International Journal of Management and Business Applied

Vol.1, No.1, (2022)
e-ISSN: 2827-9840

Profitability, Leverage, Firm Size and Enviromental Performance Moderated Company Profile in Company CSR Disclosure

Novita W Respati[1], Ayu Oktaviani,[2]
[1,2,]Master of Accounting Postgraduate Program. Faculty of Economics and Business
Universitas Lambung Mangkurat Banjarmasin
Email: padlah.riyadi@gmail.com

doi.org/10.54099/ijmba.v1i1.95

ARTICLE INFO
Research Paper

Article history:
Received: February 10, 2022
Revised: March 17, 2022
Accepted: March 30, 2022

Keywords: Profitability, leverage, firm size, environmental performance, company profile and CSR disclosure

ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine and analyze the effect of profitability, leverage, firm size and environmental performance moderated by company profile variable on the CSR disclosures of companies listed the IDX in 2014-2019. Based on purposive sampling, there were 12 companies according to the research criteria multiplied by the number of 6 years of observation, 72 data were processed and analyzed using multiple linear regression. The result of simultaneously, the variables of profitability, leverage, firm size, environmental performance and company profile have a significant influence on CSR Disclosure. Partial testing shows that only leverage has a significant effect on CSR disclosure, while profitability, firm size, environmental performance and company profile have no significant effect on CSR disclosure.

INTRODUCTION

Organizational progress in the 4.0 revolution era, is very dynamic and advanced. All these advances are shown by the modern industrial enterprise that uses robotic applications to increase production capacity. The use of human and natural aspects is also increasing, in maximizing work processes, efficiency and productivity, business entities seek (robotic and digital approach) in production, business streamlining, use of cheap resources, cost efficiency and others as an effort to increase productivity.

Increasing productivity and efficiency that ignores social and environmental factors, causing natural damage, such as land erosion, forest fires, air pollution, water waste and others are very detrimental to other stakeholders in maintaining sustainability or sustainability of the company's business environment. Facts show how neglect of social and environmental aspects creates resistance from society (conflicts and disputes). Various problems arise due to the company's indifference in managing natural resources, the environment and the surrounding community, both in the short and long time range, in the long and long period of time after the restoration of social damage, environmental ecology is very threatening the regeneration of the sustainability of the ecosystem, environment and social of the surrounding community, (sustainability damage domino effect). The number of cases of environmental damage in Indonesia, which is caused by the neglect of corporate responsibility from the company's business processes in natural resource management, is more negative for the surrounding environment, the negative impact is pollution and environmental damage,

In Indonesia, CSR disclosure is regulated by Law No. 40 of 2007. Article 74 paragraph 1 states that PTs that carry out business activities in the field of and/or related to natural resources are obliged to carry out social and environmental responsibilities. UU no. 25 of 2007 Article 15 concerning "Investment" explains that every business actor is responsible for carrying out corporate social activities, and Article 34 contains sanctions for business entities or individuals who ignore corporate social responsibility, even though there are regulations that regulate In the form of law, not a few companies are negligent or less compliant in implementing corporate social responsibility program policies because the costs incurred are relatively large, and this will certainly reduce the company's net profit.

Based on the problems and the phenomenon of the existing gap, it is very interesting to do a re-examination of the disclosure of corporate social responsibility or corporate social responsibility disclosure. The independent variables of this study are profitability, leverage, firm size, environmental performance and company profile which are thought to have an effect on CSR disclosure.

From the background of the problem, phenomenon and gap research, the title of this research is: “Determinants of Profitability, Leverage, Firm Size and Environmental Performance Moderated Company Profile in Corporate CSR Disclosure on the IDX 2014-2019”. *Based on the background above, the formulation of this research is a* Do profitability, leverage, firm size and environmental performance moderated by company profile affect CSR disclosure?. The research Novelties are expected to provide benefits to organizational stakeholders in the government (public) and private (private) sectors, especially regarding management aspects in CSR disclosure and can be used as a reference for company policies, in consideration of company policies related to CSR disclosure.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Stakeholder Theory

Corporate social and environmental responsibility in Indonesia is matched with *corporate social responsibility* as stated in the Limited Liability Company Law no. 40 of 2007 Article 74, that corporate social and environmental responsibility is a state policy that is a shared responsibility to cooperate (to corporate) between the state, business people, companies, and the community, not otherwise seeking profit from the lack of legal rules that lead to neglect of the law. these responsibilities. The philosophical values contained in togetherness maintain the responsibility for harmonization of the economy, social and the environment as a common goal based on fair rules. (ius contiduendum).

Stakeholder theory starting with the assumption that the company can be explicitly influenced by various components of company decisions, policies and activities that involve stakeholders outside and within the company. Stakeholder theory has ethical (moral) and managerial fields. The field of ethics assumes that all stakeholders have the right to be treated fairly by the organization, while in the managerial field, managers must manage the organization for the benefit of all stakeholders. The hope that stakeholders are not only concerned with disclosing economic performance but also social and environmental conditions, will later be expected to have a positive impact on the company's business continuity strategy (going concern).(Jones et al., 2018, p. 8).

Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure or CSR Disclosure

Disclosure or *disclosure* Conceptually, it is a component of financial statements, so technically disclosure is the final part of the accounting process in the form of a full presentation of financial information statements (Suwarjono, 2005). Hendriksen (2000), states that disclosure is the disclosure of information presented for basic operational needs in an optimal investment scope. Disclosure activities are generally mandatory as well as voluntary. The company when disclosing financial and non-financial information aims to provide added value for the company. The information component that companies are required to report is information on CSR.

In implementing the principle of CSR responsibility, as implied as a basic need where companies are expected to not only prioritize the business interests of shareholders but also other essential components in the welfare of the company's business such as employees, local associations, NGOs, consumers, government and local communities where the company is located. . GCI in 2002 said this concept term with the abbreviation 3P (profit, people, planet), where the mission of business is not to seek profit, but can also prosper humans (people), and ensure sustainable life of the planet. In the sequel, there is a new breakthrough in the concept of corporate social responsibility which is termed the 3 P concept, The Triple Bottom Line(Zak, 2015, p. 28).

GRI Development

The development of the sustainability reporting guidelines by GRI began in 1997. GRI was formed in Boston, USA in 1997 driven by the "United Nations Environment Program" (UNEP), "Coalition for Environmentally Responsible Economies" (CERES) and the "Tellus Institute", with the formation of GRI starting to develop the first sustainability report criteria was in 2000. GRI has made several revisions to the sustainability report guidelines criteria using specific naming or coding for the second volume or GRI G2 or re-launched in 2002, then in 2006, 2011 and 2013 it was re-launched GRI G3 GRI G3.1, GRI G4.

GRI changes, transformed from GRI G3. Until GRI G4 there was a big difference in terms of preparing a sustainability report. The indicators in the previous version of GRI explanation G3.1 apply the concept of a certain level, while the current concept of change divides the report into three levels, namely A, B, and C by adjusting a special pattern based on the total point of disclosure. Level C points are disclosed relatively little and level A is disclosed more according to company level indicators. GRI G4 eliminates the application level directive, meaning that it is easier to use in its sustainability reports, so that indicators onGRI-G4 is a guide that is widely used, both professionals and beginners. The compilers of the sustainability reporting concept and many companies have the view that the greater the number of indicator points, the better. but ideally sustainability reporting remains consistent on issues related to economic sustainability, social sustainability, environmental sustainability and stakeholder sustainability. In 2015, GRI formed the “Global Sustainability Standard Board” with the mission of carrying out the development of standardization of sustainability reports. In October 2016, the GRI GSSB began to introduce the GRI Standards which were delivered in Indonesia in 2017. The GRI Standards came into effect on July 1 2018, and the continuous reporting standards were used after the date they were set.(Alfikri Romi, 2019, p. 15)

Benefits of CSR Disclosure

The term disclosure is related to how to explain technically and presentation procedures accurately and informatively that is useful for users, in addition to the main information conveyed through financial statements. It is important to convey information in the form of the latest information on financial conditions, performance governance that is reported and submitted to shareholders periodically. The purpose of the disclosure of corporate environmental social responsibility or *CSR disclosure*is for companies to convey environmental social responsibility carried out by the company within a certain period. The implementation of corporate environmental social responsibility can be submitted in an annual period in the financial report which also includes a report on corporate environmental social responsibility for a period of one year.(Abbas, 2018; Iskamto, 2014; Iskamto et al., 2020; Rizkia Anggita Sari, 2018, p. 128; Yadewani & Wijaya, 2021)

Profitability
according to(Abdul Halim & Hanafi., 2012, p. 89), the notion of profitability is "... the company's ability to generate profits or profits at a certain level of sales, assets and share capital." Profitability ratios are expected to be able to describe the basic ability of business entities to earn profits and measure the level of usability of operations carried out by management. Explanation(Abdul Halim & Hanafi., 2012)three profitability ratios that are widely used in the use of financial ratios.
.

Leverage
Explanation(Kasmir, 2016, pp. 151–152), the leverage ratio is: " ... the ratio used to measure the extent to which the company is financed with debt ".according to(Fahmi, 2015, p. 72), "leverage is the use of sources of funds that have a fixed burden, with the aim of providing increased profits from fixed costs, so that shareholder profits increase, consideration of using fixed costs, usually to increase shareholder income. Leverage is also a tool in increasing profit or return of yield or value without increasing investment (Basriani et al., 2021; Sukmadewi et al., 2021).

according to Kasmir, (2016, pp. 155–156)In practice, the use of this ratio is adjusted to the needs of the company, whether it will be used all or only partially. Some leverage ratios are:

- *Debt to Asset*
- *Debt ratio* Comparison of total debt with total assets, this analysis is used to measure how much the company's assets are financed from debt.
- *Debt to Equity Ratio:*
- This ratio compares total debt with equity, the purpose of use is to see how much rupiah of equity is used as debt security.
- Long Term Return On Equity (LTDEbr)
- Comparison of long-term debt with equity, it means that rupiah from each equity is used as collateral for long-term debt.
- *Time Interest Earned:*
- *Time interest earned*is the sizea ratio that assesses management's ability to pay or cover future interest costs. This ratio is classified as one of the financial ratios in the solvency ratio, because the times interest earned ratio assesses the company's ability to pay interest and debt.
- *Fixed Charge Coverage (FCC)*
- Used to get long debts based on a lease (lease contract).

Firm Size Company)
*Firm size a*tau company size is one of the variables that is widely used in explaining variations in disclosures in the company's annual financial statements. Usually large companies can disclose more information than small companies. Big companies will get more political risk than small companies. The size of assets or assets that are often used in measuring firm size, using the natural logarithm of total assets or assets.

Environmental Performance.
From research(Ayu & Wirawan, 2017)The term performance is an extension of kinetic energy and its equivalent is performance, defined as the output of a function or indicator of activities carried out by employees during a certain period. Hamalik (2013, p.195), describes the environment as a situational time that affects a person.

Environmental performance The company is assessed by looking at the color ranking based on the ranking list that the company has participated in through the Assessment Program Company Performance Rating (PROPER) from the Ministry of Environment (KLH).

The company's environmental performance from the PROFER value is proven to have an impact on CSR disclosure through great social care for the community and workforce.(Ayu & Wirawan, 2017, p. 2387; Iskamto, 2015; Rama Nopiana & Rusmiati Salvi, 2022)

Juridical Foundation and Scope of PROFER
Is an integrated program of the State Ministry of the Environment in implementing Law no. 23 of 1997 concerning Environmental Management.There are 4 main programs for PROPER implementation.
Supervision.
In Law no. 23/1977 Article 22 paragraph 1 explains that PROPER is a form of government supervision of companies: "The minister supervises the management of the person in charge of businesses and/or activities on the provisions stipulated in the laws and regulations in the environmental sector."
Information Disclosure
Submission of information on Law no. 23/1997:
Article 6 paragraph 2 states "everyone who carries out a business and/or activity is obliged to provide true and accurate information regarding environmental management".
Article 10 letter h, states "In the context of environmental management, the government is obliged to: provide environmental information and disseminate it to the public."
Public Participation
UU no. 23/1997 article 5 paragraph 2 states, "everyone has the right to environmental information related to his role in environmental management."
Entity's Liability
Listed in Law no. 23/ 1997 article 6 paragraph 2: states, every "individual who carries out a business and/or activity is obliged to provide true and accurate information regarding environmental management."
Company Profile (Company Profile)
Company profile or company profile is information on the company's field of operation(Rahman & Widyasari, 2008, p. 9). The relationship between the company profile and CSR disclosure can be seen in the variation in the effects of corporate governance on the environment and society. Company profile of the high profile type is seen as a company with high business competition and political risk, tends to choose environmental social responsibility. Under these conditions, it is expected to increase the good name of the company and affect the level of sales.
The company profile proxy of the company seen from the type of industry refers to Husaini's research (2020) in(Roberts, 1993)namely "high profile or low profile". High profile is seen as a business in the fields of mining, oil and gas, agribusiness, cigarettes, chemicals, food and beverage products, health, telecommunications, as well as transportation, and tourism. The profile is widely judged by the public regarding the company's business which is heavily involved in the public interest. Society in general is very sensitive to this business classification because the slightest carelessness of the company can have a fatal impact on the lives of many people. This classification was chosen because it is able to describe the company profile (Deviana et al., 2021; Htet, 2021; Iskamto, 2015).

Conceptual Framework
Main theory used in this research is stakeholder theory. The stakeholder approach aims to build a harmonization of work and solve problems faced by managers in the current era, namely global environmental changes. Stakeholder management aims to build strategic relationships in a design model of inter-group management participation. Stakeholders are individual or group parts that influence each other on the achievement of performance organization.This theory explains that entities do not always work for their own interests but must also provide benefits for other owners. From this information, the existence of an entity is greatly influenced by the support given by shareholders to the company, broadly speaking, Certo and Certo in(Ang Swat Lin & Eka, 2015) In stakeholder theory, the company is not the only entity that operates for the company and

the achievement of profits, but has a strategic aspect in maintaining the harmonization of the company's sustainability with other groups such as creditors, suppliers, consumers, government and society.(Chariri & Ghozali, 2017). The formulation of a series of research hypotheses is based on stakeholder theory, the analytical tool used in analyzing the influence and hypothesis testing is by using multiple linear regression analysis with Moderating Regression Analys (MRA) test, later conclusions will be obtained from the research results.

Research Hypothesis

Based on the existing theory and conceptual framework, the research contained in this research is:

H^1 : Profitability has an effect on CSR disclosure.
H^2 *: Leverage* effect on CSR disclosure.
H^3 : Firm size has an effect on CSR disclosure.
H^4 : Environmental performance has an effect on CSR disclosure.
H^5 : Company profile has an effect on CSR disclosure.
H^6 : Company profile is suspected to moderate the influence of the relationship between profitability, leverage, firm size and environmental performance with CSR Disclosure

RESEARCH METHODS

Scope of Research

Good research must be designed with activities and resources in mindwell structured power. The research design is a structured plan for research results that are directed from an objective and valid process of research results, the scope of research discussed in this study is as many as 5 independent variables, namely: profitability (X1), leverage (X2), firm size (X3), environmental performance (X4). and the company profile (Z) is suspected as a moderating variable, which will later be investigated for its effect on the dependent variable, namely *CSR disclosure* companies listed on the IDX for the period 2014 to 2019.

Type Study

The research conducted is quantitative associative, where this study analyzes the influence of the relationship between two and more variables, while the research data taken are secondary data..according to(Ikhsan, 2014), "Secondary data is a source of research data obtained indirectly through intermediary media". Figures and their combination of financial and non-financial reports are secondary data taken from both the annual report and the company's sustainability report data.

Research Place/Location

The subject of this research is a company that is listed or listed on the IDX, owns and publishes a report *sustainability report* and annual reports in a row during the period 2014-2019, while having a PROFER rating during the same year 2014-2019

Population

The definition of population from this research is all companies classified as main sectors such as raw material processing, manufacturing and service industries listed on the IDX with an initial observation period of 2014 to 2019, with a total of 667 companies. From the results of population observations, it turns out that as many as 200 issuer companies are incomplete in publishing Annual Reports periodically during 2014 to 2019,

Sample

The sample is the number of part of the population that is representative of the study.(Ghozali, 2016). The sample method chosen is based on purposive sampling, using various reasons (judgment sampling) for samples that do not meet the criteria and cannot have the opportunity to be selected as samples again, the criteria referred to are as follows:

Table 4
Research Sample

Sample Criteria	Number of samples
Companies listed on the IDX that publish sustainability reports from 2014 to 2019	46
Companies that are inconsistent or incomplete in publishing sustainability reports in a row during 2014-2019	(7)
Companies that do not have a PROFER rating during 2014-2109	(27)
Number of research samples	12
Observation year	6
Final research sample	72

Source: processed secondary data (2021) completeness of data can be seen in appendix 2.

Variables and Definitions Operational

Based on Ikhsan et al, (2014), the operational definition is a description that contains information and has been specifically tested. The following is a further explanation of the variables studied:

Profitability (X1)

Profitability is an organizational effort in generating profits. This variable is used to see the achievement of organizational performance in a certain period. This analysis also measures the operational effectiveness of the company. This ratio is an analytical tool in financial ratios. The profitability ratio of this study is Return on Assets (ROA), according to(Husni., 2011, p. 43)"Return on Assets (ROA) is one of the valuation methods that serves to measure the level of profitability of a company, namely the level of profit achieved by a company with all the funds in the company."

Leverage (X2)

According to Kasmir (2016), this variable measures the amount of assets financed from debt. This statement informs the rights of more than *debth olders* compared to the shareholder's authority.

***Firm Size*(X3)**

*Firm size*based on the size of the total assets, sales, number of employees, and market capitalization owned by the company. (Suhardjanto 2008). Firm size measurement is based on research by Akrout-Othman (2013), Van De Burgwal-Vieira (2014), transformed mathematically in the form of an asset logarithm to equate the calculation method with the variable in question, the reason for using the total asset value is because the asset value is greater than other indicators.

***Environmental Performance*(X4)**

From the research of Suratno, et al (2006) *environmental performance* is the company's participation in the program made by KML in the form of PROPER. Environmental performance assessment is based on research from Pradini (2013), Jannah (2014) and Jane Andriana (2017), which uses numbers 1 to 5 according to color in PROPER using direct selection of PROPER ranking reports at the Ministry of Environment.

***Company Profile*(Z)**

The public assesses the company based on the characteristics of the business model related to risk, total employees, and assets owned. From this assessment there are group categories, first*high profile*is an industrial group that is in the public spotlight due to operational performance that intersects with the community. The public is very sensitive to this type of company because the slightest carelessness of the company can have a bad impact on the community.

Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure or CSR Disclosure (Y)

Measurement *CSR* using the corporate social disclosure index (CSDI) with an explanation of the approach, namely the number 1 if the CSR instrument is disclosed, on the contrary 0 if the instrument from the CSR indicator is not reported, the number of points for each item is totaled to get the total value of each company. The CSDI calculation formula is as follows(Kristi, 2013)

$$\textit{CSR Disclosure Index} = \frac{\text{Total items disclosed by the company}}{\text{Total item disclosure GRI -G4}}$$

Data collection technique

Data collection is done by documentation, namely data collected from various sources and then studied. The data used is secondary data from financial and non-financial information of companies that issue SR and AR which are permanently downloaded on the official IDX website and registered company websites. While the theoretical literature is obtained through relevant research journals from various literatures in previous studies.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Description of Research Variable Statistics

The dependent variable (Y) in this research is CSR disclosure, while the independent variable (X) is profitability, leverage, firm size, and environmental performance, with the addition of a proxy company profile that is suspected to be a moderating variable (Z), the explanation of the results is:

Table 5.1
Descriptive Research Variables

Variable	Minimum	Maximum	mean	Std. Deviation
Profitability	-4,750	44,810	8.12583	10.934224
Leverage	0.130	0.740	0.44333	0.167769
Firm Size	15,480	18,570	17.13959	0.718483
Environmental Performance	3.00	5.00	3,52778	0.691441
Company Profile	0.000	1.00	0.91667	0.278325
CSR Disclosure	0.270	0.780	0.46278	0.120658

Source: Results of processed data (2021)

***Descriptive* Profitability Variable.**

Data *descriptive* the highest profitability is 44.81 while the lowest is -4.75. The mean profitability is 8.13 and the deviation is 10,934. The company with the largest profitability level in 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 was UNVR, worth 40.18, 37.20. 38.16. 37.05 and 35.80 Companies that have the lowest level of profitability in 2014 and 2015 are PT. Aneka Tambang (Persero) Tbk amounted to 3.52 and 4.75. 2016 is PT. Petrosea Tbk of -1.99 in 2017 is PT. Vale Indonesia Tbk of – 0.70, in 2018 and 2019 is PT. Salim Ivomas Pratama Tbk by -1.85 and -0.51.

***Descriptive* Variable Leverage**

Analysis result *descriptive* variable X2, the highest leverage is 0.740 the lowest is 0.13. The mean leverage value is 0.4433 with a standard deviation of 0.167769. The company with the largest level of leverage in 2014 to 2017 was PT. Unilever Indonesia Tbk of 0.68 0.69 0.72 and 0.64, in 2018 PT. Petrosea, Tbk of 0.66 and in 2019 is PT. Unilever Indonesia Tbk of 0.74. The company that has the lowest level of leverage in 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017 is PT. Indocement TP, Tbk 0.14, 0.14 0.13 and 0.15 for 2018 and 2019 are PT. Vale Indonesia, Tbk by 0.14 and 0.13.

***Descriptive* Firm Size Variable**

Analysis result *descriptive* variable X3, the highest firm size is 18,570 and the lowest is 15,480. The mean firm size value is 17.1395, with a deviation of 0.7185. The company with the largest firm size in 2014, 2015, 2016 and 2017 is PT. Perusahaan Gas Negara (Persero) Tbk amounted to 18.16 18.37 18.34 and 18.26. 2018 and 2019 are PT. United Traktor Tbk is 18.57 and 18.53 respectively. The company that has the lowest firm size level in 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 is PT. Petrosea Tbk amounted to 15.58 15.58 15.48. 15.59 15, 86 and 15.85.

***Descriptive* Environmental Performance Variables**

Analysis result *descriptive* variable X4, the highest environmental performance is 5, the lowest 3. The mean environmental performance is 3.5278 with a standard deviation of 0.69144. Companies at the largest environmental performance level in 2014 were PTBA at 5, in 2015 and 2016 PTBA and PT. Holcim Indonesia (Persero) Tbk each of 5. In 2017, 2018 and 2019 PTBA was 5.

Companies that have a level *environmental performance*the lowest in 2014 was PT. AKR Corporindo Tbk, PT. Aneka Tambang (Persero) Tbk, PT. Perusahaan Gas Negara (Persero) Tbk, PT. Salim Ivomas Pratama Tbk, PT. United Tractor Tbk each of 3. In 2015 it was PT. AKR Corporindo Tbk, PT. Vale Indonesia Tbk, PT. Perusahaan Gas Negara (Persero) Tbk, PT. Bukit Asam (Persero) Tbk, PT. Salim Ivomas Pratama Tbk, PT. United Tractors Tbk, PT. Unilever Indonesia Tbk each of 3.

***Descriptive* Company Profile Variables**

Analysis result*descriptive*The highest company profile variable is 1, the lowest is 0. The mean company profile is 0.92 with a deviation of 0.278. The company with the largest company profile in 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019 is PT. AKR Corporindo Tbk, PT. Aneka Tambang (Persero) Tbk, PT. Vale Indonesia Tbk, PT. Indocement Tunggal Prakarsa Tbk, PT. State Gas Company (Persero) Tbk (PGAS), PT. Bukit Asam (Persero) Tbk, PT. Petrosea Tbk, PT. Salim Ivomas Pratama Tbk, PT. Holcim Indonesia (Persero) Tbk, PT. Semen Indonesia (Persero) Tbk, PT. United Tractors Tbk, each with 1. The company with the lowest level of company profile in 2014 was PT. Unilever Indonesia Tbk each is 0. Descriptive Variable CSR Disclosure.

Analysis result *descriptive*The highest CSR disclosure variable is 0.780 and the lowest is 0.270. The mean value of CSR disclosure is 0.462 with a deviation of 0.128

Assumption Test.

Normality Testing.

according to(Ghozali, 2016), normality test is used to test whether a regression model, an independent variable and a dependent variable or both are normally distributed or vice versa, if a variable is not normally distributed it will cause the test results to decrease.

Testing the normality of the data can be seen in 2 ways:

Using PP Plot Graphs and Histograms

With the Kolmogorov Smirnov Test Sample Sample test

One sample Kolmogorov Smirnov test standard to see the normality of the data at a significance value above 5% or 0.05 is said to be normally distributed, on the other hand, the Kolmogorov Smirnov One Sample test value with a significance value below 5% or 0.05, is said to be abnormally distributed. The research uses a significance level of 5%, with an error rate of 0.05, this research is of the nature if it has a probability number (sig) > 0.05 seen from the calculation results of the SPSS statistical program.

Table 5.2

Summary of Normality with the One-Sample Kolmogorov Smirnov Test.

N		72
Normal Parameter	mean	0.00000000

	Std Deviation	0.107777060
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	0.088
	Positive	0.088
	negative	-0.76
Test Statistics		0.088
Asymp, Sig (2-tailed)		0.200 cd

Source: SPSS Ver. 26 (2021)

SPSS results on test *normality* The above shows that the value of the Kolmogorov Smirnov Test by looking at the Asymp Sig (2-tailed) is 0.200 > 0.05. The significance of the unstandardized residuals exceeds 0.05. It can be concluded that the data used is well distributed.

Multicollinearity Test

This test is intended to determine whether the regression data finds a correlation between the variables *independent.* A good model should not have a correlation between independent variables,(Ghozali, 2016, p. 103). Whether or not there is multicollinearity in the variable data seen from the variance inflation factor and tolerance value, the variable is said to have no multicollinearity if the VIF is not more than 10, and the tolerance value is 0.1. The summary of the results of the SPSS program from multicollinearity is:

Table 5.3

*Summary*Multicolonierity

Model	*Unstand B*	*Coeficients STD Error*	*Stand Coeffi Beta*	*t*	*Sig*	*Collinearity Tolerance*	*Statistics VIF*
(Constant)	*27,193*	*12,541*	*-*	*2.168*	*0.034*	*-*	*-*
Profitability	*-0.064*	*0.101*	*-0.075*	*-0.634*	*0.528*	*0.892*	*1,121*
Leverage	*-0.195*	*0.082*	*-0.0276*	*-2,377*	*0.020*	*0.915*	*1.093*
Firm Size	*0.405*	*0.381*	*0.122*	*1.062*	*0.292*	*0.930*	*1.075*
Environmental Performance	*4,909*	*1,995*	*0.282*	*2,461*	*0.016*	*0.937*	*1.067*
Company Profile	*3,855*	*4,823*	*0.089*	*0.799*	*0.427*	*0.989*	*1.011*

Source: SPSS Ver. data processing results. 26 (2021)

Based on the table above, it shows that this study does not have symptoms of multicollinearity, because all of these variables have a tolerance value of more than 0.1 and a VIF value of not more than 10, so it can be said that the data is free of symptoms. *multicollinearity*.

Heteroscedasticity Test

according to(Ghozali, 2016, p. 134), heteroscedasticity testing is used to test whether in the regression model there is an inequality of variance from the residuals of one observation to another observation, the significance value of each variable is greater than 0.05, there is no heteroscedasticity. The summary of heteroscedasticity data testing with the Spearman rank test is as follows:

Table 5.4

*Summary of Heteroscedasticity with*Spearman Rank

			X1	*X2*	*X3*	*X4*	*X5*	*Unst_Res*
Spearman Rho	*Profitability*	Corr_ Coef	1.00	-0.53	-0.25	0.084	-0.476	-0.009
		Siq (2-tail)	-	0.660	0.834	0.482	0.00	0.940
		N	72	72	72	72	72	72
	Leverage	Corr_ Coef	-0.53	1.00	-0.39	-0.78	-0.47	0.76
		Siq (2-tail)	0.660	-	0.00	0.51	0.00	0.528

				1			
	N	72	72	72	72	72	72
Firm Size	Corr_ Coef	-0.02	-0.39	1.00	-0.37	0.283	-0.057
	Siq (2-tail)	0.834	0.001	-	0.001	0.016	0.632
	N	72	72	72	72	72	72
Env Perform	Corr_ Coef	0.084	0.078	-0.37	1.00	0.160	-0.101
	Siq (2-tail)	0.482	0.514	0.001	-	0.18	0.398
	N	72	72	72	72	72	72
Comp_Prof	Corr_ Coef	-0.47	-0.47	0.283	0.160	1.00	-0.027
	Siq (2-tail)	0.00	0.00	0.016	0.180	-	0.824
	N	72	72	72	72	72	72
Unstand_Res	Corr_ Coef	-0.009	0.076	-0.05	-0.10	-0.027	1.00
	Siq (2-tail)	0.940	0.528	0.632	0.398	0.824	-
	N	72	72	72	72	72	72

Source: SPSS Ver. 26 (2021)

Autocorrelation Test

This test is intended to determine whether there is a correlation between interference errors from period t to t-1 (last), the regression model is said to be good if the regression model is free from autocorrelation symptoms.(Ghozali, 2016, p. 107), knowing the presence or absence of autocorrelation can use DW on SPSS.

The conclusion of whether or not there is autocorrelation in the regression model can be seen from the following information:

If DW is at the upper limit (dU) and (4-dU), then the autocorrelation coefficient is equal to zero, meaning that there is no autocorrelation symptom.

If DW is lower than the lower limit (dl) then the autocorrelation coefficient is greater than zero, there is an autocorrelation

If DW is greater (4-dl), then the autocorrelation coefficient is lower than zero, there is a negative autocorrelation symptom

If DW is between the upper limit (dU) and lower limit (dl) or DW lies between (4-dU) and (4-dl) the results cannot be concluded.

As for the result value*Durbin Watson*there is a table below;

Table 5.5

*summary*Autocorrelation

dL	dU	DW	4-dU	Information
1.4732	1.7688	1,899	2.2312	There is no autocorrelation

Source: SPSS Ver. 26 (2021)

From dL and DU using the Durbin Watson table at a significance level of 5%, (0.05), in the sample 72 (n) with the dependent variable 5 (k-5) there is a Durbin Watson value of 1.865 which is at the upper bound (du) and (4-du) which are 1.7688 < 1.899 < 2.2312 equal to zero which means that there is no autoclamation symptom.

Regression Model Test

With the classical assumptions fulfilled, multiple linear regression is feasible to be used in this study because the statistical requirements are met.

Coefficient of Determination Model Test

The SPSS output display in table 5. shows the magnitude of R^2*Square*of 0.210, this means that only 21% of the independent variables in this study have a relationship with the dependent variable (CSR disclosure) while the remaining 79% is influenced by other variables. Adjustted R Square value of 0.136 shows the variation of the increase in the decrease in the dependent variable by 13.6%, influenced by the independent variable.

Table 5.6

*Summary of Coefficient Analysis Model Results*Determination

Model	*R*	*R Square*	*Adj R Square*	*Std error The Estimate*	*Durbin Watson*
1	*0.458 a*	*0.210*	*0.136*	*0.11256*	*1,899*

Source: SPSS Ver. 26 (2021)

The relationship between the influence of independent variables,*profitability (X1), leverage (X2), firm size (X3) environmental performance (X4) and company profile (z)*with the dependent variable CSR disclosure (Y), has a low influence this is seen from the relationship interval shows a low correlation because it is on a scale of 0.000 to 0.210 seen from the interpretation table.

Table 5.7

Interpretation R_2

No	Coefficient Interval	Relationship Level
1	0.00 to 1.99	Very low
2	0.200 to 0.399	Low
3	0.400 to 0.5990	Currently
4	0.600 to 0.799	Strong
5	0.800 to 1.00	Very strong

Source: Soegiono, 2011

The writing of the multiple linear regression model is as follows:

Y= 0.624 +0.00X1-0.64X2-0.13X3+0.35X4 +0.51Z+ e

The value of the regression coefficient on the independent variable can be explained if the independent variable increases by one unit and the value of the other independent variables is estimated to be constant or equal to zero, then the dependent variable can increase or decrease according to the coefficient *regression* The independent variables, the conclusions can be explained as follows:

The constant value of 0.624 indicates that if the variables X1, X2, X3, X4 and Z have a value of 0, or have not changed, the company's environmental social responsibility disclosure or CSR disclosure (Y) is 0.624.

The value of the regression coefficient on the profitability variable (X1) shows a unidirectional or negative effect, which means that if the profitability variable (X1) increases by 1 unit, then the disclosure of corporate environmental social responsibility or CSR disclosure (Y) is 0%.

The value of the regression coefficient on the leverage variable (X2) shows a unidirectional or negative effect, which means that if the leverage variable (X2) increases by 1 unit, it will reduce CSR disclosure (Y) by 22.4%.

The value of the regression coefficient on the firm size variable (X3) shows a unidirectional or negative effect, which means that if the firm size variable (X3) increases by 1 unit, it will increase CSR disclosure (Y) by 1.3.5%.

The regression coefficient value on the environmental performance variable (X4) shows a unidirectional or positive effect, which means that if the environmental performance variable (X4) increases by 1 unit, it will increase CSR disclosure (Y) by 3.5%.

The value of the regression coefficient on the company profile variable (Z) shows a direct or positive influence, which means that if the company profile variable (Z) increases by 1 unit, it will increase CSR disclosure (Y) by 5.1%.

Simultaneous Significance Model Test

Based on the results of the F statistical test in table 5.10, the value of is obtained *probability*(F count) is 3.346 and the significance value is 0.009. So it can be concluded that simultaneously the independent variables profitability (X1), leverage (X2), firm size (X3) environmental performance (X4) and company profile (Z) simultaneously have a significant effect on the dependent variable CSR disclosure (Y).

Table 5.8

F Statistic Test Results (Simultaneous)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig
Regression	0.209	5	0.042	3,346	0.009b
Residual	0.825	66	0.012	-	-
Total	1.034	71	-	-	-

Source: SPSS Ver. data processing results. 26 (2021)

Partial Significance Model Test

The t statistic test was used to see the relationship of the independent variables one by one with the dependent variable. There are 2 (two) types of carrying out the t-test, namely by looking at the level of significance and comparing value of t count with the value of t table. Based on the significance of the error = 0.05, the second compares the numbers in t with the table based on the provisions if the t count is higher than the t table number, the hypothesis is accepted if the independent variable individually affects the dependent variable.(Ghozali Iman, 2018, p. 88).

Partial testing shows how much the independent variable explains the dependent variable individually. The dependent variables of this study are profitability, leverage, firm size, environmental performance and company profile with the dependent variable being CSR disclosure, at the 95% confidence level or = 5%. This step was taken to determine the extent of the influence of the variables profitability, leverage, firm size, environmental performance and company profile (Z)direct effect on CSR disclosure (Y)

If number has the smallest possible factor from the level of alpha (α) = 0.05, it can be concluded that the independent variable has a significant effect on the dependent variable. The value of t table is based on (df) = (n-1-k) =72-1-5=66 is equal to 1.99650 (attached)

Table 5.9

T Test Results (Partial)

Model	*Unstand B*	*coef. Std Err*	*Stand Coeff Beta*	*t*	*Siq*	*College Statistics*	
						Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	0.624	0.407	-	1.535	0.130	-	-
Profitability	0.00	0.003	-0.011	-0.045	0.964	0.186	5,363
Leverage	-0.224	0.098	-0.311	-2.282	0.024	0.651	1,537
Firm Size	-0.013	0.022	-0.080	-0.609	0.544	0.697	1.434
Env Performance	0.035	0.024	0.200	1,469	0.147	0.654	1,530
Company Profile	0.051	0.124	0.118	0.410	0.684	0.147	6,784

Source: SPSS Ver. 26 (2021)

From the data above, it can be explained the magnitude of the influence of each independent variable on the dependent variable:

Based on the calculation data using the SPSS 26 program as shown in table 5.9, the results of the t-test between the profitability variables on CSR disclosure where the probability has a t-count value of -0.045 and a significance level of 0.964, the provision of hypothesis decision making is accepted or rejected based on the t-count value and significance The results of the study obtained a significance value of 0.964 which is greater than 0.05 and a t-count value which is smaller than t-table (1.9965). It can be concluded that the hypothesis (H1) which states that profitability has an effect on CSR disclosure is rejected.
Based on the results of calculations using the SPSS 26 program as shown in table 5.9 The results of the t-test between the leverage variable and CSR disclosure where leverage has a t-count value of -2.282 and a significance level of 0.026. The results of the study obtained a significance value of 0.026 which is smaller than 0.05 and the t-count value is greater than t-table (1.9965). It can be concluded that the hypothesis (H2) which states that leverage has an effect on CSR disclosure is accepted.
Based on the results of calculations using the SPSS 26 program as shown in table 5.11 The results of the t-test between firm size variables and CSR disclosure where firm size has a t-count value of -0.609 and a significance level of 0.544, the provision of hypothesis decision-making is accepted or rejected based on the t-count value. and significance. The results of the study obtained a significance value of 0.544 which is greater than 0.05 and the t-count value is smaller than ttable (1.9965), so it can be concluded that the hypothesis (H3) which states that firm size affects CSR disclosure is rejected.
Based on the results of calculations using the SPSS 26 program as shown in table 5.9 The results of the t-test between environmental performance variables and CSR disclosure where environmental performance has a tcount value of 1.469 and a significance level of 0.147. The results of the study obtained a significance value of 0.147 which is greater than 0.05 and a t-count value which is smaller than t-table (1.9965). It can be concluded that the hypothesis (H4) which states that environmental performance has an effect on CSR disclosure is rejected.
Based on the results of calculations using the SPSS 26 program as shown in table 5.9 The results of the t-test between the company profile variables and CSR disclosure where the company profile has a tcount value of 0.410 and a significance level of 0.683. The results obtained a significance value of 0.410 which is greater than 0.05 and the value of t arithmetic is smaller than t table (1.9965), it can be concluded that the hypothesis (H5) which states that the company profile has an effect on CSR disclosure is rejected.
Based on the results of calculations using the SPSS 26 program as shown in table 5.9 The results of the t-test between the company profile variables and CSR disclosure where the company profile has a t-count value of 0.410 and a significance level of 0.683,The company profile variable which is suspected to be a moderating variable after a direct relationship test has no effect on CSR disclosure, so that the hypothesis (H6) which states that the company profile is thought to moderate the effect of the relationship between profitability, leverage, firm size and environmental performance with CSR Disclosure is rejected.

Moderation testing cannot be continued because there is no direct relationship between the company profile and CSR disclosure. In the absence of a direct influence, the company profile variable is not a moderating variable but only an ordinary independent variable.

Discussion

The Effect of Profitability on CSR Disclosure

Multiple linear regression testing can be seen in table 5.8 on the F statistical test, stating that profitability with other variables simultaneously affects the dependent variable or CSR disclosure, while the direct test sees the regression coefficient value with the t test, the profitability variable in the negative direction is 0.00 compared to The results of the t test of t arithmetic have the lowest value of the t table value (-0.045 < 1.9965) and the magnitude of significance (0.964 > 0.05) based on these results, it is concluded that profitability does not have a significant effect on CSR disclosure. (Y), so it can be said that the first hypothesis (H1) which states that the profitability variable (X1) has an effect on the Y variable or CSR disclosure is rejected.

This research refutes the first argument which concludes that high profitability means a lot of disclosure of social information. An entity with high profitability does not necessarily carry out more social and environmental activities. This is because the company's first orientation is profit. Another opinion also explains that the CSR disclosures carried out by the company are only used to legitimize and build a good image, so when profitability is high the company considers it unimportant to carry out wider social environmental activities (obligation bonds / compliance with minimum standards of obligations), on the other hand when financial performance is not good. The company feels it is important to create a positive image in attracting investors by conducting extensive CSR disclosure.(Agus Purwanto, 2007),(Kristi, 2013)and(Maulida Nayahita, 2018)where profitability has no significant effect on CSR disclosure and rejects research from (Selvi Mega Andriani, 2017), (Ivon Nimas Rurah and Sri Wahjudi Latifah, 2018) who found a relationship between profitability and CSR disclosure.

The Effect of Leverage on CSR Disclosure

Linear regression testing is seen in table 5.8, stating that simultaneously leverage with other variables affects the dependent variable or CSR disclosure, while the regression coefficient value with t test, leverage variable with a negative direction of 2.282 with t test results of the t arithmetic value greater than the t table value (2.282 > 1.9965) and the significance value which is smaller than the significance level (0.026 < 0.05) from the data above leverage has a significant effect on CSR disclosure. (Y) so it can be said that the second hypothesis (H2) which states that the leverage variable (X2) affects the Y variable or CSR disclosure is accepted.

Leverage describes the amount of assets financed from debt. In this study, the results obtained, leverage (X2) has a significant effect on CSR. disclosure in the negative direction, it can be seen from the t-statistic number -2.288 which is high compared to the t table (1.9965) in a negative correlation and the leverage value is below the error value of 5% (0.026 <0.05) and the 95% confidence point. The test results show that leverage has a significant effect on CSR disclosure. This is consistent with research conducted (Azwi et al, 2013),(Andrikopoulos, A. Kriklani, 2013)and(Rurah & Wahjuni, 2018)which concludes that leverage is significant and has an effect on CSR disclosure. and reject the research conducted (Yusi, et al, 2014), (I. Gusti, et al, 2015), (Meita, 2015), (Hangtono, Teng Sauh Hwee,2017) and (Maulida Nayahita, 2018), which stated that leverage is not significant effect on CSR disclosure.

Effect of Firm Size on CSR Disclosure

Multiple linear regression testing is seen in table 5.10, statistical test F, stating that simultaneously firm size with other variables affects the dependent variable or CSR disclosure, while the regression coefficient value with t test, firm size variable with a negative direction of 0.609 with t test results of The t-count value is smaller than the t-table value (0.609 < 1.9965) and a high significance number of the error rate (0.544 > 0.05) based on these results, it can be concluded that firm size (X3) has no significant effect on liability disclosure. corporate environmental social responsibility or CSR disclosure, so it can be said that the third hypothesis (H3) which states that the firm size variable (X3) has an effect on the Y variable or CSR disclosure is rejected.

This research is consistent with (Azwir, et al, 2013), (Yusi, et al, 2014), (I Gusti, et al, 2015), (Meita, et al, 2015), (Maulida Nayahita, 2018), and (Risky Latif Rosyadi, 2018) firm size does not affect CSR disclosure and rejects research conducted by (Kamil and Antonius, 2012), (Dermawan and Tita, 2014), (Herawati, 2015), (Teng Sau Hwee, 2017), and (Dika Austin, 2018) which states that firm size has a significant influence on CSR disclosure.

Effect of Environmental Performance on CSR Disclosure

Multiple linear regression testing is seen in table 5.8 F statistical test, stating that simultaneously environmental performance with other variables affects the dependent variable or CSR disclosure, while the regression coefficient value with t test, environmental performance variable with a positive direction of 1.469 with t test results of the value The smaller t arithmetic value of t table (1.469 < 1.9965) a number that is smaller than the significance of tolerance (0.147 > 0.05) from the above can be said to be environmental performance, does not have a significant impact on CSR disclosure, the conclusion of the fourth hypothesis which states that the environmental disclosure variable (X4) has an effect on the Y variable or CSR disclosure is rejected.

This study is consistent with research from (Ingram and Frazier, 2000), (Wijaya, 2012), (Ida Maria, 2012), (Dwi Oktalia, 2014), which found no significant relationship in testing the relationship between environmental performance and CSR disclosure and rejects research from (Suratno et al, 2006), (Syaiful Bahri and Febby Anggista Cahyani, 2016), and (N. Lutfi, 2017), stating that environmental performance has a significant positive effect on CSR disclosure.

Effect of Company Profile on CSR Disclosure

Multiple linear regression testing can be seen in table 5.8, statistical test F, states that the company profile simultaneously with other variables affects the dependent variable or CSR disclosure, while the regression coefficient value with t test, company profile variable with a positive direction of 0.410 with t test results from the lowest t arithmetic value t table ($0.410 < 1.9965$) and the significance is greater than the tolerance level ($0.683 > 0.05$), from the information it is said that the company profile (X5) has no impact on CSR disclosure, so it can be said that the fifth hypothesis (H5) which states that the company profile variable (X5) has an effect on the Y variable or CSR disclosure is rejected

This study is consistent with (Zuhroh and Sukmawati, 2003), (Fauzi et al., 2007) and (Nadiah, 2011) which found empirical evidence that company profiles have no effect on CSR disclosure. And rejects research (Gunawan, 2000), (Hasibuan, 2001) and (Djakman and Machmud, 2018) which state that the company profile has a significant influence on CSR disclosure.

The influence of the company profile is thought to moderate the influence of the relationship between profitability, leverage, firm size and environmental performance with CSR disclosure

Based on the results of calculations using the SPSS 26 program as shown in table 5.8 The results of the t-test between the company profile variables and CSR disclosure where the company profile produces a t-count value of 0.410 and a significance of 0.683obtained insignificant results, it can be concluded that hypothesis 6 is rejected, meaning that the company profile variable at the time of direct testing has no effect and is significant, with the conclusion that the company profile variable is not a moderator that strengthens and weakens the correlation of one variable and more so that it can be concluded that hypothesis 6 is rejected.

This research is consistent with what was done (Nurkhin, 2009), stated that the company profile had no effect on CSR disclosure, and rejected research (Sembiring, 2005), (Anggraini, 2006), (Yuliawan Dwi Cahyo, 2011) and (Ni Luh Asri Suryaputri, I Putu Sudana, 2017) stated that the company profile has a significant influence on CSR disclosure

Research Implication

The impact of this research includes 2 (two) things, namely theoretical and practical. Theoretical implications relate to the contribution of the findings to the development of theories*CSR disclosure*and then practically relates to research findings on the achievement of CSR disclosure.

Theoretical Implications.

Stakeholder theory sees that companies with high levels of leverage are more likely to reduce the level of CSR disclosure. With the high level of leverage, the company's fixed costs will increase. This will result in limited CSR disclosure. The company will try to carry out CSR disclosure activities to a minimum to avoid pressure from creditors. Creditors can influence and pressure the company if the company is too busy with social activities, creditors expect their interests to be prioritized by the company rather than carrying out social activities. This research proves the validity of stakeholder theory as the theory that underlies this research. This research is in line with research conducted by Amran & Devi (2008) and Andrikopoulos & Krkodeni (2013)

Practical Implications

The practical impact of research shows data and material for consideration for entities, especially companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange that publish *sustainability report f*or decision making for the management, If the company wants to increase the disclosure of corporate environmental social responsibility, the company must also improve the quality and quantity of the company's CSR disclosures contained in the report. Partially, only leverage has an impact on CSR disclosure. This condition indicates that CSR disclosure is important for entities that intersect with the interests of the community, creditors and other related parties. The implementation of CSR creates harmonious relationships and eliminates gaps that interfere with the sustainability (existence) of the company's business activities. This research also explains that only leverage has an effect on CSR disclosure, therefore it is necessary to re-examine the factors that influence CSR disclosure by adding different variables, objects, and periods.

Limitations.

The research conducted shows that there are still many limitations of this research, including:

The results of the Adjusted R Square test are 21%, where these results indicate that the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable in this study is still low and there are many other factors outside the variables studied that affect the dependent variable of the study.

The use of a dummy variable or dichotomy is not recommended as a moderating variable, because when the direct test is carried out the results will not be significant, for example, the company profile which is used as the moderating variable from the direct test results is not significant to the dependent variable.

The small number of research samples is only 12 companies, with a research period of 6 years (2014-2019) so that the research sample is only 72 samples.

Another limitation is that the selection of research sample criteria must consistently publish sustainability reports and PROFER regularly during the year of observation, thus causing a large number of populations that cannot be used as research samples due to the absence of opportunities or equal opportunities for each element of the population to be selected as samples.

CONCLUSION

The results of the analysis presented from this study are:

Profitability(X1) has no significant effect on CSR disclosure. This condition is due to the profits obtained first being used for operational purposes. This situation is used by management as an attraction for company development rather than implementing CSR disclosure.*Leverage* (X2) has a significant impact on CSR disclosure. This illustrates the succe ss of wealth and asset management in providing high returns to investors. In conditions of greater obligations, the financial obligations are also large, this forces the company to pay off its obligations first compared to carrying out other obligations. *Firm size* (X3) has no impact on CSR disclosure. (Y). This information explains that the disclosure of environmental social responsibility does not depend on the size of the company. Another reason is that the disclosure of corporate social responsibility is not related to the size of the total assets owned by the company, the company does not want to carry out corporate social responsibility programs because they see it only as an expense. *Environmental performance* (X4), has no significant effect on CSR disclosure. (Y). Environmental performance as measured by PROPER has no impact on the company's CSR disclosure. CSR disclosures made by the sample companies that follow PROPER, are not widely disclosed in the sustainability report. The results of the 72 data processing are mostly blue companies, meaning that environmental management carried out by companies is limited to responsibilities regulated by regulations. *Company profile* (Z) has no significant effect on CSR disclosure. (Y). From the information above, it can be concluded that the sample companies that have a high company profile also report limited or incomplete CSR disclosures, so it can be said that the size of CSR disclosure is not influenced by the company profile.

Company profile(Z) or the company profile that is suspected to moderate the profitability (X1), leverage (X2), firm size (X3) and environmental performance (X4) variables on CSR disclosure (Y), when the direct test is carried out the results have no effect and are not significant. so that it can be said that the company profile variable (X5), presumed to be a moderating variable that can strengthen and weaken the independent variable, is not a moderating variable. *Adjusted R Square*13.6%, indicating the small impact of the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable and the number of other factors that have not been studied outside of this study..

REFERENCES

Abbas, Dj. (2018). Pengaruh Modal Usaha, Orientasi Pasar, dan Orientasi Kewirausahaan Terhadap Kinerja Ukm Kota Makassar. *Jurnal Minds: Manajemen Ide dan Inspirasi*, *5*(1), 95–111. https://doi.org/10.24252/minds.v5i1.4991

Abdul Halim, & Hanafi., M. (2012). *Analisi Laporan Keuangan*. Yogyakarta: UPP STIM YKPN.

Agus Purwanto. (2007). *Pengaruh Tipe Industri, Ukuran Perushaan, Profitabilitas Terhadap Corporate Social Responsibility*. *15*, 12–29.

Alfikri Romi. (2019). *Analisis Perbandingan Pengungkapan Ekonomi dan Lingkungan pada Laporan Keberlanjutan Perusahaan Internasional Sebelum dan Sesudah Mendapatkan Peringkat Platinum dalam Asia Sustainability Reporting Rating (ASRR) 2018 Berdasarkan Standar GRI.* Universitas Andalas.

Andrikopoulos, A. Kriklani, N. (2013). *Environmental Disclosure and Financial Characteristics of the Firm: The Case of Denmark. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management, 20(1), 55-64.*

Ang Swat Lin, L., & Eka, M. P. (2015). Corporate Social Responsibility: Implikasi Stakeholder dan Legitimacy Gap dalam Peningkatan Kinerja Perusahaan. *Jurnal Akuntansi Multiparadigma*, 157–174. https://doi.org/10.18202/jamal.2015.04.6013

Ayu, I. O. P. D., & Wirawan, G. (2017). Pengaruh Ukuran Perusahaan, Profitabilitas, Tipe Industri Dan Kinerja Lingkungan Terhadap Environmental Disclosure. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi*, *20*(3), 2362–2391.

Basriani, A., Susanti, D., Zainal, R., & Sofyan, D. (2021). The Influence of Capital, Independence, and Education on Women's Entrepreneurial Motivation in Indonesia. *Husnayain Business Review*, *1*(1), 28–37. https://doi.org/10.54099/hbr.v1i1.24

Chariri, A., & Ghozali. (2017). *Teori Akuntansi*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Deviana, D. S., Agusra, D., & Prihastuti, A. H. (2021). Does Standardization of Service Tax Volunteer and Location Affect on Taxpayer Satisfaction? *International Journal of Islamic Business and Management Review*, *1*(1), 69–80. https://doi.org/10.54099/ijibmr.v1i1.52

Fahmi, Irham. (2015). *Analisis Laporan Keuangan.* Bandung: Alfabeta.

Ghozali, I. (2016). *Desain Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif untuk Akuntansi, Bisnis, dan Ilmu Sosial Lainnya*. Yoga Pratama.

Ghozali Iman. (2018). Aplikasi Analisis Multivariate Dengan Program IBM SPSS 25. In *25 Edisi 9.* (Edisi 9.). Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro.

Htet, A. T. (2021). Factors Influencing Community Participation of Youth Affairs Committee Members in Mon State Myanmar. *International Journal of Islamic Business and Management Review*, *1*(1), 35–47. https://doi.org/10.54099/ijibmr.v1i1.39

Husni. (2011). Pengaruh ROE, BOPO, dan NPL terhadap Tingkat Deposito Mudharabah pada Bank Syariah. Depok. *Husni. 2011. Pengaruh ROE, BOPO, Dan NPL Terhadap Tingkat Deposito Mudharabah Pada Bank Syariah. Depok: Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Gunadarma.*, *Universitas Gunadharma*.

Ikhsan, A. (2014). *Metodologi Penelitian Untuk Akuntansi dan Manajemen.* Bandung: Citapustaka Media.

Iskamto, D. (2014). Analisi Kualitas Pelayanan Kartu Seluler Telkom Flexi Wilayah Duri Provinsi Riau. *Eko Dan Bisnis (Riau Economics and Business Review)*, *5*(4).

Iskamto, D. (2015). Anomali Pasar Pada Bursa Efek Indonesia. *Jurnal Tepak Manajemen Bisnis*, *VII*(3).

Iskamto, D., Ghazali, P. L., & Aftanorhan, A. (2020). Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) To Measure Entrepreneur Satisfaction. *The International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management*, 9.

Jones, T. M., Harrison, J. S., & Felps, W. (2018). How Applying Instrumental Stakeholder Theory Can Provide Sustainable Competitive Advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, *43*(3), 371–391. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2016.0111

Kasmir. (2016). *Analisis Laporan Keuangan.* PT Rajawali Grafindo Persada.

Kristi, A. A. (2013). Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Pengungkapan Corporate Social Responsibility pada Perusahaan Publik Di Indonesia. *Fakultas Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Universitas Brawijaya*, *Volume 53*(9), 1–27.

Maulida Nayahita. (2018). *Analisis Pengaruh Ukuran Perusahaan, Umur Perusahaan, Profitabilitas, Leverage dan Pertumbuhan Perusahaan Terhadap Corporate Social Responsibility*. 1–179.

Rahman, A., & Widyasari, K. N. (2008). The analysis of company characteristics influence toward CSR Disclosure. Empirical evidence of manufacturing companies lited in JSX. *JAAI, 12(1), 25–35*, *25–35*.

Rama Nopiana, P. & Rusmiati Salvi. (2022). Analysis of Governance, Leverage and Financial Distress Conditions on Earnings Management in the Banking Services Sector in Indonesia. *Asean International Journal of Business*, *1*(1), 34–42. https://doi.org/10.54099/aijb.v1i1.69

Rizkia Anggita Sari. (2018). *Pengaruh karakteristik perusahaan terhadap corporate social responsibility disclosure pada perusahaan manufaktur yang terdaftar di bursa efek Indonesia*.

Roberts, W. R. (1993). Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure An Aplication of Stakeholde Theory. *Accounting Organiation and Society. 17(6), 595-612*, *17(6), 595*.

Rurah, I. N., & Wahjuni, S. (2018). *Pengaruh Profitabilitas, Leverage, Ukuran Perushaan dan Rsik Minimization Terhadap Pengungkapan Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) (Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Pertambangan Yang Terdaftar Di Bei Periode 2015- 2016)*. *1*, 42–53.

Sukmadewi, R., Sartika, D., Muin, M. R., & Sofyan, D. (2021). The Effect of Liquidity Ratio and Solvency Ratio on the Profitability of Plantation Subsector Companies Listed on the Indonesian Stock Exchange. *Husnayain Business Review*, *1*(1), 69–77. https://doi.org/10.54099/hbr.v1i1.23

Yadewani, D., & Wijaya, R. (2021). The Effect of Compensation and Career Development on Employee Turnover Intention in the Culinary Sector. *ADPEBI International Journal of Business and Social Science*, *1*(1), 37–44. https://doi.org/10.54099/aijbs.v1i1.28

Zak, A. (2015). Triple Bottom Line Concept in Theory and Practice. *Prace Naukowe Uniwersytetu Ekonomicznego We Wrocławiu*, *387*. https://doi.org/10.15611/pn.2015.387.21