

Article

The Ownership Structure, and the Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Disclosure, Firm Value and Firm Performance: The Audit Committee as Moderating Variable

Luk Luk Fuadah ^{1*}, Mukhtaruddin Mukhtaruddin ¹, Isni Andriana ¹ and Anton Arisman ²

¹ Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics, Universitas Sriwijaya, Indralaya 30662, Indonesia

² Department of Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Multi Data Palembang, Palembang 30113, Indonesia

* Correspondence: lukluk_fuadah@unsri.ac.id

Abstract: This study investigated the effect of ownership structure on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure, firm value, firm performance, and audit committees as moderating variables in the Indonesian context. The ownership structures in this study are foreign, public, state, and family ownership. This research is quantitative and uses secondary data. The sample consisted of 140 companies on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the 2018–2020 period. This study used legitimacy, stakeholder, and agency theory. The analytical method used was partial least squares structural equation modeling. The results show that foreign and public ownership positively and significantly affect environmental, social, and governance disclosure. However, state and family ownership did not affect environmental, social, and governance disclosure. In addition, environmental, social, and governance disclosure positively impacts firm value. However, environmental, social, and governance disclosure do not affect a company's performance. Audit committees moderate the influence of environmental, social, and governance disclosure and firm value. However, the audit committees do not moderate the effect of environmental, social, and governance disclosure and firm performance. The government should make stronger environmental, social, and government regulations that must be implemented by companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange even though they are now voluntary.

Keywords: ownership structure; environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure; firm value; firm performance; audit committee

Citation: Fuadah, Luk Luk, Mukhtaruddin Mukhtaruddin, Isni Andriana, and Arisman Anton. 2022. The Ownership Structure, and the Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Disclosure, Firm Value and Firm Performance: The Audit Committee as Moderating Variable. *Economics* 10: 314. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economics10120314>

Academic Editor:

Stefan Cristian Gherghina

Received: 19 September 2022

Accepted: 2 December 2022

Published: 9 December 2022

Publisher's Note: MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



Copyright: © 2022 by the authors. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

1. Introduction

Recently, corporate organizations have become more responsible for the environment and society. This is due to demands from stakeholders, customers, regulators, company shareholders, suppliers, employees, creditors, media, and social and environmental activist groups (Maama and Appiah 2019; Sajjad et al. 2019). Environmental, social, and governance (ESG) analysis has become an essential part of the investment process due to increasing attention to investing in companies' social impact and sustainability (Caporale et al. 2022). Lack of clarity on the disclosure of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices can create information gaps for responsible financiers and investors when making assessments (Rabaya and Saleh 2021). ESG disclosures reveal a company's overall initiatives to stakeholders, including regulators, communities, investors, and employees (Atif et al. 2022).

Environmental, social, and governance disclosure activity include three main components. The first is the environment, which includes aspects related to pollution, mitigation, and climate change sustainability. The second is social, which refers to how an organization treats its communities, employees, and clients and its responsibility for

products and services, diversity, the fight against corruption, and respect for human rights throughout the supply chain. The last component is governance, which is related to balancing the interests of stakeholders and shareholders and adhering to the best corporate governance practices (De Masi et al. 2021). The environmental dimension refers to a company's ability to use natural resources efficiently, thereby reducing environmental emissions. The social dimension promotes ethical values, employees' trust, and respect for human rights. Finally, the governance dimension benefits shareholders through the company's management system and effective processes (Dicuonzo et al. 2022).

Previous research explained environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure (Kumar and Firoz 2022; Li et al. 2018; Mohammad and Wasiuzzaman 2021; Rabaya and Saleh 2021; Wasiuzzaman et al. 2022), (Chen and Xie 2022), environmental, social and governance performance (Beloskar and Rao 2022; He et al. 2022; Sheehan et al. 2022; Daugaard and Ding 2022; Wang and Sun 2022), environmental, social and governance ratings (Zheng et al. 2022; Vilas et al. 2022; Liu and Lyu 2022; Boulhaga et al. 2022) environmental, social and governance reporting (Ahmad et al. 2021; Bamahros et al. 2022); environmental, social and governance practices (Dicuonzo et al. 2022; Fuente et al. 2022). This study examines the effect of ownership structure which includes foreign, public, state, and family ownership, on environmental, social, and governance disclosure, firm value, firm performance, and audit committees as moderating variables. The study used a sample of companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. In theory, this research extends legitimacy, stakeholder, and agency theories. Moreover, the current study provides insight into the role of audit committees in companies regarding environmental, social, and governance disclosure, firm value, and performance.

Our study offers several contributions. First, we contribute to the literature by seeking to understand ownership structure and environmental, social, and governance disclosure. As mentioned, the ownership structure consists of foreign, state, family, and public ownership. We expand on existing knowledge of environmental, social, and governance disclosure by exploring the contribution of ownership structures to the three components of environmental, social, and governance practices. Second, this study uses and extends legitimacy, stakeholder, and agency theory. Third, we contribute to the effects of environmental, social, and governance disclosure on firm value and performance with the audit committee as a moderating variable.

This paper is structured as follows. Section 2 illustrates the development of hypotheses. Then, Section 3 describes the research methodology, while Section 4 describes and discusses the results. Finally, conclusions are presented in Section 5.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Foreign Ownership and Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Disclosure

Foreign ownership is the amount of share ownership owned by foreign parties. Al Amosh and Khatib (2021) revealed that a company and its stakeholders gain trust and transparency with the presence of foreign shareholders in a company. Using legitimacy theory, Hanifa and Rashid (2005) described that foreign investors lead to a higher legitimacy gap. Management can disclose environmental, social, and governance elements as a proactive legitimacy strategy that can encourage capital flow from foreign parties and satisfy foreign investors. Legitimacy theory influences and regulates people's goals to obtain rewards and escape a punishing society's actions. Firm disclosure results from social values, and the legitimacy theory's environmental and social disclosure model considers stakeholder values when considering any decision (Tilling and Tilt 2010).

Foreign ownership positively affects environmental, social, and governance disclosure (Al Amosh and Khatib 2021). Foreign ownership positively was found to affect corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure in China from (Guo and Zheng 2021) and in Bangladesh (Khan et al. 2012). In addition, foreign ownership positively affects environmental sustainability reporting (Khlif et al. 2016; Masud et al. 2018; Bae et al. 2018;

Amidjaya and Widagdo 2020). Baba and Baba (2021) concluded that foreign ownership positively affects social and environmental reporting. Al Amosh and Khatib (2021) investigated 51 companies listed on Amman Stock Exchange (ASE) between 2012 and 2019 during 408 observations. Masud et al. (2018) studied 88 companies from 2006 to 2016 during 326 observations. Amidjaya and Widagdo (2020) studied 31 banks listed on the Indonesian Stock Exchange for 2012–2016 as a sample. Baba and Baba (2021) used 80 companies listed on the Nigerian Stock Exchange as a sample from 2012–2017.

Thus, foreign ownership can improve corporate governance and maximize stakeholder value by encouraging disclosure of corporate performance in sustainability. Foreign investors encourage corporate governance practices, and various disclosures, one related to environmental, social, and governance disclosure. This means that the more foreign ownership, the more significant impact on the environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure. Companies with foreign ownership are expected to disclose more social and environmental information to assist them in decision-making (Khan et al. 2012). Furthermore, Guo and Zheng (2021) revealed that companies could increase environmental, social, and governance disclosures under pressure from foreign owners. This can enhance the company's reputation and support its legitimacy. Thus, foreign ownership can improve corporate governance and maximize stakeholder value by disclosing non-financial information including, environmental, social, and governance disclosures. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 1 (H1). *Foreign ownership positively affects environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure.*

2.2. Public Ownership and Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Disclosure

Public ownership is the amount of purchased share ownership of a company by an individual or community investor. Legitimacy theory reveals that managers attempt to meet society's expectations through communication to conform to societal norms and secure the legitimacy of business behavior (Suchman 1995).

Khan et al. (2012) revealed that companies with public ownership are more likely to aspire to and achieve community aspirations and legitimacy, which increases their social responsibility and disclosure. Furthermore, Khelif et al. (2016) emphasized that a company's board strengthens social and environmental responsibility for the company. In addition, public ownership will pressure corporate accountability, where shareholders want a more comprehensive disclosure of information (Khan et al. 2012).

Public ownership positively and significantly affects corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure (Khan et al. 2012). Khan et al. (2012) investigated 135 manufacturing companies on the Dhaka Stock Exchange in Bangladesh as a sample from 2005 to 2009. When a company discloses publicly, the issue of public accountability becomes vital. Therefore, publicly owned companies are expected to experience more pressure to disclose additional information because of the visibility and accountability issues that result from a large number of stakeholders (Khan et al. 2012). Therefore, the company has more significant pressure to disclose additional information to numerous stakeholders or companies with public ownership. This is also related to the company's accountability, including environmental, social, and corporate governance disclosure. This means that the more public ownership there is, the more environmental, social, and governance (ESG) is disclosed in the company. Thus, the proposed hypothesis is as follows:

Hypothesis 2 (H2). *Public ownership positively impacts environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure.*

2.3. State Ownership and Environmental, Social, and Governance Disclosure

State ownership is defined as the percentage of state ownership of shares in a company. The government invests in companies to achieve goals and promote development.

State ownership positively affects sustainability reporting (Rudyanto 2017; Kumar et al. 2022). Naser et al. (2006) used legitimacy and stakeholder theory, which suggests that the government can pressure companies to disclose more social and environmental information and financial information to increase social perceptions of companies. State ownership increases corporate accountability and transparency, which can increase legitimacy (Monk 2009). Stakeholder theory reveals companies' motivation for transparent environmental, social, and governance disclosure. Companies must manage the relationship with stakeholders that influence business decisions. Companies and stakeholders are interdependent (Manita et al. 2018).

State ownership positively affects environmental, social, and governance disclosure (Khlif et al. 2016; Al Amosh and Khatib 2021). State ownership positively and significantly influences voluntary disclosure (Albawwat and Ali basah 2015). Albawwat and Ali basah (2015) used 72 non-financial companies listed on Amman Stock Exchange in Jordan from 2009 to 2013. State ownership plays a decisive role in companies' sustainability disclosure because companies to which the state contributes respond to government strategies that promote sustainable development, as government pressure appears to be in line with stakeholder interests (Rudyanto 2017). Furthermore, state ownership increases accountability and transparency systems in companies, thereby increasing their legitimacy (Al Amosh and Khatib 2021). The state ownership of companies can emphasize the disclosure of social and environmental responsibilities. Thus, it is also related to ESG, as it positively affects disclosure, increasing disclosure as state ownership increases. Hence, this study hypothesizes the following:

Hypothesis 3 (H3). *State ownership positively impacts environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure.*

2.4. Family Ownership and Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Disclosure

Freeman (1984) revealed that stakeholder theory forces organizational managers to respond more to the external environment and its needs. Stakeholders perceive social responsibility as positively impacting a company's future performance and conclude that higher social responsibility reduces the company's sensitivity to adverse shocks that may negatively impact the company (Bouslah et al. 2013).

Family companies manage strong relationships with external and internal stakeholders through the good disclosure of non-financial information (Salvato and Melin 2008). Chauhan and Kumar (2018) concluded that voluntary disclosure of non-financial information, in this case, environmental, social, and governance disclosure, is superior and is expected to influence the perceptions of stakeholders and investors positively.

Stakeholder theory can be described with ethical and management aspects, especially economics (Deegan 2013). From a management point of view, the company should be responsible for the stakeholders who can influence the economic impact on the organization (O'Dwyer 2003). From the ethical dimension, all stakeholders have the right to know the social and environmental consequences of a company's operations (Deegan 2013).

Family ownership positively and significantly affects sustainability reporting (Amidjaya and Widagdo 2020). This is because companies owned by families tend to protect their families' image and reputation. A good reputation in the minds of stakeholders is essential to protect family assets (Amidjaya and Widagdo 2020). Thus, family ownership can improve the disclosure of environmental, social, and governance issues. This means that the greater the family ownership, the greater the environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure. Therefore, the following hypothesis is proposed:

Hypothesis 4 (H4). *Family ownership positively affects environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure.*

2.5. Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Disclosure and Firm Value

Stakeholder theory reveals that board accountability is not only to shareholders but also to other interested parties. Proponents of stakeholder theory argue that this theory colors the corporate portrait by providing social and economic values and ethical and moral considerations for estimating firm value (Freeman 1983). Environmental, social, and governance disclosures can serve as tools to minimize potential conflicts with stakeholders and to increase stakeholders' perceptions of the appropriateness of their company's actions (Freeman 1984). Thus, the environmental, social, and governance disclosure that affects the value of this company can be explained through stakeholder theory.

Environmental, social, and governance disclosure positively influence firm value (Ferrell et al. 2016; Yu et al. 2018; Li et al. 2018; Aboud and Diab 2018; Kim et al. 2018; Shaikh 2022). Ferrell et al. (2016) conducted a study using data from MSCI's Intangible Value Assessment database and the Vigeo Corporate environmental, social, and governance (ESG) database from 1999 to 2011. Yu et al. (2018) conducted research and used 47 developed and emerging countries from 2012 to 2016 with 1,996 observations. Li et al. (2018) conducted a study on the level of environmental, social, and governance disclosure and firm value using the FTSE 350 in the UK and a sample of 2415 observations from 367 companies from 2004 to 2013. Aboud and Diab (2018) conducted research using 1,507 observations from the Egyptian stock market. Kim et al. (2018) used the Korea Investors Service Value and Bloomberg databases from 2010 to 2014. Shaikh (2022) researched 510 environmental, social, and governance scores from 17 countries from 2010 to 2018. These studies determined that TESG disclosure can increase firm value through increased transparency, accountability, and stakeholder trust (Li et al. 2018). This means that the greater the environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure, the higher the firm's value. In line with the literature, this study proposes the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 5 (H5). *Environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure positively affects firm value.*

2.6. Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Disclosure and Firm Performance

Stakeholder theory reveals that corporate social responsibility has an inconclusive effect on performance because external shareholders can reward companies that are successful in corporate social responsibility practices, but their responses do not affect performance when companies perform poorly. In other words, the cost of corporate social responsibility is not outweighed by the gains. However, companies with poor corporate social responsibility practices may be penalized by external stakeholders, whose negative opinions of the company can adversely affect the company's performance (Carlos and Lewis 2018). ROA uses to measure firm performance (Alareeni and Hamdan 2020; Pulino et al. 2022; Saini and Singhanian 2019; Kumar and Firoz 2022). In addition, the company's performance uses ROA as the primary indicator associated with capital invested in operating activities related to the balance sheet (Pulino et al. 2022).

The environmental, social, and governance disclosure positively affect firm performance (Brogi and Lagasio 2018; Mohammad and Wasiuzzaman 2021; Boulhaga et al. 2022; Kumar and Firoz 2022; Chen and Xie 2022; Pulino et al. 2022). Environmental, social, and governance disclosure positively impacts financial performance (Giannopoulos et al. 2022). In addition, integrated reporting also positively and significantly affects firm performance (Pavlopoulos et al. 2019). Brogi and Lagasio (2018) conducted research on US companies with 17,358 observations. Boulhaga et al. (2022) conducted a study using a sample of 98 firms from French registered companies on the SBF 120 index over seven years, from 2012 to 2018, for a total of 686 observations. Pavlopoulos et al. (2019) conducted research using 82 companies from 25 countries. Chen and Xie (2022) researched non-financial companies from 2000 to 2020 on the Chinese Stock Exchange. Pulino et al. (2022) investigated the largest Italian-listed companies as a sample from 2011 to 2020.

They determined that the greater the environmental, social, and governance (ESG) implementation, the higher the firm performance. Therefore, the hypothesis is:

Hypothesis 6 (H6). *Environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure positively affects firm performance.*

2.7. Audit Committee Moderation of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Disclosure, Firm Value, and Firm Performance

Agency theory (Jensen and Meckling 1976) identified audits as an essential monitoring tool to reduce information asymmetry, limit opportunistic behavior, and improve environmental, social, and governance disclosure, firm performance, and firm value. Principals use the disclosure of financial and non-financial information to reduce agency costs (i.e., information asymmetry) arising from the separation of ownership and control (Morris 1987). Companies provide environmental, social, and governance disclosures to reduce information asymmetry (Harjoto and Jo 2011). Hence, management's increased environmental, social, and governance disclosure, which represents additional non-financial information, improves the information environment and reduces the knowledge barrier between the company and its shareholders (Kim et al. 2014).

The primary responsibility of an audit committee is to oversee the financial and non-financial reporting processes and to reduce information asymmetry between managers, stakeholders, and the company (Appuhami and Tashakor 2017). In particular, the audit committee oversees mandatory and voluntary environmental, social, and governance disclosures. Therefore, audit committee members must understand how environmental, social, and governance risks and opportunities are identified and prioritized and oversee disclosure practices accordingly (Bamahros et al. 2022).

An audit committee handles preparing, presenting, and ensuring the integrity of financial statements, applying accounting principles and financial statements, and performing internal control under applicable financial accounting standards. The audit committee is also responsible for conducting an independent audit of consolidated financial statements based on auditing standards (Djaddang et al. 2017). Furthermore, an audit committee's role is to assist the board of directors in overseeing the company's reporting policies and the quality of the company's financial statements. In addition, the audit committee can increase investor and stakeholder confidence in the reliability and objectivity of financial statements and provide increased efficiency in corporate governance practices (Biçer and Feneir 2019). As a result, the study suggested the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 7 (H7). *The audit committee moderates the impact of environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure and firm value.*

Hypothesis 8 (H8). *The audit committee moderates the relationship between environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure and firm performance.*

Figure 1 presents the empirical research model, which is presented below:




Figure 1. Empirical research model. Source: Author’s own edition.

3. Methodology

3.1. Sample Selection and Data Source

The population in this study consisted of companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for each sector. In addition, this research uses secondary data from annual, financial, and sustainability reporting from companies’ websites and the IDX or Indonesian capital market directory (idx.co.id; idxchannel.com). The research period is from 2016–2020, with as many as 140 companies and 700 observations.

3.2. The Measurement of Variables

Table 1 shows the measurements of research variables. The environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure is obtained from financial reports and sustainability reports from companies’ websites and the IDX or Indonesian capital market directory (idx.co.id; idxchannel.com). This study uses content analysis (Krippendorff 2018). This analysis is used for all companies as samples to be more detailed and transparent in collecting data by examining environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosures referring to guidelines of the Global Reporting Initiatives (GRI 2013). ESG score in this study ranges from 0.1 to 100, with high scores indicating more disclosure and transparency. According to the Global Reporting Initiatives (GRI-G4), the environmental dimension of sustainability includes issues related to the organization’s impact on ecosystems. These issues include biodiversity, effluents and waste, greenhouse gas emissions, discharges into water, and other emissions. The social dimension concerns an organization’s impact on its social systems, such as equal opportunity, social investment, human rights, due diligence, and community involvement. Thus, the governance dimension focuses on organizational capabilities in instituting mechanisms that assist stakeholders in evaluating company compliance with established rules and regulations and initiatives for sustainable business practices.

Table 1. Measurement of research variables.

Variable	Measurement	Sources
Foreign ownership	Percentage of foreign ownership of shares to the total number of issued shares.	(Al Amosh and Khatib 2021).
Family ownership	Percentage of family ownership of shares to the total number of issued shares.	(Al Amosh and Khatib 2021).

State ownership	Percentage of state ownership of shares to the total number of issued shares	(Al Amosh and Khatib 2021).
Public ownership	Percentage of public ownership of shares to the total number of issued shares	(Khan et al. 2012)
Environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure	ESG score ranging from 0.1 to 100	(GRI 2013)
Firm value	Tobin's Q = (VMS + D)/TA Where: VMS = market value of all outstanding shares TA = company assets D = debt	(Lindenberg and Ross 1981)
Firm performance	ROA = EBIT/TA Where: ROA: return on assets EBIT: earnings before interest and tax TA: total assets	(Chan et al. 2019)
Audit committee	Number of people on the audit committee	(Nikulin et al. 2022)
Control variables		
Size	Size = the natural logarithm (total assets)	(Aman and Nguyen 2013)
Leverage	Leverage = (long term borrowing + short term borrowing): total assets	(Aman and Nguyen 2013)

Source: several empirical research results developed for this study.

3.3. Method of Analysis

Inferential testing uses structural equation modeling with variant-based partial least squares. The reason for data processing using partial least squares was that it involves latent variables and tiered structural models, and the direction of the relationship is recursive.

Conventional regression only examines the causal relationship, *ceteris paribus*, between the independent and dependent variables. Structural equation modeling (SEM) was advantageous in establishing complex causal relationships between variables, allowing it to perform multiple path analyses and measure the effects of interrelationship variables on the response variable (Li and Zhao 2019). The SEM model evaluated the complete adequacy of suggested hypotheses between constructs. The essential paths between the paired constructs in the model suggest the simultaneous emergence of relationships and the appropriate compilation of strategic responses to the perceived market environment. The structural model describes construction's interrelationships (Weston and Gore 2006). This study's mediating variables were environmental, social, and governance disclosure; the moderating variable was the audit committee. The independent variables included foreign, public, state, and family ownership. The dependent variable is the firm value and the firm's performance.

The outer model test was used to determine the indicators of the latent variables in the study. All indicators of latent variables were reflective, meaning a reflection of each variable. The provision of whether an indicator reflects each variable was based on the loading factor. If the results of the loading factor were > 0.7 , then the indicator reflects the variable, but if the results of the loading factor range from 0.5 to 0.60, it was considered sufficient. Model fit involves testing the structural model by considering the parameter values of the relationships between the variables studied. A hypothesis was declared significant if the *p*-value < 0.05 (Hair et al. 2016, 2019).

The form of the structural equation can be described as follows:

$$ESG = \alpha + \beta_1 FO + \beta_2 PU + \beta_3 ST + \beta_4 FA + \beta_5 S + \beta_6 L + \varepsilon \quad (1)$$

$$\text{Company performance} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ESG} * \text{AC} + \varepsilon \quad (2)$$

$$\text{Firm value} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ESG} * \text{AC} + \varepsilon \quad (3)$$

The equation symbol is defined below:

FO = foreign ownership

PU = public ownership

ST = state ownership

FA = family ownership

S = size

L = leverage

ESG = environmental, social, and governance disclosure

AC = audit committee

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Results

Table 2 shows the descriptive statistics of the sample. Table 3 shows the results of the reliability testing of all variables in this study. The reliability and validity of this study are adequate, as the value of Cronbach's alpha was >0.6, and the value for composite reliability was >0.7. The average variance extracted (AVE) value was above 0.5.

Based on Table 4 the *p*-value was less than 0.05, and the path coefficient value was positive. The proposed hypotheses H1, H2, H5, and H7 were accepted and had a positive effect. H1 was acceptable because foreign ownership positively affects environmental, social, and governance disclosure (coefficient = 0.30, *p*-value < 0.01). For H2, there was a positive association between public ownership and environmental, social, and governance disclosure (coefficient = 0.27, *p*-value = 0.04). H5 was supported because environmental, social, and governance disclosure positively affects firm value (coefficient = 0.29, *p*-value = 0.01). (Coefficient = 0.29, *p*-value = 0.01). Finally, H7 was also accepted and confirmed the H7 that the audit committee moderates the relationship between environmental, social, and governance disclosure and firm value. Meanwhile, hypotheses H3, H4, H6, and H8 were rejected because the *p*-value was greater than 0.05.

Table 2. Descriptive statistic.

Variables	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Foreign ownership	700	0.00	37.8	28.4	23.6
Public ownership	700	0.04	25.9	19.7	17.9
State ownership	700	0.00	68.2	13.9	8.7
Family ownership	700	0.00	45.3	16.5	9.3
ESG	700	8	72.8	39.2	14.5
Audit committee	700	2	4	3.4	2.3

Source: author based on output SPSS.

Table 3. Reliability and validity test result.

Variables	Cronbach's Alpha	Rho A	Composite Reliability	AVE
Foreign ownership	0.713	0.887	0.803	0.587
Public ownership	0.890	0.842	0.889	0.541
State ownership	0.846	0.924	0.863	0.617
Family ownership	0.789	0.873	0.876	0.500
ESG	0.823	0.801	0.815	0.589
Audit committee	0.831	0.899	0.885	0.625

Source: author based on the output of SEM PLS.

Table 4. Path coefficient.

Hypotheses	Coefficient	<i>p</i> Value	Result
Foreign ownership → ESG	0.30	<0.01	Accepted
Public ownership → ESG	0.27	0.04	Accepted
State ownership → ESG	0.06	0.16	Rejected
Family ownership → ESG	0.16	0.19	Rejected
ESG → firm value	0.29	0.01	Accepted
ESG → firm performance	0.10	0.15	Rejected
ESG → firm value → audit committee	0.38	<0.01	Accepted
ESG → firm performance → audit committee	0.01	0.32	Rejected

Significant level at 5% $p < 0.05$.

4.2. Discussion

The first hypothesis (H1) states that foreign ownership positively impacts environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure. The results of this study indicate that foreign ownership has a significant positive effect on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure. This means that the greater the foreign ownership, the greater the environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure. This finding supports previous research that concluded that foreign ownership significantly and positively affects ESG disclosure (Guo and Zheng 2021; Khan et al. 2012; Khlif et al. 2016; Masud et al. 2018; Bae et al. 2018; Amidjaya and Widagdo 2020; Al Amosh and Khatib 2021). However, this finding is not in line with previous research that revealed foreign ownership has a negative effect on ESG disclosure (Saini and Singhania 2019; Sharma et al. 2020; Hasan et al. 2022; Abu Qa'dan and Suwaidan 2019). Furthermore, the results of this study do not support the study by Yu and Luu (2021), which concluded that foreign ownership did not impact ESG disclosure. This study supports the legitimacy theory.

The second hypothesis (H2) reveals that public ownership affects environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure. The results of this study indicate that public ownership has a positive and significant effect on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure. Therefore, the second hypothesis is accepted. This finding supports previous research by (Khan et al. 2012) that concluded that public ownership positively affects corporate social responsibility disclosure (Khan et al. 2012). On the other hand, the result did not agree with Nugraheni et al. (2022), who concluded that public ownership does not impact corporate social responsibility disclosure. The finding of this study supports the legitimacy theory.

The third hypothesis (H3) reveals that state ownership positively influences environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure. However, the resulting research shows that state ownership does not impact environmental, social, and governance disclosure. Therefore, the third hypothesis was rejected. This finding does not support previous studies from Khlif et al. (2016); Al Amosh and Khatib (2021), who concluded that state ownership has a significant positive effect the environmental, social, and governance disclosure. Furthermore, this result is not in line with the study from Al-Janadi et al. (2016), who concluded that state ownership negatively impacts voluntary disclosure. Therefore, this finding does not support the stakeholder theory.

The fourth hypothesis (H4) states that family ownership positively affects environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure. The result of this study is not supported. The data analysis for hypothesis 4 (Figure 2 and Table 4) shows that family ownership does not affect environmental, social, and governance disclosure. This result is in line with the previous study (Salehi et al. 2017; Rudyanto 2017; Masud et al. 2018, and Rees and Rodionova 2014), which shows insignificant results. In addition, family ownership does not affect sustainability reporting (Rudyanto 2017; Masud et al. 2018) or does not influence corporate social responsibility disclosure (Salehi et al. 2017). In addition, Rees and Rodionova (2014) found that family ownership negatively affects the quality of sustainability reports. This study does not support stakeholder theory.




Figure 2. The result of partial least square (PLS). Source: Author's own edition.

The fifth hypothesis (H5) states that environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure positively affects firm value. The result of this study shows that environmental, social, and governance disclosure affects firm value. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis was supported. This means that the higher the environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure, the higher the firm value. This result supports the previous research (Ferrell et al. 2016; Aboud and Diab 2018; Kim et al. 2018; Li et al. 2018; Shaikh 2022; Yu et al. 2018) concluded that environmental, social, and governance disclosure positively and significantly affects firm value. However, this finding does not agree with previous studies by Ahmad et al. (2021) and Aouadi and Marsat (2018), who showed that environmental, social, and governance disclosure did not influence firm value. The finding of this study supports stakeholder theory.

The sixth hypothesis (H6) reveals that environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure positively affects firm performance. The data analysis for hypothesis 6 from the Figure 2 and Table 4 shows that environmental, social, and governance disclosure does not affect firm performance. Therefore, the sixth hypothesis was rejected. This finding does not support the research (Boulhaga et al. 2022; Brogi and Lagasio 2018; Kumar and Firoz 2022; Mohammad and Wasiuzzaman 2021) that concluded that environmental, social, and governance disclosure effects have a significant positive on firm performance. Furthermore, this result does not support the previous research (Buallay 2019; Duque-Grisales and Aguilera-Caracuel 2019; Shaikh 2022; Wasiuzzaman et al. 2022) that concluded that environmental, social, and governance disclosure negatively impacts the firm performance. This finding does not support stakeholder theory.

The seventh hypothesis (H7) states that audit committees moderate the relationship between environmental, social, and governance disclosure and firm value. However, the resulting research shows that environmental, social, and governance disclosure affects firm value, and the audit committee moderates this influence. Therefore, the seventh hypothesis was accepted. The audit committee is a moderating variable on environmental, social, and governance disclosure influences and firm values that strengthen its relationship. This finding supports agency theory.

The last hypothesis (H8) states that the audit committee moderates the relationship between environmental, social, and governance disclosure and firm performance. However, the results of this study did not find any significance between these variables, meaning that the audit committees do not strengthen the influence of environmental, social,

and governance disclosure on firm performance. Thus, audit committees do not act as moderating variables in this relationship.

The control variables' results indicate that the company's size is positive and significant. Larger companies have greater responsibilities to stakeholders through sustainable disclosure and are related to environmental, social, and governance disclosure. However, leverage shows insignificant results. This means that leverage does not support and contribute to the disclosures required by stakeholders.

The analysis results from Figure 2 and Table 4 show the R Square (R^2) value of 0.32 for environmental, social, and governance disclosure, 0.27 for firm value, and 0.23 for firm performance. This means that 0.32 of the environmental, social, and governance are influenced by foreign ownership, public ownership, state ownership, and family ownership, while 0.68 of the variables are influenced by other variables outside the variables that have not been studied in this study. An R^2 value of more than 0.5 indicates that the model has good goodness of fit measure (Hair et al. 2019).

5. Conclusions

The findings of this study reveal that both foreign and public ownership have a positive and significant effect on environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure. Foreign ownership plays a role in environmental, social, and governance disclosure because it contributes to the process. This is in line with public ownership, which also plays a role in environmental, social, and governance disclosure. Neither state nor family ownership significantly influences environmental, social, and governance disclosure. Furthermore, environmental, social, and governance disclosure positively and significantly affect firm value. However, environmental, social, and governance disclosure do not significantly affect the firm performance. The audit committee moderates the influence between environmental, social, and governance disclosure, and firm value. However, the audit committee does not play a moderating role in influencing environmental, social, and governance (ESG) disclosure and firm performance. Overall, these findings prompt managers to pay attention to social operations and good corporate governance that is environmentally friendly. The results are helpful for companies and the government as a regulator who can convince companies to adopt environmental, social, and governance disclosure.

5.1. Practical Implication

The results and findings of this study have several practical implications. First, regarding stakeholders, companies that disclose environmental, social, and governance aspects, can further enhance supervision by both internal and external parties, including the government and stakeholders. Stakeholders include managers, investors, or the community.

Second, implications for managers and companies should be more transparent regarding environmental, social, and governance disclosure. Environmental, social, and governance disclosure can enhance competitive advantage and create value for companies that disclose sustainability-related strategic information. Companies can also use resources related to environmental, social, and governance practices efficiently and economically.

Third, the implication for the government as a regulator in Indonesia involves the financial services authority (Otoritas Jasa Keuangan-OJK). The government must create stronger environmental, social, and government regulations that companies must apply, especially those listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange. However, a company's annual report must disclose information related to corporate social responsibility (CSR) based on the law from the financial services authority (Otoritas Jasa Keuangan-OJK).

Fourth, investors can assess the company's environmental, social, and governance disclosure more accurately. As a result, investors have a significant role in supporting companies in increasing transparency and disclosure and ultimately improving their reporting standards. Finally, environmental, social, and governance disclosure can persuade investors to invest in a company.

5.2. Limitations

This study has several limitations. The first limitation is related to weak secondary data. Suggestions for further research would be to conduct research by obtaining primary data. In addition, future researchers should conduct a qualitative study with interviews with companies that have disclosed environmental, social, and governance information. The second limitation is that the factors affecting environmental, social, and governance disclosure in this study focus only on the ownership structure, including foreign, public, state, and family ownership. Further research could use other variables, such as corporate social responsibility, profitability, board independence, and corporate governance. The third limitation of this research is related to the use of three theories: legitimacy, stakeholder, and agency theory. Future research could use different perspectives by using other theories. The last limitation is that we use financial measurement, return on assets (ROA), to measure the firm performance. Future researchers can use non-financial measurements, such as global economic policy uncertainty, political risk, governance quality, etc. Athari (2021) showed empirical results that external governance mechanisms and their dimensions, particularly political stability, regulatory quality, the rule of law, and corruption control, positively impact the profitability of Islamic banks. Furthermore, the results of this study showed that increasing the dimensions of external governance, especially political stability, regulatory quality, the rule of law, and controlling corruption, increases the profitability of Islamic banks (Athari and Bahreini 2021).

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, L.L.F., M.M., I.A., and A.A.; data curation, L.L.F., and A.A.; formal analysis, L.L.F., M.M., I.A., and A.A.; funding acquisition, L.L.F., investigation, L.L.F. methodology, L.L.F., M.M., I.A., and A.A.; project administration L.L.F., and A.A.; resources, M.M.; software, A.A.; supervision L.L.F., and A.A.; validation A.A.; visualization A.A.; writing—original draft preparation, L.L.F., M.M., I.A., and A.A.; writing—review and editing, L.L.F., M.M., I.A., and A.A. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: Ministry of Education, Culture, Research and Technology (Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset dan Teknologi) No. Kontrak 142/E5/PG.02.00.PT/2022 SP DIPA-023.17.1690523/2022.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: All the data have been included in the manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

References

- (Aboud and Diab 2018) Aboud, Ahmed, and Ahmed Diab. 2018. The Impact of Social, Environmental and Corporate Governance Disclosures on Firm Value: Evidence from Egypt. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies* 8: 442–58. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAEE-08-2017-0079>.
- (Abu Qa'dan and Suwaidan 2019) Abu Qa'dan, Mohammad Bassam, and Mishiel Said Suwaidan. 2019. Board composition, ownership structure and corporate social responsibility disclosure: The case of Jordan. *Social Responsibility Journal* 15: 28–46. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-11-2017-0225>.
- (Ahmad et al. 2021) Ahmad, Raja Adzrin Raja, Amirul Azri Ayob, Saunah Zainon, and Agung Nur Probohudono. 2021. The Influence of Environmental, Social and Governance Reporting on Firm Value: Malaysian Evidence. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences* 11: 1058–80. <https://doi.org/10.6007/ijarbss/v11-i9/10877>.
- (Alareeni and Hamdan 2020) Alareeni, Bahaeddin Ahmed, and Allam Hamdan. 2020. ESG Impact on Performance of US S&P 500-Listed Firms. *Corporate Governance* 20: 1409–28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-06-2020-0258>.
- (Al Amosh and Khatib 2021) Al Amosh, Hamzeh, and Saleh F. A. Khatib. 2021. Ownership Structure and Environmental, Social and Governance Performance Disclosure: The Moderating Role of the Board Independence. *Journal of Business and Socio-Economic Development* 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jbsed-07-2021-0094>.
- (Albawwat and Ali basah 2015) Albawwat, Ala Hussein, and Mohamad Yazis Ali basah. 2015. Corporate Governance and Voluntary Disclosure of Interim Financial Reporting in Jordan. *Journal of Public Administration and Governance* 5: 100–127. <https://doi.org/10.5296/jpag.v5i2.7580>.

- (Al-Janadi et al. 2016) Al-Janadi, Yaseen, Rashidah Abdul Rahman, and Abdulsamad Alazzani. 2016. Does Government Ownership Affect Corporate Governance and Corporate Disclosure?: Evidence from Saudi Arabia. *Managerial Auditing Journal* 31: 871–90. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MAJ-12-2015-1287>.
- (Aman and Nguyen 2013) Aman, Hiroyuki, and Pascal Nguyen. 2013. Does Good Governance Matter to Debtholders? Evidence from the Credit Ratings of Japanese Firms. *Research in International Business and Finance* 29: 14–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2013.02.002>.
- (Amidjaya and Widagdo 2020) Amidjaya, Prihatnolo Gandhi, and Ari Kuncara Widagdo. 2020. Sustainability Reporting in Indonesian Listed Banks: Do Corporate Governance, Ownership Structure and Digital Banking Matter? *Journal of Applied Accounting Research* 21: 231–47. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAAR-09-2018-0149>.
- (Aouadi and Marsat 2018) Aouadi, Amal, and Sylvain Marsat. 2018. Do ESG Controversies Matter for Firm Value? Evidence from International Data. *Journal of Business Ethics* 151: 1027–47. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3213-8>.
- (Appuhami and Tashakor 2017) Appuhami, Ranjith, and Shamim Tashakor. 2017. The Impact of Audit Committee Characteristics on CSR Disclosure: An Analysis of Australian Firms. *Australian Accounting Review* 27: 400–20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/auar.12170>.
- (Athari and Bahreini 2021) Athari, Seyed Alireza, and Mahboubeh Bahreini. 2021. The Impact of External Governance and Regulatory Settings on the Profitability of Islamic Banks: Evidence from Arab Markets. *International Journal of Finance and Economics* 26: 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijfe.2529>.
- (Athari 2021) Athari, Seyed Alireza. 2021. Domestic Political Risk, Global Economic Policy Uncertainty, and Banks' Profitability: Evidence from Ukrainian Banks. *Post-Communist Economies* 33: 458–83. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14631377.2020.1745563>.
- (Atif et al. 2022) Atif, Muhammad, Benjamin Liu, and Sivathaasan Nadarajah. 2022. The Effect of Corporate Environmental, Social and Governance Disclosure on Cash Holdings: Life-Cycle Perspective. *Business Strategy and the Environment* 31: 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.3016>.
- (Baba and Baba 2021) Baba, Bello Usman, and Usman Aliyu Baba. 2021. The Effect of Ownership Structure on Social and Environmental Reporting in Nigeria: The Moderating Role of Intellectual Capital Disclosure. *Journal of Global Responsibility* 12: 210–44. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JGR-06-2019-0060>.
- (Bae et al. 2018) Bae, Seong Mi, Md. Abdul Kaium Masud, and Jong Dae Kim. 2018. A Cross-Country Investigation of Corporate Governance and Corporate Sustainability Disclosure: A Signaling Theory Perspective. *Sustainability* 10: 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10082611>.
- (Bamahros et al. 2022) Bamahros, Hasan Mohamad, Abdulsalam Alquhaif, Ameen Qasem, Wan Nordin Wan-hussin, Murad Thomran, Shaker Al-Duais, Siti Norwahida Shukeri, and Hytham M. A. Khojally. 2022. Corporate Governance Mechanisms and ESG Reporting: Evidence from the Saudi Stock Market. *Sustainability* 14: 6202.
- (Beloskar and Rao 2022) Beloskar, Ved Dilip, and S. V.D.Nageswara Rao. 2022. Did ESG Save the Day? Evidence From India During the COVID-19 Crisis. In *Asia-Pacific Financial Markets*. Bombay: Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10690-022-09369-5>.
- (Biçer and Feneir 2019) Biçer, Ali Altuğ, and Imad Mohamed Feneir. 2019. The Impact of Audit Committee Characteristics on Environmental and Social Disclosures. *International Journal of Research in Business and Social Science* 8: 111–21. <https://doi.org/10.20525/ijrbs.v8i3.262>.
- (Boulhaga et al. 2022) Boulhaga, Mounia, Abdelfettah Bouri, Ahmed A Elamer, and Bassam A Ibrahim. 2022. Environmental, Social and Governance Ratings and Firm Performance: The Moderating Role of Internal Control Quality. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 29: 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.2343>.
- (Bouslah et al. 2013) Bouslah, Kais, Lawrence Kryzanowski, and Bouchra M Zali. 2013. The Impact of the Dimensions of Social Performance on Firm Risk. *Journal of Banking and Finance* 37: 1258–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2012.12.004>.
- (Brogi and Lagasio 2018) Brogi, Marina, and Valentina Lagasio. 2018. Environmental, Social, and Governance and Company Profitability: Are Financial Intermediaries Different? *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management* 26: 576–87. <https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1704>.
- (Buallay 2019) Buallay, Amina. 2019. Between Cost and Value: Investigating the Effects of Sustainability Reporting on a Firm's Performance. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research* 20: 481–96. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAAR-12-2017-0137>.
- (Caporale et al. 2022) Caporale, Guglielmo Maria, Luis Gil-Alana, Alex Plastun, and Inna Makarenko. 2022. Persistence in ESG and Conventional Stock Market Indices. *Journal of Economics and Finance* 46: 678–703. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12197-022-09580-0>.
- (Carlos and Lewis 2018) Carlos, W. Chad, and Ben W. Lewis. 2018. Strategic Silence: Withholding Certification Status as a Hypocrisy Avoidance Tactic. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 63: 130–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0001839217695089>.
- (Chan et al. 2019) Chan, Ling Foon, Bany Ariffin An, and Annual Bin Md Nasir. 2019. Does the Method of Corporate Diversification Matter to Firm's Performance? *Asia-Pacific Contemporary Finance and Development* 26: 207–33. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1571-038620190000026011>.
- (Chauhan and Kumar 2018) Chauhan, Yogesh, and Surya B. Kumar. 2018. Do Investors Value the Nonfinancial Disclosure in Emerging Markets? *Emerging Markets Review* 37: 32–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ememar.2018.05.001>.
- (Chen and Xie 2022) Chen, Zhongfei, and Guanxia Xie. 2022. ESG Disclosure and Financial Performance: Moderating Role of ESG Investors. *International Review of Financial Analysis* 83: 102291. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2022.102291>.
- (Daugaard and Ding 2022) Daugaard, Dan, and Ashley Ding. 2022. Global Drivers for ESG Performance: The Body of Knowledge. *Sustainability* 14: 2322. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14042322>.
- (Deegan 2013) Deegan, Craig. 2013. *Financial Accounting Theory*. Sydney: Mc Graw Hill Book Company. <https://doi.org/10.1002/zaac.201300446>.

- (De Masi et al. 2021) De Masi, Sara, Agnieszka Słomka-Gołębiowska, Claudio Becagli, and Andrea Paci. 2021. Toward Sustainable Corporate Behavior: The Effect of the Critical Mass of Female Directors on Environmental, Social, and Governance Disclosure. *Business Strategy and the Environment* 30: 1865–78. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2721>.
- (Dicuonzo et al. 2022) Dicuonzo, Grazia, Francesca Donofrio, Simona Ranaldo, and Vittorio Dell Atti. 2022. The Effect of Innovation on Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Practices. *Meditari Accountancy Research* 30: 1191–1209. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-12-2020-1120>.
- (Djaddang et al. 2017) Djaddang, Syahril, Darmansyah Darmansyah, Ronny Bagus Witjaksono, and Imam Ghozali. 2017. The Effects of Environmental Awareness and Corporate Social Responsibility on Earnings Quality: Testing the Moderating Role of Audit Committee. *International Journal of Economic Perspectives* 11: 100–111.
- (Duque-Grisales and Aguilera-Caracuel 2019) Duque-Grisales, Eduardo, and Javier Aguilera-Caracuel. 2019. Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Scores and Financial Performance of Multilatinas: Moderating Effects of Geographic International Diversification and Financial Slack. *Journal of Business Ethics* 168: 315–34. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-019-04177-w>.
- (Ferrell et al. 2016) Ferrell, Allen, Hao Liang, and Luc Renneboog. 2016. Socially Responsible Firms. *Journal of Financial Economics* 122: 585–606. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jfineco.2015.12.003>.
- (Freeman 1983) Freeman, R. 1983. Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach. *Advances in Strategic Management*, 31–60. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.263511>.
- (Freeman 1984) Freeman, R. Edward. 1984. *Stakeholder Theory of Modern Corporation*. Boston: Pittman.
- (Fuente et al. 2022) Fuente, Gabriel de la, Margarita Ortiz, and Pilar Velasco. 2022. The Value of a Firm’s Engagement in ESG Practices: Are We Looking at the Right Side? *Long Range Planning* 55: 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2021.102143>.
- (Giannopoulos et al. 2022) Giannopoulos, George, Renate Victoria Kihle Fagernes, Mahmoud Elmarzouky, and Kazi Abul Bashar Muhammad Afzal Hossain. 2022. The ESG Disclosure and the Financial Performance of Norwegian Listed Firms. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management* 15: 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/JRFM15060237>.
- (GRI 2013) GRI. 2013. G4 Sustainability Reporting Guidelines. Available online: <https://www.globalreporting.org/standards/g4/Pages/default.aspx/> (accessed on 20 August 2022).
- (Guo and Zheng 2021) Guo, Mingyuan, and Chendi Zheng. 2021. Foreign Ownership and Corporate Social Responsibility: Evidence from China. *Sustainability* 13: 508. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13020508>.
- (Hair et al. 2016) Hair, Joseph F, G Tomas M Huli, Cristian Ringle, and Marko Sarstedt. 2016. *A Primer on Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM)*. New York: Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1743727x.2015.1005806>.
- (Hair et al. 2019) Hair, Joseph F., Jeffrey J. Risher, Marko Sarstedt, and Christian M. Ringle. 2019. When to Use and How to Report the Results of PLS-SEM. *European Business Review* 31: 2–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-11-2018-0203>.
- (Hanifa and Rashid 2005) Hanifa, Mohamed Hisham, and Hafiz-Majdi Ab. Rashid. 2005. The Determinants of Voluntary Disclosures in Malaysia: The Case of Internet Financial. *Unitar E-Journal* 2: 22–42.
- (Harjoto and Jo 2011) Harjoto, Maretno A., and Hoje Jo. 2011. Corporate Governance and CSR Nexus. *Journal of Business Ethics* 100: 45–67. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0772-6>.
- (Hasan et al. 2022) Hasan, Arshad, Khaled Hussainey, and Doaa Aly. 2022. Determinants of Sustainability Reporting Decision: Evidence from Pakistan. *Journal of Sustainable Finance and Investment* 12: 214–37. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20430795.2021.1964813>.
- (He et al. 2022) He, Feng, Hanyu Du, and Bo Yu. 2022. Corporate ESG Performance and Manager Misconduct: Evidence from China. *International Review of Financial Analysis* 82: 102201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2022.102201>.
- (Jensen and Meckling 1976) Jensen, Michael C, and William H Meckling. 1976. Theory of the Firm : Managerial Behavior , Agency Costs and Ownership Structure Theory of the Firm : Managerial Behavior, Agency Costs and Ownership Structure. *Journal of Financial Economics* 3: 305–60.
- (Khan et al. 2012) Khan, Arifur, Mohammad Badrul Muttakin, and Javed Siddiqui. 2012. Corporate Governance and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosures: Evidence from an Emerging Economy. *Journal Business Ethics* 110: 207–23. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2050630>.
- (Khlif et al. 2016) Khlif, Hichem, Kamran Ahmed, and Mohsen Souissi. 2016. Ownership Structure and Voluntary Disclosure: A Synthesis of Empirical Studies. *Australian Journal of Management* 42: 376–403. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0312896216641475>.
- (Kim et al. 2018) Kim, Woo Sung, Kunsu Park, and Sang Hoon Lee. 2018. Corporate Social Responsibility , Ownership Structure , and Firm Value : Evidence from Korea. *Sustainability* 10: 2497. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su10072497>.
- (Kim et al. 2014) Kim, Yongtae, Haidan Li, and Siqi Li. 2014. Corporate Social Responsibility and Stock Price Crash Risk. *Journal of Banking & Finance* 43: 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbankfin.2014.02.013>.
- (Krippendorff 2018) Krippendorff, Klaus. 2018. *Content Analysis: An Introduction to Its Methodology*. London: Sage Publications. Available online: <http://www.uk.sagepub.com/textbooks/Book234903> (accessed on 22 August 2022).
- (Kumar et al. 2022) Kumar, Kishore, Ranjita Kumari, Monomita Nandy, Mohd Sarim, and Rakesh Kumar. 2022. Do Ownership Structures and Governance Attributes Matter for Corporate Sustainability Reporting? An Examination in the Indian Context. *Management of Environmental Quality: An International Journal* 33: 1077–96. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MEQ-08-2021-0196>.
- (Kumar and Firoz 2022) Kumar, Praveen, and Mohammad Firoz. 2022. Does Accounting-Based Financial Performance Value Environmental , Social and Governance (ESG) Disclosures? A Detailed Note on a Corporate Sustainability Perspective. *Australasian Accounting Business and Finance Journal* 16: 41–72. <https://doi.org/10.14453/aabfj.v16i1.4>.
- (Li and Zhao 2019) Li, Jiandong, and Jianmei Zhao. 2019. How Housing Affects Stock Investment—An SEM Analysis. *Economies* 7: 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.3390/economies7010026>.

- (Li et al. 2018) Li, Yiwei, Mengfeng Gong, Xiu Ye Zhang, and Lenny Koh. 2018. The Impact of Environmental, Social, and Governance Disclosure on Firm Value: The Role of CEO Power. *British Accounting Review* 50: 60–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bar.2017.09.007>.
- (Lindenberg and Ross 1981) Lindenberg, Eric B., and Stephen A. Ross. 1981. Tobin's q Ratio and Industrial Organization. *The Journal of Business* 54: 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1086/296120>.
- (Liu and Lyu 2022) Liu, Heying, and Chan Lyu. 2022. Can ESG Ratings Stimulate Corporate Green Innovation? Evidence from China. *Sustainability* 14: 12516. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su141912516>.
- (Maama and Appiah 2019) Maama, Haruna, and Kingsley Opoku Appiah. 2019. Green Accounting Practices: Lesson from an Emerging Economy. *Qualitative Research in Financial Markets* 11: 456–78. <https://doi.org/10.1108/QRFM-02-2017-0013>.
- (Manita et al. 2018) Manita, Riadh, Maria Giuseppina Bruna, Rey Dang, and L'Hocine Houanti. 2018. Board Gender Diversity and ESG Disclosure: Evidence from the USA. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research* 19: 206–24. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JAAR-01-2017-0024>.
- (Masud et al. 2018) Masud, Md. Abdul Kaium, Mohammad Nurunnabi, and Seong Mi Bae. 2018. The Effects of Corporate Governance on Environmental Sustainability Reporting: Empirical Evidence from South Asian Countries. *Asian Journal of Sustainability and Social Responsibility* 3: 1–26. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41180-018-0019-x>.
- (Mohammad and Wasiuzzaman 2021) Mohammad, Wan Masliza Wan, and Shaista Wasiuzzaman. 2021. Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Disclosure, Competitive Advantage and Performance of Firms in Malaysia. *Cleaner Environmental Systems* 2: 100015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cesys.2021.100015>.
- (Monk 2009) Monk, Ashby. 2009. Recasting the Sovereign Wealth Fund Debate: Trust, Legitimacy, and Governance. *New Political Economy* 14: 451–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563460903287280>.
- (Morris 1987) Morris, Richard D. 1987. Signalling, Agency Theory and Accounting Policy Choice. *Accounting and Business Research* 18: 47–56. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.1987.9729347>.
- (Naser et al. 2006) Naser, Kamal, Ahmad Al Hussaini, Duha Al Kwari, and Rana Nuseibeh. 2006. Determinants of Corporate Social Disclosure in Developing Countries: The Case of Qatar. *Advances in International Accounting* 19: 1–23.
- (Nikulin et al. 2022) Nikulin, Egor D., Marat V. Smirnov, Andrei A. Sviridov, and Olesya V. Bandalyuk. 2022. Audit Committee Composition and Earnings Management in a Specific Institutional Environment: The Case of Russia. *Corporate Governance* 22: 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-01-2021-0011>.
- (Nugraheni et al. 2022) Nugraheni, Peni, Arum Indrasari, and Noradiva Hamzah. 2022. The Impact of Ownership Structure on CSR Disclosure: Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Accounting and Investment* 23: 229–43. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jai.v23i2.14633>.
- (O'Dwyer 2003) O'Dwyer, Brendan. 2003. Conceptions of Corporate Social Responsibility: The Nature of Managerial Capture. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal* 16: 523–57. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513570310492290>.
- (Pavlopoulos et al. 2019) Pavlopoulos, Athanasios, Chris Magnis, and George Emmanuel Iatridis. 2019. Integrated Reporting: An Accounting Disclosure Tool for High Quality Financial Reporting. *Research in International Business and Finance* 49: 13–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ribaf.2019.02.007>.
- (Pulino et al. 2022) Pulino, Silvia Carnini, Mirella Ciaburri, Barbara Sveva Magnanelli, and Luigi Nasta. 2022. Does ESG Disclosure Influence Firm Performance? *Sustainability* 14: 7595. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14137595>.
- (Rabaya and Saleh 2021) Rabaya, Abdullah Jihad, and Norman Mohd Saleh. 2021. The Moderating Effect of IR Framework Adoption on the Relationship between Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Disclosure and a Firm's Competitive Advantage. *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 24: 2037–55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10668-021-01519-5>.
- (Rees and Rodionova 2014) Rees, William, and Tatiana Rodionova. 2014. The Influence of Family Ownership on Corporate Social Responsibility: An International Analysis of Publicly Listed Companies. *Corporate Governance: An International Review* 23: 184–202. <https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12086>.
- (Rudyanto 2017) Rudyanto, Astrid. 2017. State Ownership, Family Ownership, and Sustainability Report Quality: The Moderating Role of Board Effectiveness. *GATR Accounting and Finance Review* 2: 15–25. [https://doi.org/10.35609/af.2017.2.2\(3\)](https://doi.org/10.35609/af.2017.2.2(3)).
- (Saini and Singhania 2019) Saini, Neha, and Monica Singhania. 2019. Performance Relevance of Environmental and Social Disclosures: The Role of Foreign Ownership. *Benchmarking: An International Journal* 26: 1845–73. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-04-2018-0114>.
- (Sajjad et al. 2019) Sajjad, Aymen, Gabriel Eweje, and David Tappin. 2019. Managerial Perspectives on Drivers for and Barriers to Sustainable Supply Chain Management Implementation: Evidence from New Zealand. *Business Strategy and the Environment* 29: 592–604. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2389>.
- (Salehi et al. 2017) Salehi, Mahdi, Hossein Tarighi, and Malihe Rezanezhad. 2017. The Relationship between Board of Directors' Structure and Company Ownership with Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure: Iranian Angle. *Humanomics* 33: 398–418. <https://doi.org/10.1108/H-02-2017-0022>.
- (Salvato and Melin 2008) Salvato, Carlo, and Leif Melin. 2008. Creating Value across Generations in Family-Controlled Businesses: The Role of Family Social Capital. *Family Business Review* 21: 259–76. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-6248.2008.00127.x>.
- (Shaikh 2022) Shaikh, Imlak. 2022. Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) Practice and Firm Performance: An International Evidence. *Journal of Business Economics and Management* 23: 218–37.
- (Sharma et al. 2020) Sharma, Preeti, Priyanka Panday, and R. C. Dangwal. 2020. Determinants of Environmental, Social and Corporate Governance (ESG) Disclosure: A Study of Indian Companies. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance* 17: 208–17. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41310-020-00085-y>.
- (Sheehan et al. 2022) Sheehan, Norman T., Ganesh Vaidyanathan, Kenneth A. Fox, and Mark Klassen. 2022. Making the Invisible Visible: Overcoming Barriers to ESG Performance with an ESG Mindset. *Business Horizons* 65: 1–23.

- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2022.07.003>.
- (Suchman 1995) Suchman, Mark C. 1995. Approaches and Strategic Managing Legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review* 20: 571–610. Available online: <https://journals.aom.org/doi/abs/10.5465/AMR.1995.9508080331> (accessed on 1 August 2022).
- (Tilling and Tilt 2010) Tilling, Matthew V., and Carol A. Tilt. 2010. The Edge of Legitimacy: Voluntary Social and Environmental Reporting in Rothmans' 1956-1999 Annual Reports. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 23: 55–81. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09513571011010600>.
- (Vilas et al. 2022) Vilas, Pablo, Laura Andreu, and José Luis Sarto. 2022. Cluster Analysis to Validate the Sustainability Label of Stock Indices: An Analysis of the Inclusion and Exclusion Processes in Terms of Size and ESG Ratings. *Journal of Cleaner Production* 330: 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.129862>.
- (Wang and Sun 2022) Wang, Fengyan, and Ziyuan Sun. 2022. Does the Environmental Regulation Intensity and ESG Performance Have a Substitution Effect on the Impact of Enterprise Green Innovation: Evidence from China. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* 19: 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19148558>.
- (Wasiuzzaman et al. 2022) Wasiuzzaman, Shaista, Salihu Aramide Ibrahim, and Farahiyah Kawi. 2022. Environmental , Social and Governance (ESG) Disclosure and Fi Rm Performance : Does National Culture Matter ? *Meditari Accountancy Research* 30: 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-06-2021-1356>.
- (Weston and Gore 2006) Weston, Rebecca, and Paul A. Gore. 2006. A Brief Guide to Structural Equation Modeling. *The Counseling Psychologist* 34: 719–51. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000006286345>.
- (Yu and Luu 2021) Yu, Ellen Pei yi, and Bac Van Luu. 2021. International Variations in ESG Disclosure—Do Cross-Listed Companies Care More? *International Review of Financial Analysis* 75: 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irfa.2021.101731>.
- (Yu et al. 2018) Yu, Ellen Pei yi, Christine Qian Guo, and Bac Van Luu. 2018. Environmental, Social and Governance Transparency and Firm Value. *Business Strategy and the Environment* 27: 987–1004. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.2047>.
- (Zheng et al. 2022) Zheng, Jianzhuang, Muhammad Usman Khurram, and Lifeng Chen. 2022. Can Green Innovation Affect ESG Ratings and Financial Performance? Evidence from Chinese GEM Listed Companies. *Sustainability* 14: 8677. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14148677>.