdom adopted environmental managerial activities rather than environmental operational activities. But the average German firms took up more environmental managerial activities than the average United Kingdom firms.

In case of eco-label, the firms of German have upper trend than the firms of United Kingdom in adoption level. However, the German firms greater use environmental performance indicators and drive the supplier to employ environmental activities while the United Kingdom firms push on the integration of environmental data with the annual report. Afterwards, in both countries, the firms size correlated with the increasing trend of implementation for sustainability and environmental innovation. During fifteen year, there are a rising trend from small and medium-sized firms in utilizing environmental managerial activities. Based on external-managerial framework, the German firms are more

collaboration level with supplier and customer than the British firms do in environmental innovation. But in social activities, the both countries firms have the same level in treatment to the employee. Yet the British firms tend to focus on child care support than the German firms.

Study of Fernández and Lucena (2022) highlighted that sustainable innovation is a part of Sustainability Development Goals that are pronounced by United Nation toward the countries in the worldwide. Based on Sustainability Development Goal 9, the study showed that there are two important things that are done by academics and industrial firms related with sustainable innovation. The enhancing of scientific research and upgrading technological capabilities should be done in developing countries. Therefore the regulator should support the policy of technological development, research and innovation. Finally, how the firms of developing countries build sustainable innovation in facing pandemic Covid-19.

The previous study suggested that sustainable innovation able to be practiced by social enterprises (Harsanto et al., 2022). The enterprises give scholarship for students and provide social services for the surrounding communities. The study employ qualitative method with semi-structured interview to respondents. The respondents come from social enterprises of education sector in Indonesia. The prior study has examined the association among market orientation, marketing capabilities, and sustainable innovation that are mediated by sustainable consumption and competitive advantage (Kamboj & Rahman, 2017). The study divided the construct of marketing capabilities into product development, communication, channel linking, and pricing. The study also separated the construct of sustainable innovation into technical innovation and non-technical innovation. The study found the relationship of the variables as the following. First, there are the relationship between market orientation and market capabilities. Second, product development affect technical innovation. Third, the impact of channel linking capabilities on technical innovation. Fourth, pricing capability influence non-technical innovation. Fifth, the effect non-technical innovation on sustainable consumption. Sixth, technical and non-technical innovation have an competitive advantage of the firms. Overall, they also found that the relationship between sustainable innovation and competitive advantage are mediated partially by market capabilities. The study screens the financial and services firms in India based on sales and revenue data that including in top fortune India 500 list. They perform survey to marketing managers in the firms. The managers are sent questionnaire on a five-point Likert scale.

The study of Kneipp et al. (2021) stated that the firms that have high level of innovation in their business perspectives invest in strategic sector of sustainable innovation. They utilize 256 firms that originate from the Brazilian National Association of Research and Development of Innovative Companies and respondents of MERCOPAR (Latin America's subcontracting and industrial innovation fair). The questionnaire comprises closed questions and employed an interval scale that show the agreement of respondent related with sustainable innovation practices performed by the firms in a range between 1 (lower level of agreement) and 5 (maximum level of agreement) and in relation to the level of innovation in firms' business perspectives in the range between 1 (incremental) and 10 (radical). The category of firms in the study is a micro-, small-, medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Brazil.

Prior study has analyzed the association of between appropriation mechanisms of informal & formal and commercial success of sustainable innovation from small-, medium-sized enterprises (Morales et al., 2022). The result finds that appropriation mechanisms related with the commercial success of sustainable innovation from small-, medium-sized enterprises. The appropriation mechanisms, as independent variable, consist of patent, trademark, secrecy, confidentiality agreement, lead time advantage, and complexity Then the study measures extended possibilities of new service performance as dependent variable. They use samples of two competition sustainable innovation in Netherland, i.e. the Blue Tulip Awards and the Innovation Top 100. The potential respondents of the study are sent questionnaire through email and phone.

The study of Weidner et al. (2021) also have examined the relationship of antecedents and consequences for sustainable innovation. The antecedents of sustainable innovation comprise market-based sustainability, public ownership, organizational learning and organizational unlearning. Whereas the consequences of sustainable innovation consist of triple-bottom lines, i.e. environmental, social and economic performances from the firms. Thus the implementation of sustainable innovation for the firms are affected by the capabilities of the firms. But the capabilities of the firms are contingent on public ownership, organizational learning and unlearning. Because the firms of public ownership are more exposed to stakeholders than the private ownership. Therefore, the organizational learning lead to the firms study the turbulence of stakeholders demand to the organization. The firms able to invent a new way according to their relationship with the stakeholders. However, the firms also able to choose unlearning about the relationship of stakeholders. The option of learning or unlearning of organization impact to the implementation of sustainable innovation for the firms. Finally, the outcome of sustainable innovation for the firms is triple-bottom lines because the outcome must meet its stakeholders, i.e. environmental, economic, and social.

International society have demanded that business reveal the impact of their economic activity on environmental and social The scholars declare that the business firms in capital market which get capital from public society and the firms should disclose the impact of its economic activities toward Environmental Social and Governance (ESG) which affect the surrounding communities (Rezaee, Tsui, Cheng, & Gaoguang, 2019). The firms disclose that its operational business have implemented sustainable innovation, as an information signal, to its stakeholders (Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Reutzel, 2011).

Signaling theory suggested that when there is asymmetry information between investors and firms in capital market,

the firms deliver credible information to the stakeholders (Hahn & Kühnen, 2013). The firms that implement sustainable innovation tend to invest in Economic, Environmental and Social. This study analogizes that the firms able to disclose the information of its investment about sustainability innovation to the stakeholders. Consequently, The stakeholders will choose the firms where invest in sustainable innovation.

The listed firms in worldwide and Asia in particular have demanded to integrate ESG issue in its operational business while they must focus to sustainable finance (Rezaee et al., 2019). The literature of sustainable innovation suggested that there are the three perspectives which relate with sustainable innovation in the firms, i.e. internal-management, external-relational, and performance evaluation (Cillo et al., 2019). Based on performance evaluation approach, the firms able to achieve economic and sustainable advantage through the cooperation with the parties who stake in the organization (Rauter, Globocnik, Perl-Vorbach, & Baumgartner, 2019).

The literature of asymmetric cost behavior suggested that the asymmetric cost behavior are affected by economic factors (Anderson, Banker, & Janakiraman, 2003) local government level (Cohen et al., 2017) management's issuance of earnings forecasts (Dai et al., 2018) tax avoidance (Xu & Zheng, 2020) board characteristics (Ibrahim, 2018) competition factors (Cheung et al., 2018) the magnitude of sales change (Ciftci & Zoubi, 2019) corporate social responsibility (Habib & Hasan, 2019) charity sector (Habib & Huang, 2019) institutional investors (Chung et al., 2019) and sustainability factors (Golden & Kohlbeck, 2020). In asymmetric cost behavior concept, the managers of the firms decide to invest in committed resources but they must adjust the cost of the resources in the stochastic of sales demand (Anderson et al., 2003). The firms have initiatives ESG lead to the high of adjustment cost (Golden et al., 2020). This study hypothesizes that the firms which invest ESG in strategic resources lead to asymmetric cost behavior.

The studies of sustainable innovation stated that there are factors that influenced sustainable innovation, i.e. enterprises characteristics (Wei, Li, Liu, & Du, 2022) SDGs (Fernández & Lucena, 2022) industrial transformation and upgrading (Wang, Xu, Zhou, & Cheng, 2022) innovation of business model (Kneipp et al., 2021) market orientation and marketing capabilities (Kamboj & Rahman, 2017). In emerging countries, innovation technology relate with management innovation (Henao-García & Montoya, 2021). But study of Cillo et al. (2019) described that the firms able to integrate economic and sustainable through sustainable innovation (Cillo et al., 2019). The one of factors affected sustainable innovation are Sustainable Development Goals.

As members of G20, Indonesia apply Sustainable Development Goals program in the various sector, particularly in listed firms of capital market. In economic factor, earnings quality influence asymmetric cost behavior in the listed firm of Indonesia Capital Market (Martusa et al., 2022). Based on the regulation of Indonesia Financial Services Authorities (OJK, 2017) this study expected that the listed firms of Indonesia will also invest in ESG voluntarily. Therefore, the listed firms that apply sustainable innovation in committed resources lead to asymmetric cost behavior. Based on above argument, the following hypotheses are advanced in this study.

H1: Sustainable innovation associated with asymmetric cost behavior.

3. METHOD

This study employs purposive sampling method. The population of this study is the listed firm of Indonesia Capital Market during 2010-2019. We begin with initial sample of 7500 firm-year observations from 2010-2019 are provided from Thomson Reuters database. This study screens the samples data observed based on it has the innovation scores, the value of revenue, earnings before extraordinary items, operating income after depreciation. After we decrease the data observed that do not have the innovation scores and the financial value are 7250 firm-year observations. Finally, the total of our data are 250 firm-year. We utilize the panel data to investigate our hypotheses.

This study uses archival technique to examine our empirical model. The model employs regression test to examine our panel data. The empirical model to measure asymmetric cost behavior of the observation firm-year according to the model is used by the study of Habib and Hasan (2019) as the following.

$$ln\frac{OC_{i,t}}{OC_{i,t-1}} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 ln\left[\frac{R_{i,t}}{R_{i,t-1}}\right] + \gamma_2 DD_{i,t} \times ln\left[\frac{R_{i,t}}{R_{i,t-1}}\right] + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

The equation model (1) utilizes operating costs as dependent variables. OC is sales revenues subtract earnings before extraordinary items for firm i in year t. Sales revenue (Ri,t) is employed in this study as a proxy for firm i in year t. This study also assumes that operating costs that include expenses related to innovation in which the activities cost fluctuate according to the changes of sales. When year t of sales revenue is less than year t-1 of sales revenue, Decrease Dummy ($DD_{i,t}$) is 1, otherwise it is 0. For every 1% rise in sales revenue, coefficient 1 shows the percentage increase in operating costs (OC). The total coefficients (γ_1+γ_2) show the percentage drop in OC resulting from a 1% drop in sales revenue. Asymmetric cost behavior is confirmed by a positive coefficient for $\gamma 1$ and a negative value for γ_2. Habib and Hasan (2019) use the asymmetric cost behavior model to investigate Corporate Social Responsibility activities that are performed by the firms. With the same model, this study also investigate sustainable innovation activities are performed by the firms. The differences are study of Habib and Hasan (2019) are done in developed country and this study is performed in developing country.

This study uses innovation score from Thomson Reuters database. The scores measure sustainable innovation related with environmental and green revenue. Thomson Reuters is a provider Corporate Social Responsibility database that give

valuable information to the stakeholders of the firms (De Villiers, Jia, & Li, 2022). This study splits the firms according to its innovation scores. Based on the scores averaged, we divide the firms in two groups. The firms that have score less than the mean of innovation score are included into low sustainable innovation group and the others are included into high sustainable innovation. Afterwards, this study examines the both of group employing asymmetric cost behavior model respectively. The last, the result of the both groups would be done t-test for comparing coefficient across regression according to equation model from study of Clogg, Petkova, and Haritou (1995) as the following.

$$z = \frac{(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)}{\sqrt{SE_1^2 + SE_2^2}} \qquad (2)$$

Where SE_1^2 and SE_2^2 are the standard errors of the squared regression coefficients from each sample groups and γ_1 and γ_2 are the regression coefficients of each sample groups. The equation model is employed by this study to examine whether there are a differences of asymmetric cost behavior level between low sustainable innovation group and high sustainable innovation.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics of the variables used from the association between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. The variables consist of operating cost, sales revenue, and asymmetric cost behavior. We use mean, median, quartile 1 & 3 and observation numbers.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics.

High sustainable innovation					
Variables	**Mean**	**Median**	**Quartile 1**	**Quartile 3**	**Numbers**
Operating cost	0.004	-0.013	-0.064	0.080	140
Sales revenue	-0.018	-0.013	-0.070	0.049	140
Asymmetric cost behavior	-0.020	0	0	0	140
Low sustainable innovation					
Variables	Mean	Median	Quartile 1	Quartile 3	Numbers
Operating cost	-0.026	-0.021	-0.111	0.051	110
Sales revenue	-0.026	-0.020	-0.096	0.037	110
Asymmetric cost behavior	-0.018	0	0	0	110

The mean and median values of operating cost and sales revenue variables have a slightly range for the both of High Sustainable Innovation and Low Sustainable Innovation. This shows that the distribution of the variable values for the both is normal. On the other hand, the mean and median values of asymmetric cost behavior are very close to zero. The values describe that relatively balanced of distribution of firms with negative and positive sustainable innovation performance.

The result of correlation analysis from the variables used is provided by Table 2. According to the result, all of the variables have significant correlation values at conventional level. Overall, there is significant positive correlation among the variables, i.e. operating cost, sales revenue and asymmetric cost behavior. We removed the extreme values observed from the estimation by using interquartile range method according the study of Vinutha, Poornima, and Sagar (2018). This study is excluding the value observed when the values are below the lower and upper bound of interquartile formula. The all variables also comply the classical assumption test. Thus, this study states that the all variables value observed are best linear unbiased estimation.

Table 2. Correlation analysis.

High sustainable innovation			
???	**Operating cost**	**Sales revenue**	**Asymmetric cost behavior**
Operating cost	1.000	0.733**	0.391**
Sales revenue	0.733**	1.000	0.594**
Asymmetric cost behavior	0.391**	0.594**	1.000
Low sustainable innovation			
???	Operating cost	Sales revenue	Asymmetric cost behavior
Operating cost	1.000	0.845**	0.452**
Sales revenue	0.845**	1.000	0.521**

Commented [A17]: * not explained in the table. Please add these values in the table.

Asymmetric cost behavior	0.452**	0.521**	1.000

Note **ρ< 0.01 (one tailed); *ρ< 0.05 (One tailed).
:

4.2. Result and Robustness Test

Table 3 provides the result of regression test regarding the impact of sustainable innovation on asymmetric cost behavior. The regression results show that the changes of operating cost related with the changes of sales revenue are significant at 0.05 percent in the both of samples, i.e. High Sustainable Innovation and Low Sustainable Innovation. Based on the High Sustainable Innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_1= 0.943 with t statistic= 14.417 shows that operating cost rose 0.94% per 1% grow in sales revenue. Then based on the Low Sustainable Innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_1= 0.955 with t statistic= 13.808 refers that operating cost raised 0.96% per 1% enhance in sales revenue. However, the values of interaction, i.e. asymmetric cost behavior, is not supported in both the samples. Based on the High Sustainable Innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_2= -0.139 with t statistic= -1.281. But based on the Low Sustainable Innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_2= 0.035 with t statistic= 0.274. Although the predicted value of the both of samples are not supported but the sign of the value from High Sustainable Innovation and Low Sustainable Innovation samples are different. The predicted value of High Sustainable Innovation sample denotes negative sign but the other of the predicted value indicates positive sign. Moreover, the result of Z test refers that there are significant differences between the both group regarding the values of asymmetric cost behavior. The value of -2.123 > 1,651 (t table) indicate that the differences of the both samples are significant at 0.05. This designates that even though the investment of sustainable innovation from the firms are small but there are differences of the investment between the firms which have high invest and the firms which have low invest.

Table 3. Result

Variable	Operating cost	
	High sustainable innovation	**Low sustainable innovation**
Sales revenue	0.943** (14.417)	0.955** (13.808)
Asymmetric cost behavior	-0.139 (-1.281)	0.035 (0.274)
Constanta	0.009 (1.568)	-0.001 (-0.106)
Observation	240	110
Adjusted R squared	0.536	0.709
Z tests	-2.123**	

Note: Robust t statistics in brackets. **ρ< 0.01 (one tailed); *ρ< 0.05 (One tailed).

Commented [A18]: * not explained in the table. Please add these values in the table.

The empirical model in Table 4 is also subjected to a robustness test in this study. This test examines the same empirical model with the before but this test uses the different version to measure operating cost, i.e. sales revenues subtract operating incomes after depreciation. The predicted values of the both respectively, i.e. High Sustainable Innovation and Low Sustainable Innovation samples are γ_1= 0.830 with t statistic= 11.398 and γ_1= 0.845 with t statistic= 9.735. These results of the both samples are significant at conventional. However, the predicted values of the interactions from the both samples are not supported. But there are the differences of sign between the predicted value of High Sustainable Innovation and Low Sustainable Innovation samples. The result of the test is consistent with the result of empirical model above. So we conclude that the empirical model of this study is robust.

Table 4. Robustness test.

Variable	Operating cost	
	High sustainable innovation	**Low sustainable innovation**
Sales revenue	0.830** (11.398)	0.845** (9.735)
Asymmetric cost behavior	-0.162 (-1.340)	0.050 (0.313)
Constanta	0.007 (1.071)	0.003 (0.417)
Observation	240	110
Adjusted R^2	0.411	0.549
Z Tests	-1.061*	

Note: Robust t statistics in brackets. **ρ< 0.01 (one tailed); *ρ< 0.05 (One tailed).

4.3. Discussion

This study explores the association of between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. We intend to investigate whether the firm's investment of sustainable innovation causes asymmetric cost behavior. Even though the studies of sustainable innovation are growing, the literatures able to be grouped in three perspective, i.e. internal-managerial, external-relational and performance evaluation (Cillo et al., 2019). One perspective stated that there is a relationship between the management capabilities (Barney, 1991; Teece, 1998; Wernerfelt, 1995) and sustainable innovation implementation. The later perspective holds that the role of stakeholders involvement (Freeman, 1984) are related with the application of sustainable innovation. The other view declares that the firms which perform innovation, sustainable innovation, and non-financial disclosure are respected by the market and in turn enhance in value. Because of the firms give a signal to the stakeholders in which they perform better sustainable innovation than the other firms (Connelly et al., 2011).

Among three perspectives above, A few of studies that investigates sustainable innovation related with performance (Cillo et al., 2019). Because of it is important to explore whether the firms invest the resources according to sustainable innovation. Cost behavior concept able to describe the patterns of sustainable innovation investment. Thus the concept stated that a changes of sustainable innovation are proportionate with a changes of activity. But in actual, the patterns of sustainable innovation investment are likely to be complicated. Because sustainable innovation involvement should be committed resources of the firms related with a long-term investment. As a result, the firms will make signal to the stakeholders in which they have the better performance than the others.

This study argue when a manager decide to invest in sustainable innovation costs, the manager adjusts the resources in the fluctuation of sales demand. But the managers will not cut the investment when the sales demand is decrease. However, the managers will add the investment when the sales demand is recovery. So the managers retain the sustainable innovation investment when the sales demand is fall but they will develop the investment when the sales demand climbs up. Furthermore, the managers must manage the slack resources and lastly it is likely to be asymmetric cost behavior.

Employing innovation score of Thompson Reuters database, this study indicates that the cost of sustainable innovation reveal there are a differences of the firms that have high sustainable innovation investment with the firms that have the low investment. The firms that have the high investment getting near to asymmetric cost behavior but the otherwise firms do not. This show that the sustainable innovation involvement of listed firms in emerging market, particularly Indonesia Capital Market are still low. This result is highlighted by the study of Loh and Thomas (2018) in which the listed firms of Indonesia have the low score in related sustainability among the ASEAN countries.

This study also gives empirical evidence that there are two groups of the firms related with investment of sustainable innovation in emerging market. The first group is the firms have high sustainable innovation performance. The second group is the firms have low sustainable innovation performance. Although the results of regression tests from the both of groups are not statistically significant, there are significant differences between the both groups. The first group show that even though the finding is not supported but the sign of coefficient is negative. Based on sustainable innovation, this exhibits that the high performance firms have invested it but it is a preliminary level. However, the low performance firms have not yet invested it. This result describes that the high performance firms provide signal to the stakeholders that they perform better than the other firms. The result of this study is different from prior studies in developed countries (Golden et al., 2020; Habib & Hasan, 2019; Weidner et al., 2021).

We argue that even though the development of sustainability performance in average from the Indonesia lower than the other ASEAN countries (Loh & Thomas, 2018) but there is a progression of the investment in sustainability including in sustainable innovation. The Financial Services Authorities of Indonesia has regulated sustainable finance and sustainability reporting for the Indonesia listed firms (OJK, 2017). As a result, although not all of the Indonesia listed firms invest in sustainable innovation yet but the several firms that have invested it in beginning stage.

Commented [A19]: You have used this term throughout the document, but have not defined it. Please define it for the benefit of your reader.

The findings of this study imply that the public firms of Indonesia have prepared to compete in sustainable innovation in the worldwide. Even the government have integrated the blue and green program (environmental) with digital economic to support not only the listed firms of capital market but the small and medium enterprises. The government also release the program to facilitate collaboration between the academics of university and the firms to develop sustainable innovation. In the future, the Indonesia firms will be ready in sustainability competition across the business firms in the worldwide.

5. CONCLUSION

This study examines the association between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. We use innovation scores of Thompson Reuters database that measure performance of the firms related with environmental innovation. This study also employs asymmetric cost behavior model in quantifying investment of the firms from sustainable innovation. This study finds that overall, sustainable innovation influences asymmetric cost behavior are not supported. However, the finding partially also show that a few of the firms have invested in sustainable innovation but it is a preliminary stage. Although in average, sustainability performance of Indonesia firms are lower than the firms of others countries in ASEAN (Loh & Thomas, 2018) but there is a development of sustainability according to the implementation of Sustainability Development Goals in Indonesia Capital Market.

This study contribute to the literatures of sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. This study also extends the concept of asymmetric cost behavior to relate with sustainability factors particularly in emerging country. Our

study uses signaling theory to explain performance of the firms related with sustainable innovation. The limitation of this study is a few of firms that have innovation score in emerging market, particularly Indonesia Capital Market. So we only investigate a little of the firms in sustainable innovation performance. This study suggests that the future study able to investigate sustainable innovation in the disclosures of the firms, i.e. sustainability reporting. In the future, the study also able to investigate sustainable innovation in internal-managerial or external-relational framework in related with asymmetric cost behavior.

Funding: This research is supported by Maranatha Christian University (Grant number: ……).
Institutional Review Board Statement: Not Applicable
Transparency: The authors state that the manuscript is honest, truthful, and transparent, that no key aspects of the investigation have been omitted, and that any differences from the study as planned have been clarified. This study followed all writing ethics.
Data Availability Statement:
Competing Interests:
Authors' Contributions:
Acknowledgement:

Commented [A20]: Grant number of the funding source is missing. Please provide.

REFERENCES

Commented [A21]: References highlighted are incomplete. Please provide complete details.

Anderson, M. C., Banker, R. D., & Janakiraman, S. N. (2003). Are selling, general, and administrative costs "sticky"? *Journal of Accounting Research*, *41*(1), 47-63. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-679x.00095
Banker, R. D., Basu, S., Byzalov, D., & Chen, J. Y. S. (2016). The confounding effect of cost stickiness on conservatism estimates. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, *61*(1), 203-220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2015.07.001
Banker, R. D., & Byzalov, D. (2014). Asymmetric cost behavior. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, *26*(2), 43-79.
Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, *17*(1), 99-120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108
Bebbington, J., & Unerman, J. (2018). Achieving the United Nations sustainable development goals: An enabling role for accounting research. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *31*(1), 2-24. https://doi.org/10.1108/aaaj-05-2017-2929
Bradbury, M. E., & Scott, T. (2018). Do managers forecast asymmetric cost behaviour? *Australian Journal of Management*, *43*(4), 538-554. https://doi.org/10.1177/0312896218773136
Chen, J. V., Kama, I., & Lehavy, R. (2019). A contextual analysis of the impact of managerial expectations on asymmetric cost behavior. *Review of Accounting Studies*, *24*, 665-693. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-019-09491-2
Cheung, J., Kim, H., Kim, S., & Huang, R. (2018). Is the asymmetric cost behavior affected by competition factors? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting & Economics*, *25*(1-2), 218-234. https://doi.org/10.1080/16081625.2016.1266271
Chung, C. Y., Hur, S.-K., & Liu, C. (2019). Institutional investors and cost stickiness: Theory and evidence. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, *47*, 336-350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.najef.2018.05.002
Ciftci, M., & Salama, F. M. (2018). Stickiness in costs and voluntary disclosures: Evidence from management earnings forecasts. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, *30*(3), 211-234. https://doi.org/10.2308/jmar-51966
Ciftci, M., & Zoubi, T. A. (2019). The magnitude of sales change and asymmetric cost behavior. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, *31*(3), 65-81. https://doi.org/10.2308/jmar-52331
Cillo, V., Petruzzelli, A. M., Ardito, L., & Del Giudice, M. (2019). Understanding sustainable innovation: A systematic literature review. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *26*(5), 1012-1025. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1783
Clogg, C. C., Petkova, E., & Haritou, A. (1995). Statistical methods for comparing regression coefficients between models. *American Journal of Sociology*, *100*(5), 1261-1293. https://doi.org/10.1086/230638
Cohen, S., Karatzimas, S., & Naoum, V.-C. (2017). The sticky cost phenomenon at the local government level: Empirical evidence from Greece. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, *18*(4), 445-463. https://doi.org/10.1108/jaar-03-2015-0019
Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, *37*(1), 39-67. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419
Dai, J., Huang, R., & Yan, Y. (2018). Cost Stickiness and Management's Issuance of Earnings Forecasts. *The Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, *20*(6), 40-56. https://doi.org/10.33423/jabe.v20i6.371
De Villiers, C., Jia, J., & Li, Z. (2022). Corporate social responsibility: A review of empirical research using Thomson Reuters Asset4 data. *Accounting & Finance*, *62*(4), 4523-4568. https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.13004
Doluca, H., Holzner, B., & Wagner, M. (2019). Corporate sustainability and environmental innovations: Practical implications from a cross-country analysis over 15 years. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, *47*(2), 115-122. https://doi.org/10.1109/emr.2019.2903007
Fernández, I. A., & Lucena, F. N. (2022). Sustainable innovation: An essential paradigm in the sustainable development goals framework. In Claudia Nelly Berrones-Flemmig, Francoise Contreras, & Utz Dornberger (Eds.), Business in the 21st Century. In (pp. 177-189). Emerald Publishing Limited.
Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman, Boston: Pitman Publishing Inc.
G20. (2009). *Leaders' statement the pittsburgh summit*. Retrieved from https://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/g20_leaders_declaration_pittsburgh_2009.pdf
Golden, J., & Kohlbeck, M. (2020). Bankruptcy: The result of failed financial relationships. *Advances in Management Accounting*, *32*, 35-73.
Golden, J., Mashruwala, R., & Pevzner, M. (2020). Labor adjustment costs and asymmetric cost behavior: An extension. *Management Accounting Research*, *46*, 100647. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2019.07.004

Habib, A., & Hasan, M. M. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and cost stickiness. *Business & Society*, *58*(3), 453-492. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650316677936
Habib, A., & Huang, H. J. (2019). Cost stickiness in the New Zealand charity sector. *The International Journal of Accounting*, *54*(03), 1950012. https://doi.org/10.1142/s1094406019500124
Hahn, R., & Kühnen, M. (2013). Determinants of sustainability reporting: A review of results, trends, theory, and opportunities in an expanding field of research. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *59*, 5-21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.005
Harsanto, B., Mulyana, A., Faisal, Y. A., & Shandy, V. M. (2022). Open innovation for sustainability in the social enterprises: An empirical evidence. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *8*(3), 160. https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8030160
Henao-García, E. A., & Montoya, R. A. C. (2021). Management innovation in an emerging economy: an analysis of its moderating effect on the technological innovation–performance relationship. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, *70*(1), 128-141. https://doi.org/10.1109/tem.2021.3052746
Ibrahim, A. E. A. (2018). Board characteristics and asymmetric cost behavior: Evidence from Egypt. *Accounting Research Journal*, *31*(2), 301-322. https://doi.org/10.1108/arj-11-2015-0148
Kamboj, S., & Rahman, Z. (2017). Market orientation, marketing capabilities and sustainable innovation: The mediating role of sustainable consumption and competitive advantage. *Management Research Review*, *40*(6), 698-724. https://doi.org/10.1108/mrr-09-2014-0225
Kitching, K., Mashruwala, R., & Pevzner, M. (2016). Culture and cost stickiness: A cross-country study. *The International Journal of Accounting*, *51*(3), 402-417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intacc.2016.07.010
Kneipp, J. M., Gomes, C. M., Kruglianskas, I., Motke, F. D., & Frizzo, K. (2021). Sustainable innovation practices and the degree of innovation of business models in Brazilian industrial companies. *World Journal of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development*, *18*(3), 221-238. https://doi.org/10.1108/wjstsd-02-2021-0019
Liu, X., Liu, X., & Reid, C. D. (2019). Stakeholder orientations and cost management. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, *36*(1), 486-512. https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3846.12389
Loh, L., & Thomas, T. (2018). *Sustainability reporting in ASEAN countries: Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand*. Retrieved from https://www.asean-csr-network.org/c/images/Resources/Reports/2018Sustainability_Reporting_in_ASEAN_Countries.pdf
Martusa, R., Meythi, M., & Dharmawan, L. V. (2022). Earnings Quality and Asymmetric Cost Behavior: A Study of Indonesia Capital Market. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Economy*, *38*(2), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijite/30062022/7843
Morales, P., Flikkema, M., Castaldi, C., & de Man, A.-P. (2022). The effectiveness of appropriation mechanisms for sustainable innovations from small and medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *374*, 133921. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133921
OJK. (2017). *POJK No. 51/pojk.03 concerning the implementation of sustainable finance for financial service institutions, issuers and public companies*. Retrieved from https://www.ojk.go.id/id/kanal/perbankan/regulasi/peraturan-ojk/Documents/Pages/POJK-Penerapan-Keuangan-Berkelanjutan-bagi-Lembaga-Jasa-Keuangan,-Emiten,-dan-Perusahaan-Publik/SAL%20POJK%2051%20-%20keuangan%20berkelanjutan.pdf
Prabowo, R., Hooghiemstra, R., & Van Veen-Dirks, P. (2018). State ownership, socio-political factors, and labor cost stickiness. *European Accounting Review*, *27*(4), 771-796. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180.2017.1329659
Rauter, R., Globocnik, D., Perl-Vorbach, E., & Baumgartner, R. J. (2019). Open innovation and its effects on economic and sustainability innovation performance. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *4*(4), 226-233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2018.03.004
Rezaee, Z., Tsui, J., Cheng, P., & Gaoguang, Z. (2019). *Business sustainability in Asia: Compliance, performance, and integrated reporting and assurance*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
Tang, L., Huang, Y., Liu, J., & Wan, X. (2022). Cost stickiness and stock price crash risk: Evidence from China. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, *58*(2), 544-569. https://doi.org/10.1080/1540496x.2020.1787148
Teece, D. J. (1998). Capturing value from knowledge assets: The new economy, markets for know-how, and intangible assets. *California Management Review*, *40*(3), 55-79. https://doi.org/10.2307/41165943
Vinutha, H. P., Poornima, B., & Sagar, B. M. (2018). *Detection of outliers using interquartile range technique from intrusion dataset. In Information and decision sciences*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Ficta. Springer Singapore.
Wang, D., Xu, D., Zhou, N., & Cheng, Y. (2022). The asymmetric relationship between sustainable innovation and industrial transformation and upgrading: Evidence from China's provincial panel data. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *378*, 134453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134453
Wei, J., Li, Y., Liu, X., & Du, Y. (2022). Enterprise characteristics and external influencing factors of sustainable innovation: Based on China's innovation survey. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *372*, 133461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133461
Weidner, K., Nakata, C., & Zhu, Z. (2021). Sustainable innovation and the triple bottom-line: A market-based capabilities and stakeholder perspective. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *29*(2), 141-161. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2020.1798253
Wernerfelt, B. (1995). The resource-based view of the firm: Ten years after. *Strategic Management journal*, *16*(3), 171-174. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-2063(01)00114-3
Xu, S., & Zheng, K. (2020). Tax avoidance and asymmetric cost behavior. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, *35*(4), 723-747. https://doi.org/10.1177/0148558x18793757

11. Konfirmasi dari editor (telah menerima artikel final checking)	**20 Mei 2024**



12. Permintaan koreksi bahasa Inggris dan review konsistensi serta saran mengubah judul artikel dari editor.	**26 Juni 2024**



13. Mengirim revisi koreksi bahasa dan review konsistensi serta pengubahan judul kepada editor.	**26 Juni 2024**

International Journal of Management and Sustainability
2024 Vol.x, No.x, pp.xx-xx
ISSN(e): 2306-0662
ISSN(p): 2306-9856
DOI:

AN EXPLORATION OF SUSTAINABLE INNOVATION INVESTMENT IN EMERGING MARKETS: AN ARCHIVAL STUDY

Commented [H22]: Kindly rewrite the article title, this one lacks continuity, the proposed one is 'An Exploration of Sustainable Innovation Investment In Emerging Markets: An Archival Study.'

SeTin SeTin[1]
Riki Martusa[2+]
Meythi Meythi[3]

[1,2,3]*Department of Accounting Universitas Kristen Maranatha Bandung, Indonesia.*

(+ Corresponding author)

Article History
Received: xxxxxxxxx
Revised: xxxxxxxxx
Accepted: xxxxxxxxx
Published: xxxxxxxxx

Keywords
Asymmetric cost behavior
Emerging market.
Indonesia capital market
Sustainable development goals
Sustainable development goals
Sustainable innovation.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the relationship between asymmetric cost behavior and innovation of listed firms in emerging markets, i.e., listed firms in the Indonesia capital market. The Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) topic has become a hot issue worldwide. Innovation, as a part of SDGs, is a prerequisite to reducing the carbon emissions in a country, including the listed firms on the Indonesian capital market. This study employs quantitative method. We use innovation scores from Thomson Reuters to investigate the investment in innovation by the Indonesian-listed firms. This study utilizes multiple regression tests to examine the empirical model. Our study uses asymmetric cost behavior model to examine the investment from the firms. We apply data panel to examine the model, i.e., the listed firms of Indonesia capital market during 2010-2019. The finding is that innovation influences asymmetric cost behavior. This study also performs a robustness check regarding the empirical model. The result shows that the model is robust. We contribute to the literature on sustainability accounting and the literature on the capital market. The implication of this study to give investors information related to the development of sustainability in developing markets. The developing market is a promising investment for investors worldwide. This study also gives feedback to regulators related to the development of innovation in developing markets, particularly Indonesian capital market.

Commented [H23]: Kindly use small letters for both capital and market in the whole article.

Commented [H24]: Same as above

Contribution/Originality: This study examines the investment in innovation by the listed firms in developing markets. We investigate how environmental innovation is performed by the firms in developing countries based on the implementation of Sustainable Development Goals. Our study used the innovation score of Thompson Reuters to measure innovation performance of the firms.

1. INTRODUCTION

This study aims to investigate whether asymmetric cost behavior influences sustainable innovation of listed firms in Indonesian capital market. The concept of sustainable innovation suggests that the firms integrate the development of innovation with environmental, economic, and social objectives (Cillo, Petruzzelli, Ardito, & Del Giudice, 2019). The issue of sustainable innovation has been the focus of the stakeholders worldwide. But there are a few studies that examine the determinants of sustainable innovation. The previous studies have examined the sustainable innovation related to cross-country analysis (Doluca, Holzner, & Wagner, 2019), literature review approach (Cillo et al., 2019), Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) framework (Fernández & Lucena, 2022), social enterprises (Harsanto, Mulyana, Faisal, & Shandy, 2022), market orientation and marketing capabilities (Kamboj & Rahman, 2017), business model innovation (Kneipp, Gomes, Kruglianskas, Motke, & Frizzo, 2021), appropriation mechanism (Morales, Flikkema, Castaldi, & de Man, 2022), and market-based capabilities (Weidner, Nakata, & Zhu, 2021). However, a few studies have examined the

relationship between performance firms and sustainable innovation (Cillo et al., 2019). We were motivated to explore whether the firms invest in sustainable innovation, i.e., how the firms make an eco-friendly product to achieve the green profitability goal.

The concept of cost behavior states that costs behave according to the firm activities. It means that costs fluctuate with the magnitude of operational activities by the firms. There is the role of firm manager in deciding whether to invest or cut costs related to firm activities. The decision of the manager generated the asymmetry between the direction of costs and the fluctuation of sales predictions. The literature calls the pattern of costs asymmetric cost behavior (Banker & Byzalov, 2014). We predict that when the firms invest in sustainable innovation, the costs will change according to the future sales predictions. The decision manager is able to lead asymmetric cost behavior.

A number of prior studies have examined the association between asymmetric cost behavior[3] and the various factors. We divided the factors associated into three aspects, i.e., Economic, Country and Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG). First, the economic factors consist of conservatism appraisal (Banker, Basu, Byzalov, & Chen, 2016), competition features (Cheung, Kim, Kim, & Huang, 2018), earnings prediction error (Ciftci & Salama, 2018), issuance of profit estimates (Dai, Huang, & Yan, 2018), the gauge of sales change (Ciftci & Zoubi, 2019), the prediction of management (Chen, Kama, & Lehavy, 2019), labor adjustment cost (Golden, Mashruwala, & Pevzner, 2020), earnings quality (Martusa, Meythi, & Dharmawan, 2022), and stock price crash risk (Tang, Huang, Liu, & Wan, 2022). Second, the country factors comprise culture (Kitching, Mashruwala, & Pevzner, 2016), local government level (Cohen, Karatzimas, & Naoum, 2017), municipal setting (Bradbury & Scott, 2018), state ownership and socio-political factors (Prabowo, Hooghiemstra, & Van Veen-Dirks, 2018), and tax evasion (Xu & Zheng, 2020). Finally, the ESG factors are Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (Habib & Hasan, 2019), charity sector (Habib & Huang, 2019), institutional shareholder (Chung, Hur, & Liu, 2019), stakeholder orientation (Liu, Liu, & Reid, 2019), sustainability factors (Golden & Kohlbeck, 2020). But a limited study investigates the relationship between investment decisions of firm managers and sustainable innovation, i.e., eco-friendly designed products. The study uses listed firms in emerging market, essentially in Indonesian capital market.

The demands of sustainability practices have pressured business organizations worldwide, including Asia. In 2009, the Group of Twenty (G20) countries made a commitment to reduce carbon emissions at the Pittsburg summit in the USA (G20, 2009). As a member of G20, Indonesia released the SDGs program to develop the integration of economic, environmental, social, and governance in all areas, including the capital market. The Financial Services Authorities have issued the regulations of sustainable finance and sustainability reporting toward the listed firms in Indonesian capital market (OJK, 2017). The listed firms are driven by the regulation to perform a green business in their day-to-day operations. Therefore, this study predicts that the listed firms in Indonesian capital market will invest in environmental, social, and governance innovation, essentially sustainable innovation. However, will the firms invest in sustainable innovation? Do changes in the magnitude of investments lead to asymmetric cost behavior?

The previous study stated that the stream of studies on sustainable innovation topics can be classified by three perspectives, i.e., internal-managerial perspective, external-relational perspective, and performance evaluation perspective (Cillo et al., 2019). But there are few studies to investigate sustainable innovation based on performance evaluation. This study uses innovation score as one of the categories in the environmental score to measure the eco-performance of the firm. We intend to verify how much the firm decides to invest in its strategic resources based on sustainable innovation. Based on asymmetric cost behavior model, our study examines whether the managers of the firms decide to invest in the sustainable innovation. Certainly, if managers invest the resources in sustainable innovation, they will retain slack resources as the sales decrease. It leads to asymmetric cost behavior. If the firms invest to more Environmental Social and Governance (ESG) expenditure, they will adjust their resource costs more, which will lead to asymmetric cost behavior (Golden & Kohlbeck, 2020).

This study utilizes an asymmetric cost behavior model to measure how much firms invest in resources related to sustainable innovation. This study employs an innovation score from Thompson Reuters to quantify how well the firms perform in innovation. The findings of our study show that the association between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior in emerging markets is supported. We also check the robustness of empirical model from this study according to study of Habib and Hasan (2019). The result indicates that the model is robust enough to examine this study.

This study extends the literature on sustainable innovation as follows: First, this study investigates the sustainable innovation of the listed firms in relation to the emerging countries, particularly Indonesia. Second, this study examines the sustainable innovation of the firms in related to the SDGs program. Third, this study describes the efforts of the G20 countries, particularly Indonesia, to reduce carbon emissions as a part of their commitment to the United Nations program (Bebbington & Unerman, 2018). This study also contributes to literature on asymmetric cost behavior in relation to the sustainability factors (Golden & Kohlbeck, 2020) and CSR (Habib & Hasan, 2019).

This study is divided into three sections to investigate the association between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. The literature review and hypothesis development section explores the previous studies that have examined sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. The section also delves into the concepts of signaling and stakeholder

[3]The concept of asymmetric cost behavior consists of sticky and anti-sticky cost, but we use asymmetric cost behavior in this study to substitute sticky cost for consistency.

theory, which are crucial in developing our hypothesis. Both theories collaborate with the prior studies to build an argument supporting the hypothesis. The method section describes the empirical model of this study. Certainly, the dependent and independent variables are used in this study. We also show how to select our samples. The next section will analyze the results of this study and discuss the relationship between the results and the prior literature. The last sections conclude the result of this study and the contribution to the literature and the practices.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

The concept of business sustainability is a hot topic internationally. But the concept is not only branding and greenwashing from the firms. In the last decade, stakeholders have required sustainability as a strategic imperative of the business firms worldwide. The sustainable innovation perspective has been an important issue among the firms, investors, creditors, government, customers, and society. A study by Cillo et al. (2019) stated that there are three research frameworks related to sustainable innovation. The frameworks comprise internal-managerial, external-managerial, and performance evaluation.

In mixed frameworks, i.e., internal and external managerial, Doluca et al. (2019) perform exploratory analysis to examine whether time-, country-, industry-specific differences influence the relationship between corporate sustainability and environmental innovation. The study has given empirical evidence that management systems and country effects influence sustainable innovation activities. They employed a data survey from European Business Environment Barometer in 2001 and European Business Sustainability Barometer in 2016. The samples of study are manufacturing firms in Germany and the United Kingdom. The study compares the development of sustainable innovation among the firms over the past fifteen years in two European countries. There are three environmental activities that were added recently in 2016 in the both German and United Kingdom firms. The activities are biodiversity conservation, biodiversity restoration, and emissions off setting.

Furthermore, they also observe the differences between Germany and the United Kingdom regarding environmental operational activities. The firms in Germany tend to focus on efficient products, but the firms in the United Kingdom focus on recycling. Yet both German and United Kingdom firms have similar trend in which the firms tend to increase in performing processes and product environmental. Therefore, on average, the firms in Germany and the United Kingdom adopted environmental managerial activities rather than environmental operational activities. But the average German firms took up more environmental managerial activities than the average United Kingdom firms.

In the case of eco-labels, the firms of Germany have an upper trend than the firms of the United Kingdom in terms of adoption level. However, the German firms use more environmental performance indicators and drive suppliers to employ environmental activities, while the United Kingdom firms push for the integration of environmental data into the annual report. Afterwards, in both countries, the size of the firms correlated with the increasing trend of sustainability and environmental innovation. During the past fifteen years, there has been a rising trend for small and medium-sized firms to utilize environmental management activities. Based on external-managerial framework, the German firms have a higher level of collaboration with suppliers and customers than the British firms do in environmental innovation. But in social activities, the firms in both countries have the same level of treatment for employees. Yet the British firms tend to focus more on child care support than the German firms.

A study by Fernández and Lucena (2022) highlighted that sustainable innovation is a part of sustainability development goals that are pronounced by the United Nations towards the countries worldwide. Based on Sustainability Development Goal 9, the study showed that there are two important things that are done by academics and industrial firms related to sustainable innovation. The enhancement of scientific research and the upgrading of technological capabilities should be done in developing countries. Therefore, the regulator should support the policy of technological development, research, and innovation. Finally, how do firms in developing countries build sustainable innovation to faces pandemic Covid-19.

The previous study suggested that sustainable innovation could be practiced by social enterprises (Harsanto et al., 2022). The enterprises provide scholarships for students and provide social services for the surrounding communities. The study employs qualitative method with semi-structured interview with respondents. The respondents come from social enterprises in the education sector in Indonesia. The prior study examined the association among market orientation, marketing capabilities, and sustainable innovation that is mediated by sustainable consumption and competitive advantage (Kamboj & Rahman, 2017). The study divided the concept of marketing capabilities into product development, communication, channel linking, and pricing. The study also separated the concept of sustainable innovation into technical innovation and non-technical innovation. The study found the relationship between variables to be the following: First, there is the relationship between market orientation and market capabilities. Second, product development affects technical innovation. Third, the impact of channel linking capabilities on technical innovation is significant. Fourth, pricing capability influences non-technical innovation. Fifth, the effect of non-technical innovation on sustainable consumption. Sixth, technical and non-technical innovations have a competitive advantage for firms. Overall, they also found that the relationship between sustainable innovation and competitive advantage is partially mediated by market capabilities. The study screens the financial and services firms in India based on sales and revenue data, including those in the top Fortune India 500 list. They perform surveys for marketing managers in the firms. The managers are sent a questionnaire on a five-point Likert scale.

The study by Kneipp et al. (2021) stated that the firms that have high level of innovation in their business perspectives invest in strategic sector of sustainable innovation. They utilize 256 firms that originate from the Brazilian National Association of Research and Development of Innovative Companies and respondents to MERCOPAR (Latin America's subcontracting and industrial innovation fair). The questionnaire comprises closed questions and employs an interval scale that shows the agreement of respondents with sustainable innovation practices performed by the firms in a range between 1 (lower level of agreement) and 5 (maximum level of agreement) and in relation to the level of innovation in firms' business perspectives in the range between 1 (incremental) and 10 (radical). The category of firms in the study is a micro-, small-, and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) in Brazil.

Prior studies have analyzed the association between appropriation mechanisms of informal and formal and commercial success of sustainable innovation in small-, medium-sized enterprises (Morales et al., 2022). The result finds that appropriation mechanisms are related to the commercial success of sustainable innovation in small- and medium-sized enterprises. The appropriation mechanisms, as independent variables, consist of patent, trademark, secrecy, confidentiality agreement, lead time advantage, and complexity, and then the study measures extended possibilities of new service performance as dependent variable. They use samples of two competitions for sustainable innovation in Netherlands, i.e., the Blue Tulip Awards and the Innovation Top 100. The potential respondents to the study are sent questionnaires via email and phone.

The study by Weidner et al. (2021) also examined the relationship between antecedents and consequences for sustainable innovation. The antecedents of sustainable innovation comprise market-based sustainability, public ownership, organizational learning, and organizational unlearning. Whereas the consequences of sustainable innovation consist of triple-bottom lines, i.e., environmental, social, and economic performances from the firms. Thus, the implementation of sustainable innovation for firms is affected by their capabilities. But the capabilities of the firms are contingent on public ownership, organizational learning, and unlearning. Because the firms with public ownership are more exposed to stakeholders than those with private ownership. Therefore, the organizational learning led the firms to study the turbulence that stakeholders demand from the organization. The firms are able to invent a new way according to their relationship with the stakeholders. However, the firms are also able to choose not to learn about the relationships among stakeholders. The option of learning or unlearning an organization impacts the implementation of sustainable innovation for firms. Finally, the outcome of sustainable innovation for the firms is triple-bottom lines because the outcome must meet its stakeholders, i.e., environmental, economic, and social.

International society has demanded that businesses reveal the impact of their economic activity on environmental and social The scholars declare that the business firms in the capital market, which get capital from public society should disclose the impact of their economic activities toward Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG), which affect the surrounding communities (Rezaee, Tsui, Cheng, & Gaoguang, 2019). The firms disclose that their operational businesses have implemented sustainable innovation, as an information signal, to their stakeholders (Connelly, Certo, Ireland, & Reutzel, 2011).

Signaling theory suggests that when there is asymmetry in information between investors and firms in capital market, the firms deliver credible information to the stakeholders (Hahn & Kühnen, 2013). The firms that implement sustainable innovation tend to invest in Economic, Environmental and Social aspects. This study analogizes the firms that are able to disclose the information about their investments in sustainability and innovation to the stakeholders. Consequently, the stakeholders will choose the firms that invest in sustainable innovation.

The listed firms worldwide and Asia in particular have demanded to integrate ESG issues into their operational businesses while focusing on sustainable finance (Rezaee et al., 2019). The literature on sustainable innovation suggests that there are three perspectives that relate to sustainable innovation in firms, i.e., internal-management, external-relation, and performance evaluation (Cillo et al., 2019). Based on performance evaluation approach, the firms are able to achieve economic and sustainable advantages through the cooperation with the parties who stake in the organization (Rauter, Globocnik, Perl-Vorbach, & Baumgartner, 2019).

The literature on asymmetric cost behavior suggests that the asymmetric cost behavior is affected by economic factors (Anderson, Banker, & Janakiraman, 2003), local government level (Cohen et al., 2017), management's issuance of earnings forecasts (Dai et al., 2018), tax avoidance (Xu & Zheng, 2020) board characteristics (Ibrahim, 2018) and competition factors (Cheung et al., 2018) the magnitude of sales change (Ciftci & Zoubi, 2019), corporate social responsibility (Habib & Hasan, 2019), the charity sector (Habib & Huang, 2019), institutional investors (Chung et al., 2019), and sustainability factors (Golden & Kohlbeck, 2020). In asymmetric cost behavior concept, the managers of the firms decide to invest in committed resources, but they must adjust the cost of the resources based on the stochastic nature of sales demand (Anderson et al., 2003). The firms have initiatives in ESG that lead to the high adjustment cost (Golden et al., 2020). This study hypothesizes that the firms that invest ESG in strategic resources have asymmetric cost behavior.

The studies of sustainable innovation stated that there are factors that influence sustainable innovation, i.e., enterprise characteristics (Wei, Li, Liu, & Du, 2022) SDGs (Fernández & Lucena, 2022), industrial transformation and upgrading (Wang, Xu, Zhou, & Cheng, 2022), innovation of business model (Kneipp et al., 2021), market orientation, and marketing capabilities (Kamboj & Rahman, 2017). In emerging countries, innovation technology relates to management innovation (Henao-García & Montoya, 2021). But study by Cillo et al. (2019) described the firms were able to integrate economic and

sustainable innovation (Cillo et al., 2019). One of factors that affect sustainable innovation is the Sustainable Development Goals.

As members of G20, Indonesia applies the Sustainable Development Goals program to the various sectors, particularly listed firms in the capital market. In terms of economic factors, earnings quality influences asymmetric cost behavior in the listed firm of Indonesian Capital Market (Martusa et al., 2022). Based on the regulation of Indonesia Financial Services Authorities (OJK, 2017), this study expected that the listed firms of Indonesia would also invest in ESG voluntarily. Therefore, the listed firms that apply sustainable innovation to committed resources have asymmetric cost behavior. Based on above argument, the following hypotheses are advanced in this study:

H_1: Sustainable innovation is associated with asymmetric cost behavior.

3. METHOD

This study employs the purposive sampling method. The population of this study is the listed firm of Indonesia Capital Market during 2010-2019. We begin with an initial sample of 7500 firm-year observations from 2010-2019, provided from Thomson Reuters database. This study screens the sample data observed based on the innovation scores, the value of revenue, earnings before extraordinary items, operating income after depreciation. After we decrease the data observed that do not have the innovation scores and the financial value, we get 7250 firm-year observations. Finally, the total of our data is 250 firm-years. We utilize the panel data to investigate our hypotheses.

This study uses archival technique to examine our empirical model. The model employs regression test to examine our panel data. The empirical model to measure asymmetric cost behavior of the observation firm-year according to the model is used in the study of Habib and Hasan (2019) as the following.

$$ln\frac{OC_{i,t}}{OC_{i,t-1}} = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 ln\left[\frac{R_{i,t}}{R_{i,t-1}}\right] + \gamma_2 DD_{i,t} \times ln\left[\frac{R_{i,t}}{R_{i,t-1}}\right] + \varepsilon_{i,t} \quad (1)$$

The equation model (1). OC is sales revenues minus earnings before extraordinary items for firm i in year t. Sales revenue (Ri,t) is employed in this study as a proxy for firm i in year t. This study also assumes that operating costs, which include expenses related to innovation fluctuate according to the changes in sales. When year t of sales revenue is less than year t-1 of sales revenue, Decrease Dummy ($DD_{i,t}$) is 1, otherwise it is 0. For every 1% rise in sales revenue, coefficient 1 shows the percentage increase in operating costs (OC). The total coefficients ($\gamma_1+\gamma_2$) show the percentage drop in OC resulting from a 1% drop in sales revenue. Asymmetric cost behavior is confirmed by a positive coefficient for $\gamma 1$ and a negative value for γ_2. Habib and Hasan (2019) use the asymmetric cost behavior model to investigate Corporate Social Responsibility activities that are performed by the firms. With the same model, this study investigates sustainable innovation activities and are performed in the firms. The differences are study of Habib and Hasan (2019) are done in developed country and this study is performed in developing country.

Commented [H25]: Kindly rewrite these lines, as these lines lack clarity.

This study uses an innovation score from Thomson Reuters database. The scores measure sustainable innovation related to environmental and green revenue. Thomson Reuters is a corporate social responsibility database that gives valuable information to the stakeholders of the firms (De Villiers, Jia, & Li, 2022). This study splits the firms according to their innovation scores. Based on the average scores, we divide the firms into two groups. The firms that score less than the mean innovation score are included in the low sustainable innovation group, and the others are included in the high sustainable innovation group. Afterwards, this study examines both of the groups employing an asymmetric cost behavior model, respectively. The last, result of both groups would be a t-test for comparing coefficients across regression according to equation model from study of Clogg, Petkova, and Haritou (1995) as follows:

$$z = \frac{(\gamma_1 - \gamma_2)}{\sqrt{SE_1^2 + SE_2^2}} (2)$$

Where SE_1^2 and SE_2^2 are the standard errors of the squared regression coefficients from each sample groups and γ_1 and γ_2 are the regression coefficients of each sample group. The equation model is employed in this study to examine whether there are differences in asymmetric cost behavior levels between the low sustainable innovation group and high sustainable innovation group.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

Table 1 shows descriptive statistics of the variables used in the association between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. The variables consist of operating costs, sales revenue, and asymmetric cost behavior. We use mean, median, quartiles 1 and 3 and observation numbers.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics.

High sustainable innovation					
Variables	**Mean**	**Median**	**Quartile 1**	**Quartile 3**	**Numbers**
Operating cost	0.004	-0.013	-0.064	0.080	140
Sales revenue	-0.018	-0.013	-0.070	0.049	140

Asymmetric cost behavior	-0.020	0	0	0	140
Low sustainable innovation					
Variables	Mean	Median	Quartile 1	Quartile 3	Numbers
Operating cost	-0.026	-0.021	-0.111	0.051	110
Sales revenue	-0.026	-0.020	-0.096	0.037	110
Asymmetric cost behavior	-0.018	0	0	0	110

The mean and median values of operating cost and sales revenue variables have a slightly range for the both high sustainable innovation and low sustainable innovation. This shows that the distribution of the variable values for the both is normal. On the other hand, the mean and median values of asymmetric cost behavior are very close to zero. The values describe the relatively balanced distribution of firms with negative and positive sustainable innovation performance.

Commented [H26]: There must be a word here, either it is slightly different rang or slightly similar range. Correct this.

The result of correlation analysis of the variables used is provided in Table 2. According to the result, all of the variables have significant correlation values at conventional level. Overall, there is a significant positive correlation among the variables, i.e., operating costs, sales revenue, and asymmetric cost behavior. We removed the extreme values observed from the estimation by using interquartile range method, according to the study of Vinutha, Poornima, and Sagar (2018). This study excludes the values observed when they are below the lower and upper bounds of interquartile formula. All variables also comply with the classical assumption test. Thus, this study states that the values of all variables observed are the best linear unbiased estimations.

Table 2. Correlation analysis.

High sustainable innovation			
Variable	**Operating cost**	**Sales revenue**	**Asymmetric cost behavior**
Operating cost	1.000	0.733**	0.391**
Sales revenue	0.733**	1.000	0.594**
Asymmetric cost behavior	0.391**	0.594**	1.000
Low sustainable innovation			
Variable	Operating cost	Sales revenue	Asymmetric cost behavior
Operating cost	1.000	0.845**	0.452**
Sales revenue	0.845**	1.000	0.521**
Asymmetric cost behavior	0.452**	0.521**	1.000

Note: **ρ< 0.01 (One tailed); (One tailed).

4.2. Result and Robustness Test

Table 3 provides the result of regression test regarding the impact of sustainable innovation on asymmetric cost behavior. The regression results show that the changes in operating costs related to the changes in sales revenue are significant at 0.05 percent in both samples, i.e., high sustainable innovation and low sustainable innovation. Based on the high sustainable innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_1= 0.943 with a t statistic of 14.417 shows that operating costs rose 0.94% per 1% growth in sales revenue. Then, based on the low sustainable innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_1= 0.955 with a t statistic of 13.808 indicates that operating cost increased by 0.96% per 1% increase in sales revenue. However, the values of interaction, i.e., asymmetric cost behavior, are not supported in both the samples. Based on the high sustainable innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_2= -0.139 with a t statistic of -1.281. But based on the low sustainable innovation sample, the predicted value of γ_2= 0.035 with a t statistic is 0.274. Although the predicted values of both samples are not supported but the sign of the value from high sustainable innovation and low sustainable innovation samples is different. The predicted value of a High Sustainable Innovation sample denotes negative sign, but the other predicted value indicates a positive sign. Moreover, the result of the Z test indicates that there are significant differences between the both groups regarding the values of asymmetric cost behavior. The value of -2.123 > 1,651 (t table) indicates that the differences between two samples are significant at 0.05. This means that even though the investment in sustainable innovation by the firms is small, there are differences in investment between the firms that invest heavily and the firms that invest less.

Table 3. Result.

Variable	**Operating cost**	
	High sustainable innovation	**Low sustainable innovation**
Sales revenue	0.943** (14.417)	0.955** (13.808)
Asymmetric cost behavior	-0.139 (-1.281)	0.035 (0.274)
Constanta	0.009	-0.001

	(1.568)	(-0.106)
Observation	240	110
Adjusted R squared	0.536	0.709
Z tests	-2.123**	

Note: Robust t statistics in brackets. **ρ< 0.01 (One tailed); (One tailed).

This study also applies a robustness test to the empirical model in Table 4. This test examines the same empirical model, as before, but this test uses a different version to measure operating costs, i.e., sales revenues subtract operating incomes after depreciation. The predicted values of both samples, i.e., high sustainable innovation and low sustainable innovation, are γ_1= 0.830 with a t statistic of 11.398 and γ_1= 0.845 with a t statistic of 9.735. These results for both samples are significant in conventional terms. However, the predicted values of the interactions from the both samples are not supported. But there are the differences in sign between the predicted values of both high sustainable innovation and low sustainable innovation samples. The result of the test is consistent with the result of empirical model above. So we conclude that the empirical model of this study is robust.

Table 4. Robustness test.

Variable	Operating cost	
	High sustainable innovation	**Low sustainable innovation**
Sales revenue	0.830** (11.398)	0.845** (9.735)
Asymmetric cost behavior	-0.162 (-1.340)	0.050 (0.313)
Constanta	0.007 (1.071)	0.003 (0.417)
Observation	240	110
Adjusted R^2	0.411	0.549
Z Tests	-1.061*	

Note: Robust t statistics in brackets. **ρ< 0.01 (One tailed); *ρ< 0.05 (One tailed).

4.3. Discussion

This study explores the association between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. We intend to investigate whether the firm's investment in sustainable innovation causes asymmetric cost behavior. Even though the studies of sustainable innovation are growing, the literature can be grouped into three perspectives, i.e., internal-managerial, external-relational, and performance evaluation (Cillo et al., 2019). One perspective stated that there is a relationship between the management capabilities (Barney, 1991; Teece, 1998; Wernerfelt, 1995) and sustainable innovation implementation. The later perspective holds that the role of stakeholder involvement (Freeman, 1984) is related to the application of sustainable innovation. The other view declares that the firms that perform innovation, sustainable innovation, and non-financial disclosure are respected by the market, and in turn, enhance in value. Because the firms give a signal to the stakeholders that they perform better in sustainable innovation than the other firms (Connelly et al., 2011).

Among the three perspectives above, there are few studies that investigate sustainable innovation related to performance (Cillo et al., 2019). Because of this, it is important to explore whether the firms invest their resources according to sustainable innovation. The concept of cost behavior able to describe the patterns of sustainable innovation investment. Thus, the concept states that changes in sustainable innovation are proportionate to changes in activity. But in actuality the patterns of sustainable innovation investment are likely to be complicated. Because sustainable innovation involves the commitment of resources by firms related to long-term investment. As a result, the firms will signal to the stakeholders that they have better performance than the others.

This study argues that when a manager decides to invest in sustainable innovation costs, the manager adjusts the resources to the fluctuation of sales demand. But the managers will not cut the investment when the sales demand decreases. However, the managers will add the investment when the sales demand recovers. So the managers retain the sustainable innovation investment when the sales demand falls but they will develop the investment when the sales demand climbs. Furthermore, the managers must manage the slack resources, and lastly, it is likely to have asymmetric cost behavior.

Employing innovation score of Thompson Reuters database, this study indicates that the cost of sustainable innovation reveals that there is a differences between the firms that have high sustainable innovation investment and the firms that have low investment. The firms that have most high investment are getting close to asymmetric cost behavior, but others do not. This shows that the sustainable innovation involvement of listed firms in emerging markets, particularly Indonesian capital market, is still low. This result is highlighted by the study by Loh and Thomas (2018), in which the listed firms of Indonesia have the lowest score in related sustainability among the ASEAN countries.

This study also gives empirical evidence that there are two groups of the firms related to investment in sustainable innovation in emerging market. The first group is the firms that have high sustainable innovation performance. The second group is the firms that have low sustainable innovation performance. Although the results of regression tests between two groups are not statistically significant, there are significant differences between the two groups. The first group shows that even though the finding is not supported, the sign of coefficient is negative. Based on sustainable innovation, this indicates that the high-performance firms have invested in it, but it is a preliminary level. However, the low-performance firms have not yet invested. This result indicates that the high-performance firms provide signal to the stakeholders that they perform better than the other firms. The result of this study is different from prior studies in developed countries (Golden et al., 2020; Habib & Hasan, 2019; Weidner et al., 2021).

We argue that even though the average development of sustainability performance in Indonesia lower than that the other ASEAN[4] countries (Loh & Thomas, 2018), there is a progression of the investment in sustainability, including sustainable innovation. The Financial Services Authorities of Indonesia have regulated sustainable finance and sustainability reporting for the listed firms in Indonesia (OJK, 2017). As a result, although not all of the Indonesia listed firms have invested in sustainable innovation yet, there are several firms that have already invested in it.

The findings of this study imply that the public firms of Indonesia are prepared to compete in sustainable innovation worldwide. Even the government has integrated the blue and green program (environmental) with digital economics to support not only the listed firms of capital market but also small and medium enterprises. The government also released the program to facilitate collaboration between the academics of university and the firms to develop sustainable innovation. In the future, Indonesian firms will be ready for sustainability competition across the business firms in the worldwide.

5. CONCLUSION

This study examines the association between sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. We use innovation scores of Thompson Reuters database to measure the performance of the firms related to environmental innovation. This study also employs an asymmetric cost behavior model to quantify investment of the firms in sustainable innovation. This study finds that overall, sustainable innovation influences asymmetric cost behavior and is not supported. However, the findings partially also show that a few of the firms have invested in sustainable innovation, but it is a preliminary stage. Although the average, sustainability performance of Indonesian firms is lower than the firms of other countries in ASEAN (Loh & Thomas, 2018), there is a development in sustainability according to the implementation of sustainability development goals in the Indonesian capital market.

This study contributes to the literature on sustainable innovation and asymmetric cost behavior. This study also extends the concept of asymmetric cost behavior to relate to sustainability factors, particularly in emerging countries. Our study uses signaling theory to explain performance of the firms related with sustainable innovation. The limitation of this study is that only few firms have innovation score in the emerging market, particularly in the Indonesian capital market. So we only investigate few of the firms in terms of sustainable innovation performance. This study suggests that future studies will be able to investigate sustainable innovation in the disclosures of the firms, i.e., sustainability reporting. In the future, the study will also be able to investigate sustainable innovation in an internal-managerial or external-relational framework in relation to asymmetric cost behavior.

Funding: This research is supported by Maranatha Christian University (Grant number: 023/SK/ADD/UKM/V/2024).
Institutional Review Board Statement: Not Applicable
Transparency: The authors state that the manuscript is honest, truthful, and transparent, that no key aspects of the investigation have been omitted, and that any differences from the study as planned have been clarified. This study followed all writing ethics.
Data Availability Statement:
Competing Interests:
Authors' Contributions:
Acknowledgement:

REFERENCES

Anderson, M. C., Banker, R. D., & Janakiraman, S. N. (2003). Are selling, general, and administrative costs "sticky"? *Journal of Accounting Research, 41*(1), 47-63. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-679x.00095

Banker, R. D., Basu, S., Byzalov, D., & Chen, J. Y. S. (2016). The confounding effect of cost stickiness on conservatism estimates. *Journal of Accounting and Economics, 61*(1), 203-220. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacceco.2015.07.001

Banker, R. D., & Byzalov, D. (2014). Asymmetric cost behavior. *Journal of Management Accounting Research, 26*(2), 43-79.

[4]ASEAN or Association of South East Asia Nations are the organizations of geopolitics and economy from the countries of south east region, i.e. Brunei Darussalam, Burma, Cambodia, Indonesia, Laos, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, and Vietnam.

Barney, J. (1991). Firm resources and sustained competitive advantage. *Journal of Management*, *17*(1), 99-120. https://doi.org/10.1177/014920639101700108
Bebbington, J., & Unerman, J. (2018). Achieving the United Nations sustainable development goals: An enabling role for accounting research. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *31*(1), 2-24. https://doi.org/10.1108/aaaj-05-2017-2929
Bradbury, M. E., & Scott, T. (2018). Do managers forecast asymmetric cost behaviour? *Australian Journal of Management*, *43*(4), 538-554. https://doi.org/10.1177/0312896218773136
Chen, J. V., Kama, I., & Lehavy, R. (2019). A contextual analysis of the impact of managerial expectations on asymmetric cost behavior. *Review of Accounting Studies*, *24*, 665-693. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11142-019-09491-2
Cheung, J., Kim, H., Kim, S., & Huang, R. (2018). Is the asymmetric cost behavior affected by competition factors? *Asia-Pacific Journal of Accounting & Economics*, *25*(1-2), 218-234. https://doi.org/10.1080/16081625.2016.1266271
Chung, C. Y., Hur, S.-K., & Liu, C. (2019). Institutional investors and cost stickiness: Theory and evidence. *The North American Journal of Economics and Finance*, *47*, 336-350. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.najef.2018.05.002
Ciftci, M., & Salama, F. M. (2018). Stickiness in costs and voluntary disclosures: Evidence from management earnings forecasts. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, *30*(3), 211-234. https://doi.org/10.2308/jmar-51966
Ciftci, M., & Zoubi, T. A. (2019). The magnitude of sales change and asymmetric cost behavior. *Journal of Management Accounting Research*, *31*(3), 65-81. https://doi.org/10.2308/jmar-52331
Cillo, V., Petruzzelli, A. M., Ardito, L., & Del Giudice, M. (2019). Understanding sustainable innovation: A systematic literature review. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, *26*(5), 1012-1025. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1783
Clogg, C. C., Petkova, E., & Haritou, A. (1995). Statistical methods for comparing regression coefficients between models. *American Journal of Sociology*, *100*(5), 1261-1293. https://doi.org/10.1086/230638
Cohen, S., Karatzimas, S., & Naoum, V.-C. (2017). The sticky cost phenomenon at the local government level: Empirical evidence from Greece. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, *18*(4), 445-463. https://doi.org/10.1108/jaar-03-2015-0019
Connelly, B. L., Certo, S. T., Ireland, R. D., & Reutzel, C. R. (2011). Signaling theory: A review and assessment. *Journal of Management*, *37*(1), 39-67. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310388419
Dai, J., Huang, R., & Yan, Y. (2018). Cost stickiness and management's issuance of earnings forecasts. *The Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, *20*(6), 40-56. https://doi.org/10.33423/jabe.v20i6.371
De Villiers, C., Jia, J., & Li, Z. (2022). Corporate social responsibility: A review of empirical research using Thomson Reuters Asset4 data. *Accounting & Finance*, *62*(4), 4523-4568. https://doi.org/10.1111/acfi.13004
Doluca, H., Holzner, B., & Wagner, M. (2019). Corporate sustainability and environmental innovations: Practical implications from a cross-country analysis over 15 years. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, *47*(2), 115-122. https://doi.org/10.1109/emr.2019.2903007
Fernández, I. A., & Lucena, F. N. (2022). Sustainable innovation: An essential paradigm in the sustainable development goals framework. In Claudia Nelly Berrones-Flemmig, Francoise Contreras, & Utz Dornberger (Eds.), Business in the 21st Century. In (pp. 177-189). Leeds: Emerald Publishing Limited. https://doi.org/10.1108/978-1-80382-787-220221014
Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman, Boston: Pitman Publishing Inc.
G20. (2009). *Leaders' statement the pittsburgh summit*. Retrieved from https://www.fsb.org/wp-content/uploads/g20_leaders_declaration_pittsburgh_2009.pdf
Golden, J., & Kohlbeck, M. (2020). Bankruptcy: The result of failed financial relationships. *Advances in Management Accounting*, *32*, 35-73.
Golden, J., Mashruwala, R., & Pevzner, M. (2020). Labor adjustment costs and asymmetric cost behavior: An extension. *Management Accounting Research*, *46*, 100647. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mar.2019.07.004
Habib, A., & Hasan, M. M. (2019). Corporate social responsibility and cost stickiness. *Business & Society*, *58*(3), 453-492. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650316677936
Habib, A., & Huang, H. J. (2019). Cost stickiness in the New Zealand charity sector. *The International Journal of Accounting*, *54*(03), 1950012. https://doi.org/10.1142/s1094406019500124
Hahn, R., & Kühnen, M. (2013). Determinants of sustainability reporting: A review of results, trends, theory, and opportunities in an expanding field of research. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *59*, 5-21. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2013.07.005
Harsanto, B., Mulyana, A., Faisal, Y. A., & Shandy, V. M. (2022). Open innovation for sustainability in the social enterprises: An empirical evidence. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, *8*(3), 160. https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8030160
Henao-García, E. A., & Montoya, R. A. C. (2021). Management innovation in an emerging economy: an analysis of its moderating effect on the technological innovation–performance relationship. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, *70*(1), 128-141. https://doi.org/10.1109/tem.2021.3052746
Ibrahim, A. E. A. (2018). Board characteristics and asymmetric cost behavior: Evidence from Egypt. *Accounting Research Journal*, *31*(2), 301-322. https://doi.org/10.1108/arj-11-2015-0148
Kamboj, S., & Rahman, Z. (2017). Market orientation, marketing capabilities and sustainable innovation: The mediating role of sustainable consumption and competitive advantage. *Management Research Review*, *40*(6), 698-724. https://doi.org/10.1108/mrr-09-2014-0225
Kitching, K., Mashruwala, R., & Pevzner, M. (2016). Culture and cost stickiness: A cross-country study. *The International Journal of Accounting*, *51*(3), 402-417. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.intacc.2016.07.010
Kneipp, J. M., Gomes, C. M., Kruglianskas, I., Motke, F. D., & Frizzo, K. (2021). Sustainable innovation practices and the degree of innovation of business models in Brazilian industrial companies. *World Journal of Science, Technology and Sustainable Development*, *18*(3), 221-238. https://doi.org/10.1108/wjstsd-02-2021-0019
Liu, X., Liu, X., & Reid, C. D. (2019). Stakeholder orientations and cost management. *Contemporary Accounting Research*, *36*(1), 486-512. https://doi.org/10.1111/1911-3846.12389

Loh, L., & Thomas, T. (2018). *Sustainability reporting in ASEAN countries: Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore and Thailand*. Retrieved from https://www.asean-csr-network.org/c/images/Resources/Reports/2018Sustainability_Reporting_in_ASEAN_Countries.pdf

Martusa, R., Meythi, M., & Dharmawan, L. V. (2022). Earnings quality and asymmetric cost behavior: A study of Indonesia capital market. *International Journal of Innovative Technologies in Economy*, *38*(2), 1-10. https://doi.org/10.31435/rsglobal_ijite/30062022/7843

Morales, P., Flikkema, M., Castaldi, C., & de Man, A.-P. (2022). The effectiveness of appropriation mechanisms for sustainable innovations from small and medium-sized enterprises. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *374*, 133921. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133921

OJK. (2017). *POJK No. 51/pojk.03 concerning the implementation of sustainable finance for financial service institutions, issuers and public companies*. Retrieved from https://www.ojk.go.id/id/kanal/perbankan/regulasi/peraturan-ojk/Documents/Pages/POJK-Penerapan-Keuangan-Berkelanjutan-bagi-Lembaga-Jasa-Keuangan,-Emiten,-dan-Perusahaan-Publik/SAL%20POJK%2051%20-%20keuangan%20berkelanjutan.pdf

Prabowo, R., Hooghiemstra, R., & Van Veen-Dirks, P. (2018). State ownership, socio-political factors, and labor cost stickiness. *European Accounting Review*, *27*(4), 771-796. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180.2017.1329659

Rauter, R., Globocnik, D., Perl-Vorbach, E., & Baumgartner, R. J. (2019). Open innovation and its effects on economic and sustainability innovation performance. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *4*(4), 226-233. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2018.03.004

Rezaee, Z., Tsui, J., Cheng, P., & Gaoguang, Z. (2019). *Business sustainability in Asia: Compliance, performance, and integrated reporting and assurance*. Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Tang, L., Huang, Y., Liu, J., & Wan, X. (2022). Cost stickiness and stock price crash risk: Evidence from China. *Emerging Markets Finance and Trade*, *58*(2), 544-569. https://doi.org/10.1080/1540496x.2020.1787148

Teece, D. J. (1998). Capturing value from knowledge assets: The new economy, markets for know-how, and intangible assets. *California Management Review*, *40*(3), 55-79. https://doi.org/10.2307/41165943

Vinutha, H. P., Poornima, B., & Sagar, B. M. (2018). *Detection of outliers using interquartile range technique from intrusion dataset. In Information and decision sciences*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Ficta. Springer Singapore.

Wang, D., Xu, D., Zhou, N., & Cheng, Y. (2022). The asymmetric relationship between sustainable innovation and industrial transformation and upgrading: Evidence from China's provincial panel data. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *378*, 134453. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.134453

Wei, J., Li, Y., Liu, X., & Du, Y. (2022). Enterprise characteristics and external influencing factors of sustainable innovation: Based on China's innovation survey. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *372*, 133461. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2022.133461

Weidner, K., Nakata, C., & Zhu, Z. (2021). Sustainable innovation and the triple bottom-line: A market-based capabilities and stakeholder perspective. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, *29*(2), 141-161. https://doi.org/10.1080/10696679.2020.1798253

Wernerfelt, B. (1995). The resource-based view of the firm: Ten years after. *Strategic Management Journal*, *16*(3), 171-174. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0149-2063(01)00114-3

Xu, S., & Zheng, K. (2020). Tax avoidance and asymmetric cost behavior. *Journal of Accounting, Auditing & Finance*, *35*(4), 723-747. https://doi.org/10.1177/0148558x18793757

We have filled in the grant number, i.e. 023/SK/ADD/UKM/V/2024).

SeTin SeTin: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7065-1093
email: setin@eco.maranatha.edu
HP: +6281320111120

Riki Martusa: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9779-5828
email: riki.martusa@eco.maranatha.edu (corresponding author).
HP: +628978571574
The picture of corresponding author:

Meythi Meythi: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0262-0268
email: meythi@eco.maranatha.edu
HP: +8156125788

14. Konfirmasi dari editor jurnal (telah menerima artikel koreksi Bahasa Inggris) dan dikirimkan kepada editor akademik.	**26 Juni 2024**



15 Publish **https://archive.conscientiabeam.com/index.php/11/article/view/3982**	**21 November 2024**