JURNAL AKUNTANSI
Vol.19 No.1 April 2025 : 055-074.
Doi: https://doi.org/10.25170/jak.v19i1.5999

ISSN : 2580-9792 (Online)
ISSN : 1978-8029 (Print)

KOMITMEN LINGKUNGAN DAN SOSIAL: APAKAH BERMANFAAT BAGI NILAI PERUSAHAAN?

ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL COMMITMENTS: IS IT BENEFICIAL FOR FIRM VALUE?

Zakir Yusuf Gunibala[1*]
Satia Nur Maharani[2]
Sri Pujiningsih[3]

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis pengaruh pengungkapan ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) dan kinerja lingkungan terhadap nilai perusahaan dengan ukuran dewan direksi sebagai variabel moderasi. Penelitian ini menggunakan analisis regresi berganda dan uji moderasi terhadap data dari 30 perusahaan sektor industri dan energi yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia (BEI). Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa pengungkapan ESG dan kinerja lingkungan tidak berpengaruh signifikan terhadap nilai perusahaan. Selain itu, ukuran dewan direksi tidak memoderasi hubungan antara pengungkapan ESG maupun kinerja lingkungan terhadap nilai perusahaan. Penelitian ini memperluas pemahaman tentang dinamika pengungkapan ESG dan kinerja lingkungan dalam kaitannya dengan nilai perusahaan serta mengeksplorasi peran ukuran dewan direksi sebagai faktor moderasi. Temuan ini memberikan wawasan praktis bagi manajemen perusahaan, investor, dan pembuat kebijakan dalam upaya mendorong praktik bisnis yang lebih berkelanjutan.

Kata Kunci: Kinerja Lingkungan, Nilai Perusahaan, Pengungkapan ESG, Teori Legitimasi, Teori Pemangku Kepentingan, Ukuran Dewan Komisaris.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the effect of ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) disclosure and environmental performance on firm value with board size as a moderating variable. This study uses multiple regression analysis and moderation test on data from 30 industrial and energy sector companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX). The results showed that ESG disclosure and environmental performance had no significant effect on firm value. In addition, board size does not moderate the relationship between ESG disclosure and environmental performance on firm value. This study expands the understanding of the dynamics of ESG disclosure and environmental performance in relation to firm value and explores the role of board size as a moderating factor. The findings provide practical insights for corporate management, investors and policy makers in an effort to encourage more sustainable business practices.

---

[1] Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia, *Email*: zakir.yusuf.2304218@students.um.ac.id
[2] Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
[3] Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Negeri Malang, Indonesia
*Penulis Korespondensi: Zakir Yusuf Gunibala
Sitasi: Gunibala, Z.Y., Maharani , S.N., Pujiningsih, S.. (2025). Environmental And Social Commitments: Is It Beneficial For Firm Value?. *Jurnal Akuntansi, 19* (1), halaman 55-74.
Artikel masuk: 27 September 2024; Artikel diterima: 29 April 2025

***Keywords**: Board Size , Environmental Social and Governance Disclosure, Environmental Performance, Firm Value, Legitimacy Theory, Stakeholder Theory.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Environmental issues are now crucial, given concerns about climate conditions relevant to corporate activities. The perspective of stakeholder theorys related to how companies identify stakeholders to provide the same level of importance to all stakeholders (Ching & Gerab, 2017). Moreover, when viewed from the legitimacy theory perspective, this intersects with how companies operate always to be accepted by society's norms and culture. Georg and Justesen (2017) state that the environmental accounting forms focusing on decreasing energy use must be equitable with other considerations such as working humidity, aesthetics, and expenditure.

Indicators of company success are no longer assessed only from an economic perspective; they also consider the corporate authority to be related to environmental and social aspects (Al-Dhaimesh, 2020; Halkos & Nomikos, 2021). Although many companies are aware of environmental protection issues, their commitment to addressing them is minimal(Jahamani, 2003). Research by Setthasakko (2010) reveals that this is due to shortcomings in conducting organizational learning development, a narrow focus on economic performance, and the absence of guidance on environmental management accounting. For example, 80% of the selected mining companies in Colombia have integrated environmental accounting into their management practices (Gonzalez & Mendoza, 2020). Therefore, examining it in different contexts, such as in developing country studies (Gonzalez & Peña-Vinces, 2023) is necessary. Green accounting plays a role in shifting the focus from economic well-being to overall societal well-being and impacts the achievement of sustainability (Chen et al., 2014; Stanojević et al., 2010).

Corporate value describes the condition of the prosperity of owners and shareholders reflected through the company's stock price (Iswajuni et al., 2018). Several studies discussing the value of the firm are measured using the Tobin's Q, Earning per Share (EPS), and Price to Book Value (PBV) proxies (Al-Najjar & Al-

Najjar, 2017; Asante-Darko et al., 2018). Firm value is inseparable from systematic risk stemming from market-related factors and unsystematic risk originating from entity-specific factors (Asante-Darko et al., 2018). Factors specific to the entity, such as its cash reserves, corporate governance, and ownership structure, can affect firm value (Harford et al., 2008).

Previous research tends to discuss the influence of green accounting on financial performance. The literature search that has been conducted found that there is still very little research on its effect on corporate value. Research that discusses green accounting on firm value, for example, research by (Sukmadilaga et al., 2023) suggests that green accounting, especially regarding emissions, has a notably positive effect on creating economic value added (EVA), which reflects firm value. In addition, previous research did not incorporate the presence of the board of directors as a factor affecting how companies implement green accounting (Gonzalez & Peña-Vinces, 2023). The board of directors can intervene and emphasize its implementation. Previous research that examines firm value mostly discusses from the point of view of corporate governance, capital structure, enterprise risk management (ERM), earnings smoothing, managerial ownership, foreign institutional investors, and unrealized diversification (Abogun et al., 2021; Li et al., 2021; Wayan Widnyana et al., 2021). Thus, our study fills some of those gaps, focusing on evaluating corporate value through ESG disclosure and environmental performance.

This study originates from the need to bridge the research gap concerning the limited examination of the impact of ESG disclosure and environmental performance on firm value, particularly by incorporating the moderating role of the board of directors. While prior studies have primarily concentrated on financial performance outcomes or traditional corporate governance factors, this research uniquely focuses on how environmental and social responsibility initiatives contribute to corporate value creation. By introducing board intervention as a moderating variable, this study offers a novel perspective on the mechanisms through which green accounting practices influence firm valuation, especially in the context of developing countries. Thus, the originality of this research lies in its integrated approach to non-financial performance factors and corporate governance dynamics in enhancing firm value.

The primary aim of this study is to investigate the mediating role of the board of directors in ESG disclosure and environmental performance and its effect on the firm's value. This study expands the evidence of testing firm value influenced by non-financial variables, namely environmental performance and ESG disclosure mediated by board intervention. Given the limited research on the influence of green accounting, including environmental performance and ESG disclosure on firm value and the use of mediating variables to strengthen the effect. Therefore, it is important to note that the presence of the board of directors in intervening in company policy is instrumental in enhancing the application of green accounting, which will impact the improvement of the company's value.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS

Stakeholder Theory and Legitimacy Theory

Stakeholder theory centers on securing approval for corporate decisions from groups whose essential backing is necessary to enable the organization to accomplish its objectives (Tricker, 1983). Legitimacy theory is based on the idea that companies must adhere to social norms that society deems socially acceptable to continue operating (O'Donovan, 2002; Suchman, 1995). Investors now prioritize socially and environmentally responsible companies (Halkos & Nomikos, 2021). From this viewpoint, social and environmental disclosure serves as a tool for legitimacy management, enabling companies to shape stakeholders' perceptions regarding their operations' social and environmental effect (Cho, 2009; Gray et al., 1995).

ESG Disclosure, Environmental Performance, and Firm Value

Essentially, the company's primary objective is to enhance its value by achieving the financial well-being and overall interests of the owners and shareholders, as evidenced by its stock price. The concept of value is jointly shaped and created through the contributions and interactions of all stakeholders with the organization (Tregua et al., 2015). Legitimacy theory presents concepts related to environmental prestige and the impact of socially obligated actions on economic enforcement

(Bansal & Clelland, 2004). Cahan et al. (2016) state that strong ESG enforcement will generate positive publicity, and companies with good ESG performance will get higher scores. Empirical research on the impact of the influence of ESG on economic enforcement and the company's value has not provided a definitive outcome (Fatemi et al., 2018). Studies related to green accounting and firm value were also conducted by Chouaibi et al. (2022), which shows that the strength of ESG can increase corporate value and its weaknesses reduce corporate value. Thus, the hypothesis proposed in the study is:

H1: Environmental performance affects corporate value.

H2: ESG disclosure affects corporate value.

The Role of the Board of Directors

The board of directors holds a critical responsibility in shaping and influencing key decisions and strategies in the direction of policies oriented towards the corporation's welfare. The board of directors is responsible for reviewing management performance to ensure that the company operates appropriately and protects the interests of shareholders (Subhan, 2011). Pfeffer (1972) states that major organization substantially influence society and consequently necessitate larger boards to engage with diverse stakeholders effectively. Other literature also shows that the board of directors influences diversity on corporate value (Fernández-Temprano & Tejerina-Gaite, 2020). A previous study exploring the influence between ESG disclosure and corporate value ignores the board of directors' performance as a factor that directs companies to implement green accounting (Gonzalez & Peña-Vinces, 2023). Several studies reveal that the board of directors is influential in intervening in corporate policy (Hakimi et al., 2018; Paolone et al., 2024). The hypotheses proposed in the study are as follows.

H3: Board size impacts moderating the connection between environmental performance and ESG disclosure on firm value.

3. RESEARCH METHOD

Quantitative research aims to test a predetermined hypothesis by looking at a specific population or group, collecting data using research instruments, and conducting statistical analysis. This research seeks to ascertain the effect of independent variables with moderating factors on the outcome of the dependent variable, so the type of relationship it examines is a causal relationship. Correlational research is described as a study aimed at determining the nature and the degree of correlation between two or more variables without seeking to manipulate them (Faenkel & Wallen, 2008) in Paramita et al. (2021). The other source mentions it as survey-explanatory quantitative research, a type of quantitative research whose data is taken directly from everyday life and does not require additional processing (Sugeng, 2020).

The population for this study comprises all companies operating in the industrial sector publicly traded on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX), representing the full spectrum of firms within this category in 2022, with a total of 127 companies. According to data, the industrial sector accounts for most of B3 waste; therefore, the manufacturing sector is considered. In 2021, B3 waste was generated by 2,897 industrial sector companies, based on information released by the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK). The sampling method used is purposive sampling, based on the following criteria: companies that publish Sustainability Reports and companies that obtain PROPER ratings in the observation year. A carefully selected sample of 30 companies that meet the established criteria for inclusion in the study the predetermined criteria was obtained. The following criteria were applied when selecting samples for data analysis.

Tabel 1
Research Sample Criteria

No.	Description	Amount
1.	Number of Industrial and Energy Sector Companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2022	127
2.	Companies that do not publish Annual Report and Sustainability Report	55
3.	Companies that are not registered PROPER Ministry of Environment for the period 2022	42
	Sampel	**30**

Variable Measurement

Firm value reflects investors' assessment of a company's success, which is closely linked to its stock price (Sujoko & Soebiantoro, 2007). Investors widely use price-to-book value (PBV) to measure a company's valuation. According to Darmadji and Fakhrudin (2012), price to book value reverses the market's appreciation of the book value of a stock. An increasing ratio will increase market confidence in the company's presumption (Rahman et al., 2022).

According to Ulupui et al. (2020) environmental management aims to motivate businesses to protect the surrounding environment, resulting in environmental performance. Environmental performance is assessed using a measurement system grounded in the company's PROPER rating, which comprehensively evaluates its environmental practices and compliance. The environmental performance measurement uses an ordinal scale using the PROPER rating category: gold is worth 5, green is worth 4, blue is worth 3, red is worth 2, and black is worth 1. ESG is defined as the intentional and methodical integration of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors into the investment analysis and decision-making processes and the enhancement of corporate value (Chouaibi et al., 2022; Safriani & Utomo, 2020). ESG disclosure is measured using a score covering three elements contained therein, which encompass various elements such as environmental disclosure, social disclosure, and governance disclosure in one numerical measure ranging from 0 to 100. The data scale used is ratio. According to (Ianniello et al., 2013), board size is an indicator to contribute more to the realization of good corporate governance. Board size is quantified by counting the number of members on the board within a company (Sukandar & Rahardja, 2014).

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Based on the results of descriptive statistics in Table 2, this study uses 30 observations for each variable. The ESG Disclosure variable shows an average of 0.4466 with a minimum value of 0.05 and a maximum of 1.00. This indicates that the level of ESG disclosure of companies in the sample is quite diverse, ranging from very low to fully disclosing ESG, with a moderate level of data distribution as reflected by the standard deviation of 0.28539. The environmental performance variable averages 3.5667 on a scale of 3 to 5, with a minimum value of 3 and a maximum of 5. This indicates that most companies show environmental performance that is classified as fairly good to very good, with a moderate data spread (standard deviation of 0.67891).

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Obs	Min.	Max.	Mean	Std. Deviation
ESG Disclosure	30	.05	1.00	.4466	.28539
Env. Performance	30	3.00	5.00	3.5667	.67891
Board Size	30	2.00	16.0	6.6333	3.20004
Firm Value	30	.12	19.0	2.5011	3.65361

The board size variable's average number of board members is 6.6333, with the smallest members being two and the largest being sixteen. The standard deviation of 3.20004 indicates a fairly high variation in board size among the observed companies. Meanwhile, firm value shows an average value of 2.5011, with a range of values between 0.12 and 19.00. The high standard deviation of this variable, 3.65361, indicates a large difference in firm value between samples. Overall, these results show the diversity of firm characteristics in terms of ESG disclosure, environmental performance, board size, and firm value. This is an important foundation for analyzing the relationships between variables in this study.

Table 3

Regression Analysis

Variabel	Sig.	R Square	Hypothesis
ESG Disclosure	.400	.384	Rejected
Env. Performance	.573		Rejected

Variabel Dependen: Firm Value

The Effect of ESG Disclosure on Firm Value

Hypothesis H1 states that ESG disclosure affects corporate value. It is observed that the implication value of the ESG Disclosure is 0.400. Since this value exceeds the significance level used (0.05), the data analysis results show rejection of the null hypothesis (H0). The conclusion is that the ESG Disclosure variable cannot affect the corporate value. This is estimated to reveal that the market or investors do not respond significantly to ESG disclosure or the disclosure has not been transformed into a rise in company value in the study period. Legitimacy Theory and

Stakeholder Theory are two prominent frameworks among the theories that support the implementation of corporate social responsibility (Deegan, 2019). Legitimacy Theory states that companies must adhere to social norms and operate within the limits of what society deems socially acceptable behavior in order to maintain operations (Nikolaeva & Bicho, 2011; O'Donovan, 2000; Suchman, 1995). The stakeholder reasoning is distressed with future people by seeing sustainability, economic growth,nd community welfare, thereby enhancing the firm image (Deb et al., 2020; Schaltegger et al., 2019).

Studies related to ESG disclosure will add value to the corporation, reducing business risk (Buallay, 2019). In general, the corporation's main goal is to increase company quality by enhancing the well-being of its owners and shareholders, which is reflected in the stock price. The firm value represents the amount a prospective buyer or investor is willing to offer in exchange for ownership, reflecting the company's perceived worth(Kamaliah, 2020; Prasetyorini, 2013). Linking the above findings with the Legitimacy Theory perspective, companies strive to demonstrate compliance and social responsibility through ESG disclosures. However, neither the market nor investors respond to such disclosures as a sufficiently important factor in assessing firm value. This could be due to a range of factors, including the absence of consistent standards or metrics to measure ESG impacts, or it may also be because the disclosed ESG information is considered less relevant or credible by investors.

Research on the impact of ESG disclosures presents mixed findings. While some studies report positive results, others show negative or insignificant effects. Mandatory ESG disclosure has been found to increase stock liquidity, mainly when implemented by government agencies with strong enforcement (Krueger et al., 2024). Chouaibi et al. (2022) demonstrated that strengths in ESG can enhance firm value, while weaknesses in ESG can diminish it. Additionally, ESG disclosure can mitigate underinvestment and improve access to debt markets, especially for firms with lower levels of disclosure (Allman et al., 2021). However, in emerging markets with lower information asymmetry, ESG disclosure may negatively impact firm performance, as it may be perceived as unnecessary(Farooq, 2015). Similarly, Wangi & Aziz (2024) discovered that ESG disclosure and liquidity do not impact the firm value of publicly traded companies on the IDX ESG Leaders index. Dini (2024) observed that individual ESG aspects do not significantly affect financial performance in the energy sector, with governance disclosures negatively affecting market valuation. This finding suggests that ESG activities can be used to build a reputation without improving financial performance. However, (Roestanto et al., 2022) indicated that factors such as firm size, age, and industry type affect the frequency of ESG disclosures, which suggests that specific firm characteristics may play a role in ESG reporting practices.

However, more recent research suggests that ESG disclosure positively influences financial performance, particularly for well-established companies with ESG-focused investors, which attract significant media coverage and incur high agency costs (Chen & Xie, 2022). These conflicting results highlight the complexity of the impact of ESG disclosure and the potential influence of contextual factors.

The Effect of Environmental Performance on Firm Value

Hypothesis (H2) proposes that environmental performance affects firm value. Based on the test results, it is known that the significance value of the Environmental Performance variable is 0.573. Since this figure is greater than the significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis (H0) cannot be rejected, and the alternative hypothesis (H2) is not supported. Thus, it can be concluded that the Environmental Performance variable does not significantly influence the Company Value variable.

Stakeholder Theory argues that the success of an organization depends on its ability to meet the needs and expectations of various stakeholder groups, such as employees, customers, the general public, and investors. This theory focuses on the company's efforts to gain legitimacy from these groups to achieve organizational goals (Tricker, 1983). The main difference between Legitimacy Theory and Stakeholder Theory lies in their focus; Legitimacy Theory offers a broader perspective in explaining environmental disclosure, while Stakeholder Theory focuses more on the relationship between the company and various stakeholder groups (Patten, 1992; Roberts, 1992).

Although the results of this study do not support the hypothesis that environmental performance affects firm value, conceptually, Stakeholder Theory still states that companies with good environmental performance tend to get more value in the eyes of stakeholders. Stakeholders, especially investors, usually assess companies with a commitment to good environmental performance as entities that are more sustainable and have lower risks, so they are more encouraged to support or invest in these companies. This support can ultimately increase the value of the company.

Previous research on the impact of environmental performance on financial performance shows mixed results, although most lead to positive results. Improved environmental performance is often associated with improved economic performance through reduced costs, increased revenue, and improved profitability (Earnhart, 2018; Haninun et al., 2018). In the context of research in Indonesia, Sukmadilaga et al. (2023) found that in the application of green accounting, energy consumption has no effect on firm value, water consumption has a negative effect, and the emission aspect has a positive impact on firm value. Environmental performance itself is part of the application of green accounting (Ulupui et al., 2020). In addition, Indriastuti and Mutamimah (2023) showed that the sustainable performance of MSMEs can be improved through environmentally friendly accounting practices and good financial performance.

The difference in the results of this study and most previous studies that show a positive effect of environmental performance on firm value can be caused by several factors. First, this study's industrial context and sample characteristics may differ. In some industrial sectors, especially in Indonesia, stakeholders' awareness and attention to environmental issues are still relatively low compared to developed countries, so environmental performance has not become a significant factor in assessing firm value.

Second, disclosure of company environmental performance information may still be a formality or fulfill regulatory obligations without reflecting a strong commitment to sustainable environmental practices. As a result, stakeholders do not see any significant added value from environmental performance to firm value. Third, the effect of environmental performance on firm value can be indirect through other variables such as corporate reputation, customer loyalty, or operational efficiency. Suppose these intermediary variables are not observed in the research model. The direct relationship between environmental performance and firm value may become insignificant in that case.

Fourth, the observation period in this study is too short to capture the impact of environmental performance on firm value. Efforts to improve environmental performance generally have a long-term impact, so the effect on firm value may not be significantly visible within the observed period. By considering these factors, the results of this study add insight that the relationship between environmental performance and firm value is contextual and does not always show a uniform relationship pattern. This provides an opportunity for future research to explore further factors that may strengthen or weaken the relationship, including the role of mediating or moderating variables, such as corporate reputation or the level of stakeholder environmental awareness.

Moderating Effect of Board Size

Tabel 4
Regression Analysis (Moderation)

Variable	Sig.	Hypothesis
ESG Disclosure*Board Size	.513	Rejected
Env. Performance*Board Size	.177	Rejected

Variabel Dependen: Firm Value

The board of directors has an important role in directing policies within the company. The effectiveness of the board of directors and the quality of governance are the main factors that shape the environmental performance of the company as well as the overall disclosure of non-financial information (Liu et al., 2023).

The analysis shows that the significance value of the interaction variable between board size and ESG Disclosure on firm value is 0.513. The significance value of the interaction variable between board size and Environmental Performance on firm value is 0.177. Since both significance values are greater than 0.05, there is insufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis (H_0). Thus, it can be concluded that board size neither strengthens nor weakens the relationship between ESG Disclosure and Environmental Performance on firm value.

The size of the board of directors may represent the company's capacity to process and oversee ESG activities effectively. However, based on the results of this study, board size does not moderate the relationship between ESG disclosure and firm value. This means that the size of the board of directors does not influence the legitimacy obtained by the company through ESG disclosure.

Stakeholder theory can also be used to understand the role of the board of directors in managing relationships with various stakeholder groups. Although some previous studies indicate that board size can affect the relationship between environmental achievement and firm value, the results of this study show otherwise. Some earlier studies, such as Ali (2018), found a board size effect on the company's financial performance. Sari and Ardiana (2014) stated that board size has a positive but insignificant effect on firm value. This study's findings align with the results of research by Jurnali et al. (2024), which also shows that board size has no effect on firm value. Thus, based on this study, it can be concluded that board size is not a factor that strengthens or weakens the relationship between ESG Disclosure and Environmental Performance on firm value.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

This study contributes to understanding how the market and investors receive ESG disclosures. Although the findings of this study show that ESG disclosure does not affect firm value, this result may encourage further research to examine other factors that influence the effectiveness of ESG disclosure implementation and communication. In addition, the results of this study show that environmental performance has no significant effect on firm value, which does not support the stakeholder theory in this context. Thus, the focus on environmental performance has not been proven to increase firm value in this research sample directly.

From a practical perspective, the findings of this study can be a recommendation for company management to continue to understand the importance of environmental performance in building corporate reputation and maintaining attractiveness for investors, even though the direct effect on firm value has not been significant. Management is advised to continue to improve sustainability and ESG reporting efforts to meet stakeholder expectations and maintain a competitive advantage in the future. For investors, these results provide insight into the fact that ESG disclosure and environmental performance need to be further analyzed along with other factors before making investment decisions. This research can also serve as a reference for policymakers to continue encouraging companies to improve the quality of ESG disclosures and environmental performance to promote long-term sustainability.

Like any other research, this study has several limitations. First, the sample size used in this study is relatively small, namely 30 industrial and energy sector companies, so it does not fully represent the entire population of companies and cannot be widely generalized. Future research needs to use a larger sample size and involve companies from various sectors and countries to produce more representative and generalizable results.

Second, this study only covers a certain period, so it cannot capture long-term changes or trends related to the impact of ESG disclosure and environmental performance on firm value. Further research is recommended to use time series data to observe long-term dynamics. Third, this study only considers the variables of ESG Disclosure, Environmental Performance, and Board Size. Whereas many other factors potentially affect firm value, such as financial performance, innovation, and macroeconomic conditions, which have not been included in this research model. Future research can adopt different methods, such as qualitative analysis or case studies, to dig deeper into the mechanisms behind ESG disclosure and environmental performance and their influence on firm value. The research focus can also be directed to sectors more closely related to environmental issues, such as energy, manufacturing, and agriculture.

REFERENCES

Abogun, S., Adigbole, E. A., & Olorede, T. E. (2021). Income smoothing and firm value in a regulated market: the moderating effect of market risk. *Asian Journal of Accounting Research*, *6*(3), 296–308. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJAR-08-2020-0072

Al-Dhaimesh, O. H. (2020). Green accounting practices and economic value added: An applied study on companies listed on the Qatar stock exchange. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, *10*(6), 164–168. https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeep.10199

Ali, M. (2018). Determinants and consequences of board size: Conditional indirect effects. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, *18*(1), 165–184. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-01-2016-0011

Allman, E., Won, J., Dreyer, C., Kalmenovitz, J., Mehrotra, V., Pil-Seng, L., Rzeznik, A., Xu, K., Yildrim, A., Lock, B., Hazarika, S., Peng, L., & Wang, J. (2021). *The Effect of ESG Disclosure on Corporate Investment Efficiency* *. https://ssrn.com/abstract=3816592

Al-Najjar, B., & Al-Najjar, D. (2017). The impact of external financing on firm value and a corporate governance index: SME evidence. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, *24*(2), 411–423. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSBED-11-2016-0172

Asante-Darko, D., Adu Bonsu, B., Famiyeh, S., Kwarteng, A., & Goka, Y. (2018). Governance structures, cash holdings and firm value on the Ghana Stock Exchange. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, *18*(4), 671–685. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-07-2017-0148

Bansal, P., & Clelland, I. (2004). Talking trash: Legitimacy, impression management, and unsystematic risk in the context of the natural environment. *Academy of Management Journal*, *47*(1).

Buallay, A. (2019). Is sustainability reporting (ESG) associated with performance? Evidence from the European banking sector. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal*, *30*(1), 98–115. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEQ-12-2017-0149

Cahan, S. F., De Villiers, C., Jeter, D. C., Naiker, V., & Van Staden, C. J. (2016). Are CSR disclosures value relevant? Cross-country evidence. *European Accounting Review*, *25*(3), 579–611. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180.2015.1064009

Chen, B., Dai, J., & Sciubba, E. (2014). Ecological accounting for China based on extended exergy. In *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 37, 334–347). Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2014.05.022

Chen, Z., & Xie, G. (2022). ESG disclosure and financial performance: Moderating role of ESG investors. *International Review of Financial Analysis*, *83*, 102291. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2022.102291

Ching, H. Y., & Gerab, F. (2017). Sustainability reports in Brazil through the lens of signaling, legitimacy and stakeholder theories. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *13*(1), 95–110. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-10-2015-0147

Cho, C. H. (2009). Legitimation strategies used in response to environmental disaster: A french case study of total SA's Erika and AZF incidents. *European Accounting Review*, *18*(1), 33–62. https://doi.org/10.1080/09638180802579616

Chouaibi, S., Chouaibi, J., & Rossi, M. (2022). ESG and corporate financial performance: the mediating role of green innovation: UK common law versus Germany civil law. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, *17*(1), 46–71. https://doi.org/10.1108/EMJB-09-2020-0101

Deb, B. C., Saha, S., & Rahman, Md. M. (2020). Does green accounting practice affect bank performance? A study on listed Banks of Dhaka Stock Exchange in Bangladesh. *PalArch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, *17*(9), 7225–7247.

Deegan, C. M. (2019). Legitimacy theory: Despite its enduring popularity and contribution, time is right for a necessary makeover. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, *32*(8), 2307–2329. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-08-2018-3638

Dini, F. I. J. (2024). Aspek manakah yang memberikan imun lebih baik bagi kinerja keuangan & penilaian pasar perusahaan? *Jurnal Ekonomi, Koperasi & Kewirausahaan*, *14*(8), 1329–1257. https://journal.ikopin.ac.id

Earnhart, D. (2018). *The effect of corporate environmental performance on corporate financial performance*. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-resource

Farooq, O. (2015). Financial centers and the relationship between ESG disclosure and firm performance: Evidence from an emerging market. *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, *31*(4), 1239–1244.

Fatemi, A., Glaum, M., & Kaiser, S. (2018). ESG performance and firm value: The moderating role of disclosure. *Global Finance Journal*, *38*, 45–64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gfj.2017.03.001

Fernández-Temprano, M. A., & Tejerina-Gaite, F. (2020). Types of director, board diversity and firm performance. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, *20*(2), 324–342. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-03-2019-0096

Georg, S., & Justesen, L. (2017). Counting to zero: accounting for a green building. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, *30*(5), 1065–1081. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-04-2013-1320

Gonzalez, C. C., & Mendoza, K. H. (2020). Green accounting in Colombia: a Case study of the mining sector. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, *23*(4), 6453–6465. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-020-00880-1

Gonzalez, C. C., & Peña-Vinces, J. (2023). A framework for a green accounting system-exploratory study in a developing country context, Colombia. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, *25*(9), 9517–9541. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-022-02445-w

Gray, R., Walters, D., Bebbington, J., & Thompson, I. (1995). The greening of enterprise: an Exploration of the (non) role of environmental accounting and environtmental accountans in organizational change. *Critical Perspective on Accounting*, *6*, 211–239.

Hakimi, A., Rachdi, H., Ben Selma Mokni, R., & Hssini, H. (2018). Do board characteristics affect bank performance? Evidence from the Bahrain Islamic banks. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, *9*(2), 251–272. https://doi.org/10.1108/JIABR-06-2015-0029

Halkos, G., & Nomikos, S. (2021). Corporate social responsibility: Trends in global reporting initiative standards. *Economic Analysis and Policy*, *69*, 106–117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2020.11.008

Haninun, Lindrianasari, & Denziana, A. (2018). The effect of environmental performance and disclosure on financial performance. *Int. J. Trade and Global Markets*, *11*(2), 138–148.

Harford, J., Mansi, S. A., & Maxwell, W. F. (2008). Corporate governance and firm cash holdings in the US. *Journal of Financial Economics*, *87*(3), 535–555. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2007.04.002

Ianniello, G., Mainardi, M., & Rossi, F. (2013). *Corporate governance and auditor choice*.

Indriastuti, M., & Mutamimah, M. (2023). Green accounting and sustainable performance of micro, small, and medium enterprises: The role of financial performance as mediation. *The Indonesian Journal of Accounting Research*, *26*(02). https://doi.org/10.33312/ijar.691

Iswajuni, I., Manasikana, A., & Soetedjo, S. (2018). The effect of enterprise risk management (ERM) on firm value in manufacturing companies listed on Indonesian Stock Exchange year 2010-2013. *Asian Journal of Accounting Research*, *3*(2), 224–235. https://doi.org/10.1108/AJAR-06-2018-0006

Jahamani, Y. F. (2003). *Green accounting in developing countries: The Case of U.A.E. and Jordan*.

Jouber, H. (2021). Is the effect of board diversity on CSR diverse? New insights from one-tier vs two-tier corporate board models. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, *21*(1), 23–61. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-07-2020-0277

Jurnali, T., Haniyyah, N., & Tabrani, P. (2024). *The Effect of Board Size and Gender Diversity on Company Performance Moderated by Political Connections and Family Ownership*. *4*(1).

Kamaliah. (2020). Disclosure of corporate social responsibility (CSR) and its implications on company value as a result of the impact of corporate governance and profitability. *International Journal of Law and Management*, *62*(4), 339–354. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJLMA-08-2017-0197

Karim, S., & Ilyas, M. (2021). Foreign institutional investors and the contribution of cash and dividend to firm's value. *Managerial Finance*, *47*(3), 310–325. https://doi.org/10.1108/MF-11-2019-0568

Krueger, P., Sautner, Z., Yongjun Tang, D., & Zhong, R. (2024). The effects of mandatory ESG disclosure around the world. *ECGI Working Paper Series in Finance*. http://ssrn.com/abstract_id=3832745www.ecgi.global/content/working-papers

Liu, C., Su, K., & Zhang, M. (2023). Do boards practice what they preach on nonfinancial disclosure? Evidence from China on corporate water information disclosures. *China Accounting and Finance Review*, *25*(2), 249–289. https://doi.org/10.1108/cafr-07-2022-0080

Li, Z., Wei, J., Marinova, D. V., & Tian, J. (2021). Benefits or costs? The effects of diversification with cross-industry knowledge on corporate value under crisis situation. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *25*(1), 175–226. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-11-2019-0659

Mishra, R. K., & Kapil, S. (2018). Effect of board characteristics on firm value: evidence from India. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, *7*(1), 41–72. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAJBS-08-2016-0073

Nikolaeva, R., & Bicho, M. (2011). The role of institutional and reputational factors in the voluntary adoption of corporate social responsibility reporting standards. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, *39*(1), 136–157. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0214-5

O’Donovan, G. (2000). *Legitimacy theory as an explanation for corporate environmental disclosures*. Victoria University of Technology.

O’Donovan, G. (2002). Environmental disclosures in the annual report. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *15*(3), 344–371. https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570210435870

Paolone, F., Pozzoli, M., Chhabra, M., & Di Vaio, A. (2024). Cultural and gender diversity for ESG performance towards knowledge sharing: Empirical evidence from European banks. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, *28*(11), 106–131. https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-05-2023-0445

Paramita, R. W. D., Noviansyah, R., & Sulistyan, R. B. (2021). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif : Buku ajar perkuliahan metodologi penelitian bagi mahasiswa akuntansi & manajemen* (3rd ed.). Widya Gama Press.

Patten, D. M. (1992). Intra-industry environmental disclosures in response to The Alaskan Oil Spill: a Note on legitimacy theory. In *Accounting OrgantzatlonsandSoctety* (Vol. 17, Issue 5).

Pfeffer, J. (1972). Size and composition of corporate boards of directors: the organization and its environment. In *Source: Administrative Science Quarterly*, 17(2).

Prasetyorini, B. F. (2013). Pengaruh ukuran perusahaan, leverage price earning ratio dan profitabilitas terhadap nilai perusahaan. *Jurnal Imu Manajemen |*, *1*(183).

Rahman, F., Purwoko, G. D., & Rachmi, T. N. (2022). Analisis rasio keuangan dalam mengukur nilai perusahaan berdasarkan rasio likuiditas, rasio solvabilitas dan rasio profitabilitas pada PT Elang Mahkota Teknologi Tbk Periode 2012-2021. In *SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL OF REFLECTION: Economic, Accounting, Management and Business*, *5*(3).

Roberts, R. W. (1992). Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosure: an application of stakeholder theory. In *Accounting Organizations and Society*,17(6).

Roestanto, A., Vivianita, A., & Nurkomalasari, N. (2022). Pengaruh ukuran perusahaan, umur perusahaan, jenis industri, dan struktur kepemilikan terhadap environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure (Studi empiris perusahaan di Indonesia yang terdaftar di IDX 2017-2020). *Jurnal Akuntansi Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Muhammadiyah Palopo*, *8*(1), 1–18.

Sari, A. M. P., & Ardiana, P. A. (2014). Pengaruh board size terhadap nilai perusahaan. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana*, *7*(1), 177–191.

Schaltegger, S., Hörisch, J., & Freeman, R. E. (2019). Business cases for sustainability: a Stakeholder theory perspective. *Organization and Environment*, *32*(3), 191–212. https://doi.org/10.1177/1086026617722882

Setthasakko, W. (2010). Barriers to the development of environmental management accounting: An exploratory study of pulp and paper companies in Thailand. *EuroMed Journal of Business*, *5*(3), 315–331. https://doi.org/10.1108/14502191011080836

Stanojević, M., Vranes, S., & Gökalp, I. (2010). Green accounting for greener energy. In *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*,14(9), 2473. Elsevier Ltd. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2010.06.020

Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy: Strategic and institutional approaches. In *Source: The Academy of Management Review*,20(3).

Sugeng, B. (2020). *Fundamental metodologi penelitian kuantitatif (eksplanatif)* (1). Deepublish.

Sujoko, & Soebiantoro, U. (2007). Pengaruh struktur kepemilikan saham, leverage, faktor intern dan faktor ekstern terhadap nilai perusahaan (Studi empirik pada perusahaan manufaktur dan non manufaktur di Bursa Efek Jakarta). *Jurnal Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan*, *9*(1), 41–48.

Sukandar, P. P., & Rahardja. (2014). Pengaruh ukuran dewan direksi dan dewan komisaris serta ukuran perusahaan terhadap kinerja keuangan perusahaan. *Diponegoro Journal of Accounting*, *3*(3), 1–7.

Sukmadilaga, C., Winarningsih, S., Yudianto, I., Lestari, T. U., & Ghani, E. K. (2023). Does green accounting affect firm value? Evidence from ASEAN countries. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, *13*(2), 509–515. https://doi.org/10.32479/ijeep.14071

Tregua, M., Russo Spena, T., & Casbarra, C. (2015). Being social for social: A co-creation perspective. *Journal of Service Theory and Practice*, *25*, 198–219. https://doi.org/10.1108/JSTP-09-2013-0183

Ulupui, I. G. K. A., Murdayanti, Y., Marini, A. C., Purwohedi, U., Mardi, & Yanto, H. (2020). Green accounting, material flow cost accounting and environmental performance. *Accounting*, *6*(5), 743–752. https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ac.2020.6.009

Wangi, G. T., & Aziz, A. (2024). Analisis pengaruh ESG disclosure, likuiditas, dan profitabilitas terhadap nilai perusahaan pada perusahaan yang terdaftar di indeks ESG Leaders. *Jurnal IKRAITH-EKONOMIKA*, *7*(2), 221–230. https://doi.org/10.37817/ikraith-ekonomika.v7i2

Wayan Widnyana, I., Gusti Bagus Wiksuana, I., Artini, L. G. S., & Sedana, I. B. P. (2021). Influence of financial architecture, intangible assets on financial performance and corporate value in the Indonesian capital market.

International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management, *70*(7), 1837–1864. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-06-2019-0307