JPB REVIEW
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PROFESSIONAL BUSINESS REVIEW
ISSN: 2525-3654
OPEN ACCESS

THE EFFECT OF OWNERSHIP STRUCTURE AND BOARD DIVERSITY ON CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY (CSR) DISCLOSURE

Putri Nurhalisa[A], Erna Hernawati[B]

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 09 June 2023

Accepted 06 September 2023

Keywords:

Ownership Structure;
Board Diversity;
Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure.

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The aim of this studi is to determine the effect of ownership structure and Board Diversity on Disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility

Theoretical framework: Agency theory can be defined as a relationship that occurs between the principal (owner) and agent (manager) and meets in a contract, where the manager becomes the party that is given the power to make decisions that represent the decisions of the owners in the context of managing the operational activities of the business entity.

Design/Methodology/Approach: This research is a quantitative study that aims to determine the effect of ownership structure (institutional ownership, managerial ownership, ownership concentration) and board diversity (gender diversity board and nationality diversity board). The samples in this study were taken from the manufacturing and mining sector companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in the 2019-2021 period which were selected based on the purposive sampling method.

Findings: The results of the test show that (1) institutional ownership has negative effect on disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility, (2) managerial ownership has no effect on disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility, (3) concentration of ownership has a negative effect on disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility, (4) board gender diversity does not affect the disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility, (5) the nationality diversity board does not affect the disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility.

Research, Practical & Social implications: The higher institutional ownership in the company causes them to be able to control decisions in the company. And the results of this study also state that there is a negative influence between institutional ownership and disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility because institutional investors or shareholders tend to make short-term investments that focus more on company profits and profits in order to get returns from their investments and tend not to pay attention to the problem of Corporate Social Responsibility in the company.

Originality/Value: This research are that some of them are that there are still many companies in the sector used in the research that do not publish sustainability reports. In addition, the research only uses sustainability reports that use the GRI Standard guidelines, so the sample obtained is relatively small.

Doi: https://doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i9.2506

[A] *Lecturer. Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta. Jakarta, Indonesia.*
E-mail: putrinurhalisa369@gmail.com Orcid: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7550-472X
[B] *Lecturer. Universitas Pembangunan Nasional Veteran Jakarta. Jakarta, Indonesia.*
E-mail: erna.unpveteranjakarta@gmail.com Orcid: https://orcid.org/0009-0003-6207-2069

O EFEITO DA ESTRUTURA DE PROPRIEDADE E DA DIVERSIDADE DO CONSELHO SOBRE A DIVULGAÇÃO DA RESPONSABILIDADE SOCIAL CORPORATIVA (RSE)

RESUMO

Objetivo: O objetivo deste estudo é determinar o efeito da estrutura de propriedade e da diversidade do conselho sobre a divulgação da responsabilidade social corporative.

Estrutura teórica: A teoria da agência pode ser definida como uma relação que ocorre entre o principal (proprietário) e o agente (gerente) e se encontra em um contrato, onde o gerente se torna a parte que tem o poder de tomar decisões que representam as decisões dos proprietários no contexto da gestão das atividades operacionais da entidade de negócios.

Design/Metodologia/Abordagem: Esta pesquisa é um estudo quantitativo que visa determinar o efeito da estrutura de propriedade (propriedade institucional, propriedade gerencial, concentração de propriedade) e da diversidade do conselho (conselho de diversidade de gênero e conselho de diversidade da nacionalidade). As amostras neste estudo foram retiradas de empresas dos setores de manufatura e mineração listadas na Bolsa de Valores da Indonésia no período 2019-2021, que foram selecionadas com base no método de amostragem propositAL.

Constatações: Os resultados do teste mostram que (1) a propriedade institucional tem efeito negativo sobre a divulgação da Responsabilidade Social Corporativa, (2) a propriedade gerencial não tem efeito sobre a divulgação da Responsabilidade Social Corporativa, (3) a concentração da propriedade tem um efeito negativo sobre a divulgação da Responsabilidade Social Corporativa, (4) a diversidade de gênero do conselho não afeta a divulgação da Responsabilidade Social Corporativa, (5) o conselho de diversidade da nacionalidade não afeta a divulgação da Responsabilidade social corporative.

Pesquisa, Implicações práticas e Sociais: A maior propriedade institucional na empresa faz com que eles sejam capazes de controlar as decisões na empresa. E os resultados deste estudo também afirmam que há uma influência negativa entre a propriedade institucional e divulgação da Responsabilidade Social Corporativa, porque os investidores institucionais ou acionistas tendem a fazer investimentos de curto prazo que se concentram mais nos lucros e lucros da empresa, a fim de obter retornos de seus investimentos e tendem a não prestar atenção ao problema da Responsabilidade Social Corporativa na empresa.

Originalidade/Valor: Esta pesquisa é que alguns deles são que ainda existem muitas empresas do setor utilizadas na pesquisa que não publicam relatórios de sustentabilidade. Além disso, a pesquisa usa apenas relatórios de sustentabilidade que usam as diretrizes do padrão GRI, de modo que a amostra obtida é relativamente pequena.

Palavras-chave: Estrutura de Propriedade, Diversidade do Conselho, Divulgação de Responsabilidade Social Corporativa.

EL EFECTO DE LA ESTRUCTURA DE PROPIEDAD Y LA DIVERSIDAD DE JUNTAS EN LA DIVULGACIÓN DE LA RESPONSABILIDAD SOCIAL EMPRESARIAL (RSE)

RESUMEN

Objetivo: El objetivo de este estudio es determinar el efecto de la estructura de propiedad y la diversidad de juntas en la divulgación de la responsabilidad social empresarial

Marco teórico: La teoría de la agencia puede definirse como una relación que se produce entre el principal (propietario) y el agente (gerente) y se reúne en un contrato, donde el gerente se convierte en la parte a la que se le da el poder de tomar decisiones que representan las decisiones de los propietarios en el contexto de la gestión de las actividades operacionales de la entidad comercial.

Diseño/Metodología/Enfoque: Esta investigación es un estudio cuantitativo que tiene como objetivo determinar el efecto de la estructura de propiedad (propiedad institucional, propiedad gerencial, concentración de propiedad) y la diversidad de juntas (junta de diversidad de género y junta de diversidad de nacionalidad). Las muestras en este estudio fueron tomadas de las empresas del sector manufacturero y minero que cotizaban en la Bolsa de Valores de Indonesia en el período 2019-2021, las cuales fueron seleccionadas con base en el método de muestreo intencional.

Conclusiones: Los resultados de la prueba muestran que (1) la propiedad institucional tiene un efecto negativo en la divulgación de la responsabilidad social corporativa, (2) la propiedad gerencial no tiene ningún efecto en la divulgación de la responsabilidad social corporativa, (3) la concentración de la propiedad tiene un efecto negativo en la divulgación de la responsabilidad social corporativa, (4) la diversidad de género del consejo no afecta la divulgación de la responsabilidad social corporativa, (5) la junta de diversidad de nacionalidades no afecta la divulgación de información Responsabilidad Social Corporativa.

Implicaciones de Investigación, prácticas y Sociales: La mayor propiedad institucional en la empresa hace que sean capaces de controlar las decisiones en la empresa. Y los resultados de este estudio también señalan que existe

una influencia negativa entre la propiedad institucional y la divulgación de la Responsabilidad Social Empresarial porque los inversores institucionales o accionistas tienden a realizar inversiones de corto plazo que se centran más en los beneficios y utilidades de la empresa con el fin de obtener ganancias de sus inversiones y tienden a no prestar atención al problema de la Responsabilidad Social Empresarial en la empresa.
Originalidad/Valor: Esta investigación es que algunas de ellas son que todavía hay muchas empresas del sector utilizadas en la investigación que no publican informes de sostenibilidad. Además, la investigación solo utiliza informes de sostenibilidad que utilizan las directrices del estándar GRI, por lo que la muestra obtenida es relativamente pequeña.

Palabras clave: Estructura de Propiedad, Diversidad de Tableros, Divulgación de Responsabilidad Social Corporativa.

INTRODUCTION

One of the goals of the company in carrying out its operational activities is to seek profit or profit. However, with the increase in the activities carried out by the company, the impact resulting from these activities increases. Both the impact on the environment, as well as the impact on society. Viewed from the economic aspect, the main direction of the company is profit or profit from the operational business activities of the company. However, when viewed from a social perspective, in addition to generating profits, a business must also contribute to creating prosperity for the community and the surrounding environment so that it is necessary to integrate environmental concerns into the company's strategy (Respati & Hadiprajitno, 2015; Al Naim et al., 2023; Hasan et al, 2023).

According to *the World Bank*, the definition of CSR is a commitment madeby a company or business to contribute to sustainable economic development with employees in the company, local community organizations and society that aims toraise the level of quality of life, in the right way for business and growth.

At the end of 2020, reported by *liputan6.com*, PT Mayora Indah received an award from the ASEAN Business Award 2020. In this award, PT Mayora was considered capable of growing *revenue* and *net income*, product innovation,employment and corporate social responsibility. However, during June 2022, as reported by (*allianzerowasteindonesia*), several organizations for the plastic-free parade movement carried out *brand audit activities* at 11 coastal points spread across 10 provinces. From this activity, 16,519 pieces of waste and 201.3 kg of waste were found. and 79.7% of the types of waste found were single-use plastic packaging waste. As a result, it can be seen from the table above that PT Mayora's packaging won first place out of the three companies that contributed to disposableplastic packaging waste.

From the phenomena above, it shows that there is still a lack of accountability from companies both from an environmental, social and communityperspective. From the cases carried out by several companies above, CSR disclosureis very important for companies to do so that the public is able to see and monitor social responsibility practices carried out by companies (Al Naim et al., 2023; Malik et al., 2023). One factor is the ownershipstructure. Institutional Ownership is a condition where the shares in a company areor are held by an institutional party or a body (Singal & Putra, 2019). In overseeingcompany performance, institutional ownership can also encourage management to be more aware of social and environmental issues and disclose information about social responsibility or *corporate social responsibility* carried out by companies. (Masoud & Vij, 2021). And supported in previous research Nurleni et al. (2018) which states that there is a significant positive influence for institutional ownershipon CSR disclosure and is in line with Singal & Putra (2019). However, this is not in line with the research by Salehi et al. (2017) and Rahmasari (2020) which state that institutional ownership has no effect on CSR disclosure

In addition to institutional ownership, according to (Nurleni et al., 2018) management ownership can reduce agency problems between shareholders and managers because it aligns the interests of managers and stakeholders. In the corporate system, managerial ownership can reduce gaps and conflicts of interest between owners, namely shareholders and management as managers of the company because management will act by thinking about the interests of shareholders, who are themselves so that information asymmetry will be lower. This is supported by Rahmasari's research (2020); Rivandi (2020) which states thatthere is a significant positive effect of managerial ownership on CSR disclosure andis in line. However, this research is not in line with the results of research by Fauzyyah & Rachmawati (2018) which states that there is no significant effect between managerial ownership and CSR disclosure.

Apart from institutional and managerial shareholders in a company, concentration of ownership is a cause that has an impact on CSR disclosure in a company. In a study by Younas et al. (2017) explained that when the concentrationof ownership in a company has a greater composition, it will have an impact on theparty's power to control and supervise management performance to carry out disclosures regarding sustainability which will be higher. There is research that proves that there is an effect of concentration of ownership on CSR disclosure conducted by Fallah & Mojarrad (2019); Fauzyyah & Rachmawati (2018); Garas &ElMassah (2018) which states that there is a positive influence between the concentration of ownership and the implementation of *Corporate Social* Responsibility disclosure. Meanwhile, there are different results in the research results from research by Dias et al. (2017) states that there is no significant effect between the concentration of ownership on CSR disclosure.

A high diversity in board of directors will lead to a higher probability of having more CSR reporting (Rao & Tilt, 2015). *Board diversity* itself is defined asheterogeneity among board members, and has an infinite number of dimensions ranging from age to nationality, from religious to functional background, from taskskills to relational skills, and from political preferences to sexual preferences(Knippenberg et al., 2004). Gender diversity in the board of directors also has an influence on CSR disclosure. According to stakeholder theory, the presence of women members in board structures can strengthen organizational relationships with key stakeholders, which improves environmental and social practices (Issa et al., 2021). And this is proven in research conducted in Setiawan et al. (2018) statesthat if there is a positive relationship for *the gender diversity board variable* for disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*, research states that things are not parallel to the research conducted by Issa et al. (2021) which states that there is a negative relationship between *board gender diversity* and environmental disclosure.Apart from gender diversity, nationality diversity also has an influence on CSR disclosure. With the diversity of foreign nationalities on the board of directors, it can enrich the perspective in terms of social responsibility which causes the implementation of disclosing information in practices carried out by companies (Azzahra et al., 2021). In the research of Khan et al. (2019) shows that the*nationality diversity* of the board has a positive relationship to the CSR disclosure variable, but research by Setiawan et al. (2018) showed results that were not in linebecause the results showed that there was a negative effect on CSR disclosure. In addition, other aspects of business ownership and management, namely company size, are also factors that influence CSR disclosure.

Based on the phenomena that occur and with the research gap from previousresearch and there are still many impacts that companies produce both in the environmental, social and economic communities motivate them to carry out research entitled "The Influence of Ownership Structure and Board Diversity *on* Disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility " where in this study using corporateentities in the listed manufacturing and mining sectors on the Indonesian Stock Exchange in 2019-2021.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Agency Theory

Based on Jensen & Meckling (1976), agency theory can be defined as a relationshipthat occurs between the principal (owner) and agent (manager) and meets in a contract, where the manager becomes the party that is given the power to make decisions that represent the decisions of the owners in the context of managing theoperational activities of the business entity.

Due to differences in interests between the two parties in the relationship between principals and agents in the company, conflicts can occur. According to agency theory, this conflict can lead to information asymmetry. When owners act as principals while management act as agents, an information asymmetry results. (Rivandi, 2020). Information asymmetry can occur when management, as an agent,knows more about the company's plans or knows more sensitive information aboutthe company than the principal). Disclosure of information by management requiresmonitoring to monitor management as the management of the company. To carry out monitoring within the company, the ownership structure within the company can carry out activities to monitor management performance in operating the company.

Stakeholder Theory

According to Wibisono (2007) stakeholders are those who have an interest inthe sustainability of a company that influences and is affected by it, either directly or indirectly. In the implementation of social responsibility carried out by companies, the *stakeholder theory* underlies the practice because there is a relationship between the company and the *stakeholders*, and the existence of stakeholders has a role for sustainability. corporate life so that in order to maintainrelationships with *stakeholders*, companies can carry out social and environmentalresponsibility (Azzahra et al., 2021).

Effect of Institutional Ownership on Disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

In the perspective of agency theory initiated by Jensen & Meckling (1976) discussing the dissimilarity of interests for managers and shareholders can cause conflicts of interest between all these parties. To reduce this conflict, a supervisorymechanism is needed for management. The existence of institutional ownership promotes tighter oversight of management. According to Singal & Putra (2019) Institutional ownership is share ownership owned by institutions or institutions, such as insurance companies, banks, investment companies, asset management.

In a study conducted by Nurleni et al. (2018) shows that there is a positive influence between institutional ownership on CSR disclosure where the higher the institutional ownership, the higher the CSR disclosure by companies, this result is in line with research (Sari & Handini, 2019; Rivandi, 2020) which states ownershipinstitutions can affect CSR disclosure

H 1 = Institutional ownership has a significant positive effect on CSR disclosure

The Influence of Managerial Ownership on Disclosure of *Corporate SocialResponsibility* (CSR)

In a company with ownership owned by management, it can be a mechanism for reducing agency problems for managers to align the interests of managers and shareholders (Jensen & Meckling, 1976). When managers also own shares in the company they will act with due regard to the interests of the shareholders which they themselves thereby prevent them from taking *opportunistic actions*.

In line with research (Singal and Putra, 2019; Rahmasari, 2020; Arikasinta & Wirakusuma, 2020; Asrori et al., 2019) the following hypothesis is formulated inthis study:

H 2 : Managerial ownership has a significant positive effect on CSR disclosure.

Effect of Ownership Concentration on Disclosure of *Corporate SocialResponsibility* (CSR)

In Fauzyyah & Rachmawati (2018) states that the concentration of share ownership in a company can be one of the controls and supervision of managers who serve as company policy makers. With an optimal monitoring mechanism, itwill increase CSR disclosure by management as a form of management transparency and accountability to shareholders.

This is in line with the results of research from (Fallah & Mujarrad, 2018; Fauzyyah & Rachmawati, 2018; Garas & El-Massah, 2018) which shows that thereis a positive influence between ownership concentration and CSR disclosure

H3: Concentration of ownership has a significant positive effect on CSR disclosure

The Influence of *the Gender Diversity Board on* Disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility* (CSR)

According to *stakeholder* theory, it is important for companies to maintain relationships with stakeholders and the presence of female members in the board structure can strengthen organizational relationships with key stakeholders, which improves environmental and social practices (Issa et al., 2021).

Diversity in the composition of the board of directors promotes a wider spectrum of knowledge and compared to men, women are more responsive to environmental, social and community issues, effective communication skills whichlead to better carrying out the needs of *stakeholders* (Khan et al ., 2019). And this is proven in research conducted by (Setiawan et al., 2018; Khan, 2019) showing thatthere is a positive relationship between *board gender diversity* and CSR disclosure.H 4 : *Board Gender Diversity* has a significant positive effect on CSR disclosure

The Effect of *Nationality Diversity Board on* Disclosure of *Corporate SocialResponsibility* (CSR)

The board of directors in the corporate structure is considered to be the maincontrol in a company that has responsibility to *stakeholders* (Rao & Tilt, 2015). With the presence of a diversity of nationalities, the boards in the organizational structure can increase awareness of the company to integrate CSR issues (El- Bassiouny & ElBassiouny, 2019).

The diversity of foreign nationalities can provide a broad perspective, and the experience they have, especially related to social responsibility practices and information disclosure, so as to improve companies in carrying out CSR practices and disclosures and in line with stakeholder theory where companies must maintainrelationships with stakeholders. one way is by carrying out social responsibility (Setiawan et al., 2018). And in Issa et al.'s research, it shows a positive relationshipbetween *board nationality* and CSR disclosure and research (Farida, 2020; Siregar,2021) shows that *boards nationality diversity* has a positive significant effect on CSR disclosure. H 5 : *Board Nationality Diversity* has a significant positive effect on CSR disclosure.

METHOD

This study uses a quantitative method with secondary data sources obtained from the official website of the Indonesian Stock Exchange (IDX), namely www.idx.com and the official website of the related company. The population in this study are manufacturing and mining sector companies listed on the IDX in 2019-2021. The sample method used was purposive sampling with the following criteria:

a) Manufacturing and mining sector companies listed on the IDX during the 2019-2021 period

b) Companies that make and publish *annual reports* during the 2019-2021 period

c) Companies that make and publish *sustainability reports* using the GRI Standard during the 2019-2021 period

Operational Definition and Variable Measurement

In this study CSR disclosure is the dependent variable. Variable measurements are calculated by giving a value or score of 1 for each item disclosedand a value of 0 for items not disclosed by the company. and the number of items disclosed by the company will be divided by the maximum number of CSRdisclosure indicators carried out by the company. and the measurement of this variable is guided by the GRI Standard for the economic, social and environmental categories which total 125 items. And the calculations for the dependent variable inthis study refer to calculations in Arikarsita's research (2020) , namely:

$$CSRDIj = \frac{\sum xij}{Nj}$$

Institutional ownership

The institutional ownership variable is measured by calculating the number of shares owned by the institution divided by the number of outstanding shares, with referenceto research (Rivandi, 2020) which uses a ratio measurement calculated from the number of institutional ownership divided by the number of outstanding shares.

$$KI : \frac{Number\ of\ Share\ Owned\ by\ Institusion}{Number\ of\ Share\ Outstanding} \times 100\%$$

Managerial ownership

The managerial ownership variable in this study is measured by calculating the number of shareholdings owned by management divided by the number of outstanding shares and refers to research (Singal & Putra, 2019) .

$$KM : \times 100\% \frac{Number\ of\ Share\ Owned\ by\ Managerial}{Number\ of\ Share\ Outstanding}$$

Ownership concentration

The ownership concentration variable in this study was measured using a dummy, that is, it will be given a value of 1 if there is a non-institutional party in share ownership who has a share ownership of 20 percent or more and is given a value of otherwise (Sellami et al., 2019).

Gender diversity board

The Board Gender Diversity variable in this study was measured by calculating the number of women's board of directors in the company divided by the total number of board of directors, with reference to research (Azzahra et al., 2021):

$$\frac{\textit{Number of women board director}}{\textit{Number of all board director}}$$

Nationality diversity board

Board Gender Diversity variable in this study is measured by calculating the numberof foreign boards of directors in the company divided by the total number of boardsof directors, with reference to research (Azzahra et al., 2021).

$$\frac{\textit{Number of foreign board director}}{\textit{Number of all board director}}$$

Company size

The size of the company in this study is measured by referring to the research (Widiastuti et al., 2018).

Size = Ln(Total Assets)

Data Analysist Method

This study used multiple linear regression analysis, and the model of the regressionis Model 1:

CSRDit : $\alpha + \beta\ 1\ KIit + \beta\ 2\ KM\ it + \beta\ 3\ KK\ it + \beta\ 4\ BGD\ it + \beta\ 5\ BND\ it + \beta\ 6\ UP + e$

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Table 1. Descriptive Statistic

Variables	*Obs*	*Means*	*Min*	*Max*
CSRD	153	0.5013333	0.168	0.816
KI	153	0.4032071	0	0.999535
KM	153	0.0353239	0	0.450601
BG	153	0.1147330	0	0.75
BN	153	0.1552085	0	0.8
UP	153	15.9959500	11.887650	19.721720

Note: CSRD = Disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility; KI = Ownership Institutional; KM = Managerial Ownership; BG = Gender Diversity Board; BN = BoardNationality Diversity;
Source: Prepared by the authors (2023)

Panel Data Regression

This test is carried out to determine the estimated panel data that is in accordancewith the research data by carrying out several tests , namely:

Chow test

The chow test was carried out with the aim of choosing a model betweenthe common effect model and the *fixed effect model*. With the criterionif the probability < 0.05 then the model chosen is the *fixed effect model* and if the probability is > 0.05 then the model chosen is the *common effect model.*

Table 2. Chow test

Probability F-restricted	α
0.0000	0.05

Source: Output STATA v.16, Prepared by the authors (2023)

From the table above, the results of the Chow test show that the probability has a value of <α (0.05), so that from these results the appropriate model is the *fixed effect model.*

Langrange multiplier test

The LM test was carried out with the aim of selecting a model between the *common effect model* and the random effect model. With the criterionif the probability < 0.05 then the model chosen is the *random effect model* and if the probability is > 0.05 then the model chosen is the *common effect model.*

Table 3. Langrange Multiplier Test

probability	α
0.0000	0.05

Source: Output STATA v.16, Prepared by the authors (2023)

Based on the table above, the results of the Langrange multiplier test performed show a probability of < α (0.05) so the model chosen in this test is the *random effect model.*

Hausman test

The last is the Hausman test which is carried out with the aim of choosing a model between the *fixed effect model* and the random effect model. With the criterion if the probability < 0.05 then the selected model is the *fixed effect model* and if the probability > 0.05 then the selected model is the *random effect model.*

Table 4. Hausman test

probability	α
0.0061	0.05

Source : Output STATA v.16, Prepared by the authors (2023)

From the table above, the Hausman test tested produces a probability value of 0.0061 which is smaller than α (0.05), so that for. So based on the tests conducted, the correct research model to use is the *fixed effect model.*

Classic assumption test

Normality test

Following are the results of the normality test after the 5% winsorizes treatment:

Table. 5 Normality Test

Variable	skewness	kurtosis
CSRD	0.1295045	2.922818
KI	0.2795779	1.593844
km	2.711802	9.387789
KK	-1.887074	4.561047
BG	1.459879	4.450248
BN	1.308819	3.601683
UP	-0.31105537	2.030683

Source: Output STATA v.16, Prepared by the authors (2023)

Multicollinearity test

Next is the multicollinearity test carried out with the aim of seeing the correlation or relationship between the independent variables used in the study. The requirements or criteria for the multicollinearity test are the VIF (*Variance InflationFactor*) test value and a tolerance value of > 0.10, so there is no multicollinearity problem from the variables used. And below is a table of results from the multicollinearity test:

Table 6. Multicollinearity Test

Variables	VIF	1/VIF
KI	1.43	0.698013
km	1.34	0.747707
KK	2.49	0.402213
BG	1.52	0.659376
BN	1.5	0.665927
UP	1.15	0.870250

Source: Prepared by the authors (2023)

After carrying out the multicollinearity test there are data that have a value > 10 sothat *treatment centering is carried out*. From the table above after *centering*, it shows the results of a VIF value of less than 10 and a tolerance value of more than 0.10 for all variables. And from these results, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity problem from the variables used in the study.

Heteroscedasticity test

Furthermore, in the classical assumption test, a heteroscedasticity test was carried out. This test was carried out with the aim of seeing whether the *variance* from oneobservation to another in the model used in the study has discrepancies or dissimilarities (Ghozali, 2018). And the heteroscedasticity test was carried out usingthe *Breusch Pagan Godfrey test* with the criteria that if the probability is more than 0.05 then there is no heteroscedasticity problem in the research data. And the following results of the heteroscedasticity test are presented in the table:

Table 7. Heteroscedasticity Test

Prob > chi2	0.7597

Source: Output STATA v.16, Prepared by the authors (2023)

From the results above, it shows that the probability is greater than 0.05 so there isno heteroscedasticity problem.

Autocorrelation test

And the next test performed in the classic assumption test is the autocorrelation test.

This test was carried out aiming to see if there were errors (Ghozali, 2018). And tosee if there are autocorrelation problems, the Wooldridge test is carried out. And the test results are presented in the following table:

Table 8. Autocorrelation Test

Prop > F	1,000

Source : Prepared by the authors (2023)

From the test results in the table above, it shows that the autocorrelation test results have a greater value of significance (α) 0.05, which means there is no autocorrelation problem in the study.

Hypothesis Test Determination Coefficient Test (R-square)

The purpose of carrying out the coefficient of determination test or Rsquaretest is to calculate how far a model used in research has the ability to drive variationof the dependent variable used in research. And below are the results of the tests carried out:

Table 9. R-square test

Number Of Obs	153
Prob > F	0.023
Within R-square	0.1892

Source: Output STATA v.16, Prepared by the authors (2023)

From the table above it can be seen that the R-squared overall value in this study is 0.1892 or 18.92%. From these results it can be shown that the ability of theindependent variables namely institutional ownership, managerial ownership, concentration of ownership, *board gender diversity*, *board nationality diversity*, and company size control variables in explaining the CSR disclosure *variable* as thedependent variable is 13.63% and equal to 86.37% is explained by variables outsidethe research.

F test

Table 10. F test

Prob>Chi2	0,0230

Source: Output STATA v.16, Prepared by the authors (2023)

From the table above, the results of the simultaneous tests carried out state that the resulting probability value is 0.0230 and this value is less than α (0.05). And from this, it can be concluded that the variables of institutional ownership, managerial ownership, ownership concentration, *gender diversity board*, *nationality diversity board*, company size and jointly affect the dependent variable, namely the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*.

Hypothesis Acceptance Test: Partial Test (Statistical Test t)

Table 11. Summary of Model Testing Results

Variables	Regression Models: Fixed Effect Models				
	Coef	t	P>t	Result Expectations	Conclusion
Cons	0.7354801	9,82	0		
KI	-0.182133	0.96	0.037*	SignificantPositive	KI has a negativesignificant effect on CSRD
KM_w	*- 0.1163862*	*-0.38*	*0.703*	Significant Positive	KM has no effect onCSRD
KK	- 0.1976829	-3,2	0.002*	Significant Positive	KK is influential negative significant toCSRD
BG	0.1818005	1.56	0.123	SignificantPositive	BG has no effecton CSRD
BN	- 0.0736744	-0.49	0.626	Significant Positive	BN has no effect on CSRD
centered_UP	0.0157917	0.45	0.657		

Note : CSRD = Disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility; KI = Ownership Institutional; KM = Managerial Ownership; BG = Gender Diversity Board; BN = BoardNationality Diversity; UP = Company Size; * < 0.05
Source: Output STATA v.16, Prepared by the authors (2023)

According to the results from the table above, the results can be explained as follows:

The first hypothesis is that institutional ownership has a positive influenceon the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*. And it is stated in the tableabove, for institutional ownership (KI) has a Prob value that is smaller than 0.05,namely 0.037 > 0.05 and a coefficient value of -0.182133 which causes a negativesignificant effect between institutional ownership on disclosure of *Corporate SocialResponsibility*, so that the result cannot support H 1. So based on this, it shows thatinstitutional ownership has a significant negative effect on *corporate disclosure Social Responsibility*.

The second hypothesis is that managerial ownership has a positive influenceon the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*. And based on the results in the table above, the variable management ownership (KM) has a Prob value that isgreater than 0.05, namely 0.703 > 0.05 so that there is no effect between managerialownership on disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*, so these results cannotsupport H2. So based on these results, it shows that managerial ownership has no influence on the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*.

The third hypothesis is the concentration of ownership has a positive effecton the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*. And if seen in the table above,for ownership concentration (KK) it has a Prob value that is smaller than 0.05, namely 0.002 > 0.05 and a coefficient of 0.1976829 which reflects that there is a significant negative effect between ownership concentration on disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility, so these results cannot support H3. So based on this, it shows that the concentration of ownership has a negative significant effect on *corporate disclosure Social Responsibility*.

The fourth hypothesis is that *the gender diversity board* has a positive influence on the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*. And based on the table above, for *the gender diversity* (BG) board it has a Prob value that is greater than 0.05, namely 0.123 > 0.05 which causes no effect between institutional ownership on disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility, so these results cannotsupport H 4. So based on this, it shows that *the gender diversity board* has no influence on the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*.

The fifth hypothesis is that *the nationality diversity board* has a positive influence on the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*. And it is stated in the table above, for *the nationality diversity* (BG) board has a Prob value that is greater than 0.05, namely 0.626 > 0.05 which causes no influence between institutional ownership on disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*, so these results cannot support H5. So based on this, it shows that *the nationality diversity board* has no influence on the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*.

Effect of Institutional Ownership on Disclosure Corporate Social Responsibility

Based on the results of the hypothesis that has been done, the results for theinstitutional ownership variable are 0.037 (0.037 <0.05) and a coefficient of - 0.182133 so that from these results H1 is rejected. And institutional ownership which is proxied by calculating the number of institutional share ownership dividedby the number of shares outstanding has a significant negative effect on *CorporateSocial disclosure Responsibility* .

And these results are consistent with research (Sukasih & Sugiyanto, 2017)which has a population of manufacturing companies stating that institutional partiestend to focus on company profits or profits which will affect the rate of return on their investment in the company, therefore in companies with institutional ownership tall one. The higher institutional ownership in the company causes themto be able to control decisions in the company. And the results of this study also state that there is a negative influence between institutional ownership and disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility* because institutional investors or shareholders tend to make short-term investments that focus more on company profits and profits in order to get returns from their investments and tend not to payattention to the problem of *Corporate Social Responsibility* in the company. The results of this study are in line with research (Abu Qa'dan & Suwaidan, 2019) (Sukasih & Sugiyanto, 2017) which states that there is a negative influence between institutional ownership and disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*. Meanwhile, this research is not in line with research (Adiputri Singal & Wijana Asmara Putra, 2019) which states that there is a positive influence on disclosure of*Corporate Social Responsibility*.

The Influence of Managerial Ownership on Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

Based on the results of the hypothesis that has been carried out, the results for the managerial ownership variable are 0.703 where (0.703 <0.05) so that from these results it cannot support H2.

Judging from the results of the descriptive analysis, the average or *mean value* of the managerial ownership variable for mining and manufacturing sector companiesfor the 2019-2021 period is 0.0353239 or only 3.5% which indicates that the average in manufacturing and mining companies registered on the IDX for the 2019-2021 period, management share ownership is only 3.5% of the number of shares outstanding by the company. The data above shows that the variable managerial ownership in this study cannot affect the disclosure of *Corporate SocialResponsibility* carried out by the company.

And in research (Utami et al., 2017) which states that the existence of managerial ownership tends to only focus on performance that will benefit them toget a bonus or appraisal of their performance from shareholders so that it is compared to CSR disclosure *activities*. Apart from the low average managerial ownership within the company, regulations on Corporate Social Responsibility disclosure that are still not uniform as well as financial disclosures that have guidelines, namely PSAK, in Indonesia there is no uniform regulation regarding Corporate Social Responsibility disclosure which causes management to pay no attention to Corporate Disclosures. Social Responsibility carried out by the company.

And this research is in line with research (Elizabeth, 2021); (Sari & Handini,2021) which states that there is no effect between managerial ownership in the company on the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*.

The Influence of Ownership Concentration on Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

Based on the results of the hypothesis that has been done, the results for theownership concentration variable are 0.002 where (0.002 <0.05) and a coefficient of - 0.1976829 so from these results it cannot support H3.

Kristiawan (2020) which examines the concentration of ownership states that there is a possibility that the concentration of ownership in companies that have majority shares influences management decisions with majority rights for their owninterests and does not pay attention to the interests of other stakeholders. And in research (Adel et al., 2019) and (CorreaGarcia et al., 2020) stated that the high levelof concentration of ownership within the company allows them to obtain internal company information more easily, so that the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility* to external parties decreases. So that the high level of concentration of ownership within the company can lead to a decrease in the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility* due to the presence of concentration of ownershipwhich are non-institutional parties, they can directly get information directly from the company's internal parties so that they tend to cover up information that can damage corporate image to the public causing information asymmetry, and because of the high concentration of ownership, the information needs of other shareholderstend to be small, so that the demand for disclosing company information such as disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility* is even smaller.

The results of this study are in line with research (Adel et al., 2019); (CorreaGarcia et al., 2020) which shows that concentration of ownership has a negative effect on disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*.

The Effect of the Gender Diversity Board on Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

Based on the results of the hypothesis that has been done, the results for the *board variable gender diversity* are 0.123 where (0.123 <0.05) so that from these results it cannot support H4

Based on the research results, the average or mean number of female board members is only 11.49% in the board of directors, so that the presence of women inthe board of directors is still low and classified as a minority group in all board members. In Indonesia itself, there is no regulation that states that there must be a percentage of female directors in the company's board of directors, which isdifferent from several other countries which require that there be a percentage of female members in the board of directors of 40% (Isidro & Sobral, 2015). Due to the low presence of women in the board of directors, so that the diversity of viewpoints or experiences from the side of women does not have much effect on management decisions, especially the board of directors, one of which is CSR disclosure.

The results of this study are in line with research (Azzahra et al., 2021) which showsthat there is no effect between gender diversity of directors on disclosure of*Corporate Social*

Responsibility.

The Influence of Nationality Diversity Board on Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

Based on the results of the hypothesis that has been done, the results for the *board variable nationality diversity* are 0.626 where (0.626 <0.05) so that from these results it cannot support H5.

Judging from the mean results in the descriptive statistical analysis of the study, the average percentage of foreign boards on foreignboards is relatively small, namely 15% of the total number of directors. And from the research data, 50 companies out of 79 companies that were sampled did not haveforeign boards in their company's board of directors. From these results it can be stated that the diversity of foreign nationalities on the board of directors does not necessarily encourage companies to disclose *Corporate Social Responsibility* . And research (Hadya & Susanto, 2018) states that the board of directors as the management of the company has their respective duties and obligations so that thereis no influence of nationality on their performance, one of which is to carry out *Corporate Social Responsibility disclosures*. The results of this study are in line with research (Hadya & Susanto, 2018) which states that there is no effect betweenthe national diversity of directors on the disclosure of *Corporate Social Responsibility*.

CONCLUSION

The results of hypothesis 1 and hypothesis 3 test show that institutional ownership and concentration of ownership have a significant negative effect on thedisclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility. And the results of testing hypothesis2, hypothesis 4, hypothesis 5 which shows that managerial ownership, the gender diversity board, and the nationality diversity board have no effect on the disclosureof Corporate Social Responsibility.

The limitations of this research are that some of them are that there are stillmany companies in the sector used in the research that do not publish *sustainabilityreports*. In addition, the research only uses sustainability reports that use the GRI *Standard guidelines*, so the sample obtained is relatively small.

REFERENCES

Abu Qa'dan, MB, & Suwaidan, MS (2019). Board composition, ownership structure and corporate social responsibility disclosure: the case of Jordan. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *15* (1), 28–46. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-11-2017-0225

Adel, C., Hussain, MM, Mohamed, EKA, & Basuony, MAK (2019). Is corporate governance relevant to the quality of corporate social responsibility disclosure in large European companies? *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, *27* (2), 301–332. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJAIM-10-2017-0118

Adiputri Singal, P., & Wijana Asmara Putra, IN (2019). Effects of Institutional Ownership, Managerial Ownership, and Ownership Foreigners on Disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility. *E-Journal Accounting*, *29* (1), 468. https://doi.org/10.24843/eja.2019.v29.i01.p30

Alnaim, M. M. A., Sulong, F., Salleh, Z., & Alsheikh, G. A. A. (2023). Corporate Environmental Performance as a Mediator Between Eco-Efficiency Strategy and Financial Performance in Jordanian Industrial Sectors. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, *8*(5), e01733-e01733.

Azzahra, DS, Pratama, BC, Fakhruddin, I., & Mudjiyanti, R. (2021). Effect of Green Accounting Implementation, Characteristics of the Audit Committee, Nationality Diversity of Directors and Gender of Directors on Disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility in Banking. *Journal of Accounting and Taxes*, *22* (22), 1–13.

Correa-Garcia, JA, Garcia-Benau, MA, & Garcia-Meca, E. (2020). Corporategovernance and its implications for sustainability reporting quality in Latin American business groups. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *260*,121142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2020.121142

Dias, A., Rodrigues, LL, & Craig, R. (2017). Corporate governance effects on social responsibility disclosures. *Australasian Accounting, Business andFinance Journal*, *11* (2), 3–22. https://doi.org/10.14453/aabfj.v11i2.2

Elizabeth, D. (2021). The Effect Of Managerial Ownership OnThe Disclosure Of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Social and Technology (SOSTECH)*, *1* (11), 457–464.

Fallah, MA, & Mojarrad, F. (2019). Corporate governance effects on corporate social responsibility disclosure: empirical evidence from heavy-pollution industries in Iran. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *15* (2),208–225. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-04-2017-0072

Farida, DN (2020). the Influence of Gender Diversity, Nationality, and Education of the Board of Directors on Csr in Indonesia Sharia Banking. *Amwaluna: Journal of Islamic Economics and Finance*, *4* (2), 260–275.https://doi.org/10.29313/amwaluna.v4i2.5475

Fauzyyah, R., & Rachmawati, S. (2018). the Effect of Number of Meetings of theBoard of Commissioners, Independent Commissioners, Audit Committee and Ownership Structure Upon the Extent of Csr Disclosure. *The Accounting Journal of Binaniaga*, *3* (02), 41. https://doi.org/10.33062/ajb.v3i2.232

Garas, S., & ElMassah, S. (2018). Corporate governance and corporate social responsibility disclosures: The case of GCC countries. *Critical Perspectiveson International Business, 14* (1), 2–26. https://doi.org/10.1108/cpoib-10-2016-0042

Hadya, R., & Susanto, R. (2018). Model of the Relationship Between GenderDiversity, Education and Nationality of the Board of Commissioners Against Disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Benefita Journal*, *3* (2), 149. https://doi.org/10.22216/benefita.v3i2.3432

Hasan A. H., Abdulkareem, S. K., & Khazaal, H. J. (2023). Voluntary Non-Financial Disclosure and its Impact on Corporate Environmental Responsibility in the Iraq Stock Exchange. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, *8*(5), e01602-e01602.

Issa, A., Zaid, MAA, Hanaysha, JR, & Gull, AA (2021). An examination of board diversity and corporate social responsibility disclosure: evidence from the banking sector in the Arabian Gulf countries. *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, *30* (1), 22–46. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJAIM-07-2021-0137

Jensen, M.c., & Meckling, WH (1976). Theory of Firm: Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *3*, 305–360.

Knippenberg, D. Van, Dreu, CKW De, & Homan, AC (2004). *Workgroups Diversity and Group Performance: An Integrative Model and Research agenda*. *89* (6), 1008–1022. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.89.6.1008

Kristiawan, NB (2020). Ceo Characteristics, Ownership Concentration and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure. *Journal of Business and Accounting*, *22* (2), 147–166. https://doi.org/10.34208/jba.v22i2.701

Malik, E., Najamuddin, M. N., & Chalid, L. (2023). The Effect of Good Corporate Governance, Profitability, and Corporate Social Responsibility on Market Reaction and Company Value in the Registered Mining Industry on the Indonesian Stock Exchange. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*, *8*(5), e02174-e02174.

Masoud, N., & Vij, A. (2021). Factors influencing corporate social responsibilitydisclosure (CSRD) by Libyan state-owned enterprises (SOEs). *Cogent Business and Management*, *8* (1). https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1859850

Nurleni, N., Bandang, A., Darmawati, & Amiruddin. (2018). The effect ofmanagerial and institutional ownership on corporate social responsibility disclosure. *International Journal of Law and Management*, *60* (4), 979–987. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-03-2017-0078

Rahmasari, GAPW (2020). The Effect of Environmental Performance, Corporate Governance on Disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Warmadewa Management and Business Journal (WMBJ)*, *2* (2), 102–111.

Rao, K., & Tilt, C. (2015). Board Composition and Corporate SocialResponsibility: The Role of Diversity, Gender, Strategy and Decision Making. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *138* (2), 327–347.https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2613-5

Respati, RD, & Hadiprajitno, PB (2015). Analysis of The Influence ofProfitability, Leverage, Company Size, Industry Type, and Media Disclosure of Disclosure Corporate Social

Responsibility (Empirical Study of Manufacturing Companies Listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2014).*Journal of Accounting*, *4* (4), 1–11.

Rivandi, M. (2020). The Effect of Ownership Structure on Disclosure of CorporateSocial Responsibility in High Profile Companies on the IDX. *Accountability*, *13* (2), 205–220. https://doi.org/10.15408/akt.v13i2.17336

Salehi, M., Tarighi, H., & Rezanezhad, M. (2017). The relationship between the board of directors' structure and company ownership with corporate social responsibility disclosure: Iranian angle. *Humanomics*, *33* (4), 398–418.https://doi.org/10.1108/H-02-2017-0022

Sari, PA, & Handini, BT (2021). The Influence of Managerial Ownership,Institutional and Audit Committee on CSR Disclosure. *EL Muhasaba: Journal of Accounting*, *12* (2), 102–115.

Siregar, F. (2021). *Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in ManufacturingCompanies Registered on the IDX in 2018-2019*. *2* (1), 54–69. http://jurnal.untagsmg.ac.id/index.php/sa/article/view/2102

Sukars, A., & Sugiyanto, E. (2017). Effect of Good Structure Corporate Governance and EnvironmentalPerformance On Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure (Study of Manufacturing Companies on the Indonesia Stock Exchange Period 2011-2015). *Indonesian Accounting and Finance Research*, *2* (2), 121–131. https://doi.org/10.23917/reaksi.v2i2.4894

Utami, DP, Yuliandari, WS, & Muslih, M. (2017). Mechanism of Good Corporate Governance and Corporate Transparency on Disclosure of Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Contemporary AccountingResearch*, *9* (1), 19–30.

Wibisono, Y. (2007). *Dissecting the Concept & Application of CSR (CorporateSocial Responsibility)*. Gramedia PT.