



The Influence of Company Characteristics Toward Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

Jurica Lucyanda

*Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, Bakrie University, Jakarta - Indonesia
e-mail: jurica.lucyanda@bakrie.ac.id*

Lady GraciaPrilia Siagian

*Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, Bakrie University Jakarta - Indonesia
e-mail: lady.siagian@hotmail.com*

Abstract

The study aimed to examine the influence of company characteristics toward Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure. The variables used in this research are by firm size, company profitability, company leverage, board of commissioner size, company profile, company age, management ownership, earning per share, environmental concern, and growth opportunities. The populations are all company member of Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2007-2998 periods. The samples are 273 samples that eliminated using purposive sampling. The analysis methods are using multiple regression analysis. The measurement of the disclosure is using Corporate Social Responsibility Rating System that was modified by Sutanto (2008) from Global Reporting Initiatives (GRI) Index 2002. The research found that company size, company profitability, company profile, earning per share, and environmental concern have an influence toward the Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure. The research also found that leverage, board of commissioner size, company profile, company age, management ownership, and growth opportunities have no influence toward the Corporate Social Responsibility.

Keywords: *Corporate social responsibility disclosure, company characteristics, management ownership, environmental concern, growth opportunities*

INTRODUCTION

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is an integral component of the company's operations where the company voluntarily contributes to the environment in terms of economic, environmental, ethical, and social investment (Kanji & Chopra, 2010). Company is responsible for the actions that affect consumption, society, and environment (Ronalde, 2006). The importance of disclosures in the financial statements can be seen from the regulations set forth by the government, namely the Capital Market Supervisory Agency Regulation (BAPEPAM Number KEP-38/PM/1996 and Regulation Number VIII.G.2) concerning the annual report. With direct regulation of the government, the companies increasingly compelled to disclose its social responsibility.



Studies with respect to corporate social responsibility disclosure is made in Indonesia, among others Sembiring (2005), Hendrasaputra (2007), Bramono (2008), Rahman and Widyasari (2008), Tampubolon (2008), Apriwenni (2009), Putra (2009), Veronica (2009), Untari (2010), Yulita (2010), and Fahrizqi (2011). The factors that differentiate companies known as companies' characteristics consisting of company size, liquidity level, profitability, leverage level, the social constraints faced, company age, company profile, board structure, the owner of a company, the country of establishment companies that affects the company's corporate social responsibility (Veronica, 2009).

Company size is often used as a characteristic that affects the company's corporate social responsibility disclosure in many previous studies and provides different results. Previous studies of Rahman and Widyasari (2008), Tampubolon (2008), Putra (2009), Veronica (2009), and Yulita (2010), the results showed that company size has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. In contrast to those studies, studies of Sembiring (2005), Apriwenni (2009), Prihandono (2010), Untari (2010), Fahrizqi (2011), and Purnasiwi (2011) found a company size has effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Company profitability is the company's characteristics used as factors influencing corporate social responsibility disclosure. The result of research by Hendrasaputra (2007), Bramono (2008), Putra (2009), Veronica (2009), Prihandono (2010), Untari (2010) and Fahrizqi (2011) indicates company profitability affect corporate social responsibility disclosure. However, research conducted by Sembiring (2005), Rahman (2008), Apriwenni (2009), Yulita (2010), and Purnasiwi (2011), found that company profitability has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Characteristics of the company's leverage are used in research related to the disclosure of corporate social responsibility. Based on the results of research by Sembiring (2005), Rahman (2008), Putra (2009), Veronica (2009), Untari (2010), and Yulita (2010), the company's leverage has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Instead Apriwenni study (2009) and Purnasiwi study (2011) found that the company leverage affect the corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Board of commissioner is an important part in the life of a company. Research of Sembiring (2005), Putra (2009), and Yulita (2010) explain that the board of commissioner affects the corporate social responsibility disclosure. In contrast Fahrizqi (2011) found that the board of commissioner has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Company profile is used as a factor influencing corporate social responsibility disclosure. The result of Sembiring (2005); Hendrasaputra (2007); Rahman and Widyasari (2008) found that a company profile has influence on corporate social



responsibility disclosure. In contrast Putra (2009) found the company profile has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Untari's research (2010) found company's age affects the company corporate social responsibility disclosure. However, this does not correspond with the results of the Putra (2009) and Prihandono (2010) who found otherwise (company's had no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure).

Rahman and Widayasari (2008) include the characteristics that are less commonly used, namely the percentage of management ownership of shares of the company. His research result that these characteristics affect corporate social responsibility disclosure. In contrast to that study, Apriwenni (2009) found that management ownership has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Putra's research (2009) use earnings per share as factors influencing corporate social responsibility disclosure. This research resulted in earnings per share affects corporate social responsibility disclosure. Tampubolon (2008) using different factors and is rarely used compared to other studies of the environmental concern and growth opportunities. In his research, he finds environmental concern has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Growth factors are not linked directly to the disclosure of corporate social responsibility, but because the company's growth rate is a picture of the strength of a company to survive, the authors are interested in finding out the relationship of these variables on the disclosure of corporate social responsibility.

Based on the results of previous studies that indicate a research gap, the authors are interested in re-researching on the effect of company's characteristics (company size, company profitability, company leverage, board of Commissioners, company profile, company age, management ownership, earnings per share, environmental concern, and growth opportunities) against corporate social responsibility disclosure. The purpose of this study was to test empirically whether the company size, company profitability, company leverage, board of commissioners, company profile, company age, management ownership, earnings per share, environmental concern, and growth opportunities affect corporate social responsibility disclosure.

REFERENCES REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS

Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

The issue of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has gained the attention from various parties. Especially in Europe, the political body such as the European Commission has been the key driver of corporate social responsibility. With its journal known popularly as "Green Paper", European Commission gives a broad



definition of CSR and focuses on two different aspects of corporate responsibility, namely: (1) as a management tool, CSR should be able to ensure that relevant aspects of CSR has become part of the company's daily business and has been integrated into the management structure, and (2) as a political demand, CSR describes the voluntary participation of the company for a better society and a healthier environment (Aßländer, 2011).

According to Gray et al. (1987) in Sembiring (2005), there are two significantly different approaches in conducting research on corporate social responsibility disclosure. First, corporate social responsibility disclosure is treated as a supplement of a conventional accounting activities. The second alternative approach is to put corporate social responsibility disclosure to a testing role in public relations and information organization.

Company Characteristics

In this study ten characteristics of companies (the company size, company profitability, company leverage, commissioner size, company profile, company age, management ownership, earnings per share, environmental concern, and growth opportunities) that are considered related to the disclosure of company financial statements. Company size is the size of the company's image, which can be assessed based on the volatility of the company's activities, which can be viewed from various aspects. Cowen, Ferreri, and Parker (1987) revealed that larger companies do a lot more activity, causing a greater impact on the environment, have more shareholders who may be concerned with corporate social programs, and its financial reports provide an efficient tool in communicating corporate social information. Research conducted by Anggraini (2006) and Apriwenni (2009) produces a positive effect of firm size on the level of social disclosure.

Profitability is the company's ability to produce a profit that would sustain long-term and short-term growth. Profitability is a factor that makes the management free and flexible in expressing its social responsibility to its shareholders (Anggraini, 2006). The higher the level of corporate profitability should be the greater the level of social disclosure (Bowman &Haire, 1976; Preston, 1978 in Hackston& Milne, 1996).

Leverage is the use of various financial instruments or borrowed funds, such as margin, to increase the potential return of an investment. Leverage can be created through the right options, margin and other financial instruments. According to Belkaoui and Karpik (1989), the decision to disclose social information will follow for certain outflow for the disclosure that will lower corporate earnings. If so, then the company has a high level of leverage will have a low level of social disclosure.



Board of commissioners is board in charge to supervise and advise the board of directors. Related to the size of the board of commissioners, Coller and Gregory (1999) suggest that the greater the number of commissioners, the easier to control Chief Executive Officer (CEO) and the supervision will be more effective. This is reinforced by the results of research conducted by the Putra (2009) and Veronica (2009) which was board of commissioner showed a positive effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Company profile is a description of the company's field operations. Related company profile, the field of operations, generally, will be divided into two types, namely the high-profile and low-profile company. High-profile companies are companies in the field of automotive, aviation, agribusiness, tobacco and cigarettes, food and beverage, media and communications, energy (electricity), health and transport. While the low-profile company is a company that is in the field of construction companies, finance and banking, medical equipment providers, real estate, retail, textiles, personal products and household products (Hendrasaputra, 2007).

Logically, the longer the company's established, the more things are learned more and more improvements are made. Companies will always try to meet the demands given to it. All of this is to improve the company image in the eyes of investors and the public. In her research, Untari (2010) also stated that the company's age affects the disclosure of corporate social responsibility.

According to Fraser (2005), the larger the holdings of company's management will make a better performance in maximizing corporate value. Manager of the company will disclose information to improve the social image of the company, although the management had to sacrifice resources for the event.

Earnings per share represents the amount of income earned in one period for each outstanding share of stock, and will be used by the company to determine the amount of dividends to be distributed. According to Alexander and Buholdz (1977) in Belkoui and Karpik (1991), management is aware of and pays attention to social problems will propose the necessary capabilities to drive financial performance. Consequently, companies that have a social response in relation to the disclosure of social responsibility should be thinking about the return on investment. Therefore, it can be said that earnings per share has positive effects on corporate social responsibility disclosure.

ISO 14001 is an international standard that determines the extent to which companies can implement the Environmental Management System (EMS). By this standard, companies can identify aspects of business that have an impact on the environment and understand the environmental laws relevant to the circumstances of



the company. Variable environmental concern has a positive effect on the disclosure of corporate social responsibility (Tuwajiri et al., 2003 in Tampubolon, 2008).

Measurement of growth rate measures the difference between market valuation on the company's value and the estimated aggregate value of accounting transactions mandated by Financial Accounting Standards or FAS (Tampubolon, 2008). Previous research indicates environmental performance affects corporate social responsibility disclosure (Porter, 2009).

Company Size and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

Previous studies showed that company size has a positive effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure (Anggraini, 2006; Sembiring, 2005; Apriwenni, 2009; Untari, 2010; Amal, 2011; and Fahrizqi, 2011). In contrast to the results of research conducted by Rahman and Widyasari (2008), Tampubolon (2008), Putra (2009), Veronica (2009), and Yulita (2010) showed that company size has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Based on the results of previous studies, the hypothesis proposed:

H₁: Company size has a positive influence toward corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Company Profitability and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

The result of Hendrasaputra (2007), Bramono (2008), Putra (2009), Nurdin (2009), Veronica (2009), Prihandono (2010), Sari (2010), Untari (2010), Amal (2011), and Fahrizqi (2011) indicates company profitability affects corporate social responsibility disclosure. In contrast to studies conducted Sembiring (2005), Rahman and Widyasari (2008), Apriwenni (2009), Yulita (2010), and Purnasiwi (2011) who found that company profitability has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Based on the results of previous studies, the hypothesis proposed:

H₂: Company profitability has a positive influence toward corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Company Leverage and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

Based on agency theory, company management with high leverage levels will reduce corporate social responsibility disclosure. This theory is evidenced from studies by Belkaoui and Karpik (1989); Cornier and Magnan (1999) in Sembiring (2005); and Purnasiwi (2011) which concludes company that produces the leverage has effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. However, different from the results of research conducted by Sembiring (2005), Rahman and Widayasari (2008), Veronica (2009), Untari (2010) and Yulita (2010), suggesting that the company leverage has no



effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Based on the difference in the results of these studies, the hypothesis proposed:

H₃: Company leverage has a negative influence toward corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Board of Commissioner and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

Research of Coller and Gregory (1999), Sembiring (2005), Putra (2009), Nurdin (2009), Veronica (2009), Yulita (2010) and Untari (2010) concludes board of commissioner produces a positive effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Fahrizqi's research (2011) found the board of commissioner is not a positive influence on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Based on the results of previous studies, the hypothesis is proposed:

H₄: Board of commissioner has a positive influence toward corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Company Profile Corporate Social Responsibility and Disclosure

Based on research (Sembiring, 2005); Hendrasaputra (2007), and Rahman and Widyasari (2008), companies tend to disclose high-profile corporate social responsibility to restore his reputation than the low-profile company. However, in contrast to result of Putra (2009), company profile has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Based on the results of previous studies, the hypothesis proposed:

H₅: Company profile has a positive influence toward corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Company Age and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

Age of the company shows the company's ability to compete in a challenging business world. In general, companies that have been doing business will likely reveal more social information than the new operating company (Anindita, 2008). The larger companies are increasingly trying to provide something that is best for the community to express their social activities. Research conducted by Untari (2010) showed a positive effect of company's age on corporate social disclosure. However, in contrast to Untari's result of research, Prihandono (2010) found that company age has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Based on the results of previous studies, the hypothesis proposed:

H₆: Company's age has a positive influence toward corporate social responsibility disclosure.



Management Ownership and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

The greater ownership in a company's management increases productivity and maximizes the performance of managers within the company. Company manager tried to disclose the information to improve the social image of the company, even at the expense of its resources (Fraser, 2005). Amal's research (2011) found that management ownership affects toward corporate social responsibility disclosure. Researchs of Rahman and Widayarsi (2008), and Apriwenni (2009) found that management ownership has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Based on these considerations, the hypothesis proposed:

H₇: Management ownership has a positive influence toward corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Earning per share and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

Earnings per share are the right tool to see the level of profits of an enterprise. A good level of profit should make companies able to run the company's operations well. Management capabilities level in making a profit should be equal to the level of corporate social views. The higher the earnings per share of the company, can make the better the level of corporate social responsibility disclosure (Putra, 2009). Research of Sari (2010) showed that earning per share has effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Based on the results of previous studies, the hypothesis proposed:

H₈: Earning per share has a positive influence toward corporate social responsibility disclosure.

Environmental concern and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

The higher one's level of concern, surely the better way of life he reflected to the people around him. Similarly, environmental concern is believed to have a positive relationship to corporate social responsibility disclosure (Tuwajiri et al., 2003 in Tampubolon, 2008). Based on the results of previous studies, the hypothesis proposed:

H₉: Environmental Concern has a positive influence toward corporate social responsibility disclosure

Company Growth Opportunities and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure

In previous studies, there is a belief that the growth rate has a positive relationship with the company's environmental performance (Tuwajiri et al, 2003 in Tampubolon, 2008). Plus, as it has been mentioned earlier, environmental performance affects corporate social responsibility disclosure (Porter, 2009). Therefore, it can be concluded that the rate of growth of the company has an



influence on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Based on the results of previous studies, the hypothesis proposed:

H₁₀: Company growth opportunities has a positive influence toward corporate social responsibility disclosure.

RESEARCH METHOD

Population, Sampling and Data

The population in this study is all listed companies and issue shares on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (BEI) in the years 2007-2009. Sampling was conducted using purposive sampling method, based on several criteria of the company: (1) report the activities related to CSR in the company's annual financial statements, (2) the company's financial statements using the Euro currency, (3) has a positive value of net income, and (4) do not have a negative equity value. Based on sampling results of the 273 samples are attained (Appendix 2). Source of data used in this study is secondary data. Data collection techniques using archival research.

Variables Operationalization

Measurement is using CSR Rating System that has been modified from the Global Reporting Initiatives 2002. This system was popularized by Sutanto (2008) where this CSR Rating System has more advantages compared to the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) Index.

Company size is measured by the amount of the total assets of the company as a parameter measuring the size of the company. Company profitability is measured by Return on Assets (ROA) with the formula of net income divided by total assets. Company leverage is measured by Debt to Equity Ratio (DER) with the formula of total liabilities divided by shareholder equity. Board of commissioner is calculated based on the number of commissioners.

Company profile is using a dummy variable, where the high-profile companies are given a value of 1, whereas the low-profile company to be rated 0. High-profile companies are companies in the automotive, aviation, agribusiness, tobacco and cigarettes, food and beverage, media and communications, energy (electricity), health and transport. Low-profile company is a company that is in the field of construction companies, finance and banking, medical equipment providers, real estate, retail, textiles, personal products and household products.

Company age is calculated in units of months from the first month the company listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange until December of the running year of the annual financial statements. Management ownership is measured by the percentage ownership of shares held by company management. Earnings per share is



measured by the ratio of net income after deducting taxes and dividends divided by the number of shares issued (Robert Ang, 1999 in Putra, 2009).

Environmental concern is measured from the participation of the company follows the ISO 14001 certification program. The participation rate is viewed by scoring in testing whether the company has ISO 14001 certification by the officially recognized agency or not. If it has participated then it will be rated 1, but if it hasn't yet participated then it will be rated 0. The growth rate of a company can be seen from the growth in sales, with the formulation of current year sales minus net sales of the previous year divided by the previous year's sales.

Data Analysis Methods

Before hypothesis testing, the testing of some classical assumptions will be made by testing its normality, heteroscedasticity and multicollinearity. A method of analysis used in this study is multiple regression analysis. Multiple regression equation to test the hypothesis:

$$\text{CSR} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{ Size} + \beta_2 \text{ Profit} + \beta_3 \text{ Lev} + \beta_4 \text{ Com} + \beta_5 \text{ Profile} + \beta_6 \text{ Age} + \beta_7 \text{ MO} + \beta_8 \text{ EPS} + \beta_9 \text{ Env} + \beta_{10} \text{ Growth}$$

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive statistics and Classical Test Assumptions

Judging from the means and standard deviations of each variable it is found that there are a lot of data not outlier (Appendix 3). Based on the results of normality testing to meet the classical assumptions in this study showed that regression models are qualified normality test for normally distributed (Appendix 4). Multicollinearity testing seen that all the VIF for each independent variable from the model used in this study with the conditions of $VIF < 10$ (Appendix 5) concluded there was no multicollinearity. Heteroscedasticity testing performed using white heteroscedasticity test - cross term. The testing concluded that model has been homocedasticity (Appendix 6).

Test of Hypothesis

The first hypothesis test result proved that the company size has a positive effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. This study supports the research conducted by Sembiring (2005), Prihandono (2010), Untari (2010), Fahrizqi (2011), and Purnasiwi (2011). Cowen et al. (1987) describing that larger companies do a lot more activity, causing a greater impact on the environment, have more shareholders who may be concerned with corporate's social programs, and its



financial reports provide an efficient tool in communicating company's social information.

The second hypothesis test result proved that the company profitability has a positive influence on corporate social responsibility disclosure. This result supports previous research conducted by Hendrasaputra (2007), Bramono (2008), Putra (2009), Veronica (2009), Prihandono (2010), Untari (2010), and Fahrizqi (2011).

The third hypothesis test result concluded that the company leverage variables do not affect the company's disclosure of corporate social responsibility. This result supports previous research, namely Sembiring (2005), Rahman (2008), Putra (2009), Veronica (2009), Untari (2010), Yulita (2010), and Fahrizqi (2011). The third hypothesis is rejected because the higher the company leverage will make the company most likely experience a breach of contract in which is the manager will attempt to report a higher current profit than it is in the future (Belkaoui&Karpik, 1989 in Anggraeni, 2006), including expenses for the expressed corporate social responsibility.

The fourth hypothesis test result concluded that the board of commissioner has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. The result of this study supports the findings of Fahrizqi (2011), but does not support research of Sembiring (2005), Putra (2009) and Yulita (2010). In conducting its operations, the number of commissioners of each company would vary according to the needs of the company. Its performance is also not too different. It can be seen if one search for the company's annual report. Company with a lot of commissioner's members does not necessarily report and express their company's social responsibility well. Companies with less number of commissioners may report and express their company's social responsibility. So, the number of commissioner does not affect the quality of corporate performance. This could be one reason why the test results show that board size does not affect the disclosure of corporate social responsibility.

The fifth hypothesis concluded that company profile has effect on positive influence in corporate social responsibility disclosure. This result is consistent with findings of Sembiring (2005), Hendrasaputra (2007) and Rahman and Widayasari (2008). High-profile companies will tend to provide disclosure of qualified social responsibility to keep the company's survival. High-profile companies have a higher control of the government to ensure these companies are always concerned about the social effects of the operating company.

The sixth hypothesis test result concluded that company age has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. This result supports research by Putra (2009) and Prihandono (2010). This is presumably caused by several things, namely the issue of social responsibility is being echoed in the rise times of the year 2007-2009, so



many companies will improve their activities in accordance with the demands of the business world in its time and report social responsibility as early as possible.

The seventh hypothesis test result indicated that management ownership has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. The result of this study support the research of Rahman and Widyasari (2008). According to Rahman and Widyasari (2008), this can be caused by the behavior of management who tend to focus on the company's economic performance to improve corporate value that is also profitable for them as a management and owner of the company.

The eight hypothesis test result showed that earnings per share has positive impact on corporate social responsibility disclosure. The result of this study supports the research of Putra (2009) and Sari (2010). It's mean the higher the earnings per share, the better the disclosure of corporate social responsibility.

The ninth hypothesis test results proved that environmental concern has positive effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. This result indicate that when the company has had ISO 14001 certification, the company increasingly concerned about the actions and forms of social responsibility.

The tenth hypothesis test results proved that company's growth rate has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. This result is contrast with result obtained by Tampubolon (2008) who found that company's growth rate has an effect. The level of sales can cause this and the increase is not an aspect to be seriously considered by the company in doing its corporate social responsibility.

CONCLUSIONS, LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the results of hypothesis testing which has been carried out it is concluded that company size, company profitability, company profile, earnings per share, and environmental concern has a positive effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. Company's characteristic, such as company leverage, board of commissioner, company age, management ownership, and growth opportunities has no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure.

In this study there are limitations in filling CSR Rating System, as in the might be subjectivity in rating. Suggestions for future research is to use CSR rating derived from professional institutions so that the results of rating are more accurate, and to see the level of disclosure of social responsibility as a whole it is possible to do research not only in industries other than finance and other financial institutions, but also with separation relevant to the tight regulation in the industry.



REFERENCES

- Aßländer, M. S. (2011). Corporate social responsibility as asubsiary co-responsibility: A macro economic perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99, 115-128.
- Amal, M. I. (2011). *Pengaruh manajemen laba, kepemilikan manajerial, ukuran perusahaan, dan profitabilitas terhadap pengungkapan tanggungjawab sosial perusahaan dan lingkungan*. Universitas Diponegoro: Thesis.
- Anggraini, F. R. R. (2006). *Pengungkapan informasi sosial dan faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi pengungkapan informasi sosial dalam laporan keuangan tahunan (Stud iempiris pada perusahaan-perusahaan yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Jakarta)*. Simposium Nasional Akuntansi 9, Padang.
- Apriwenni, P. (2009). Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi pengungkapan corporate social responsibility pada laporan tahunan perusahaan untuk industri manufaktur tahun 2008. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, Volume 6 Nomor 1, April, 41-58.
- Belkoui, A., & Karpik, P. G. (1989). Determinants of the corporate decision to disclose social information. *Accounting, Audit, and Accountability Journal*, 2, 36-51.
- Bramono, E. (2008). *Tanggungjawab sosial dan profitabilitas perusahaan*. Skripsi. Universitas Indonesia. Jakarta
- Coller, P., & Gregory, A. (1999). Audit committee activity and agency cost. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 18 (4-5), 311-332.
- Cowen, S., Ferreri, L. B., & Parker, L. D. (1987). The impact of corporate characteristics on social responsibility disclosure: a typology and frequency-based analysis. *Accounting, Organization and Society*, 12 (2), 111-22.
- Fahrizqi, A. (2011). *Faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi corporate social responsibility disclosure dalam laporan tahunan perusahaan*. Universitas Diponegoro: Skripsi.
- Fraser, B. W. (2005). Corporate social responsibility. *The Internal Auditor*, Vol.62, No. 1, F, 42-47.
- Global Reporting Initiative (2002). *Sustainability reporting guidelines*. Boston: GRI.
- Hackston, D., & Milne, M. J. (1996). Some determinant of social and environment disclosures in New Zealand Company. *Accounting, Audit, and Accountability Journal*, 9, 77-108.



- Hendrasaputra, A. A. R. (2007). *Pelaksanaan corporate social responsibility pada perusahaan-perusahaan high-profile dan low-profile yang listed di BEI tahun 2004*. Universitas Indonesia: Skripsi.
- Kanji, G. K., & Chopra, P. K. (2010). CSR in a global economy. *Total Quality Management*, 21 (2), 119–143.
- Nuridin, A. (2009). *Corporate governance dan profitabilitas: pengaruhnya terhadap pengungkapan tanggungjawab sosial perusahaan (Studi empiris pada perusahaan yang tercatat di Bursa Efek Indonesia)*. Universitas Diponegoro: Thesis.
- Porter, M. E. (2009). *Strategy and society: from CSR to creating shared value*. New York City: Inner City Capital Connections (ICCC).
- Prihandono, A. Y. (2010). *Pengaruh return on asset, kepemilikan asing, ukuran dan umur perusahaan terhadap tingkat pengungkapan tanggungjawab sosial pada perusahaan yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia tahun 2009*. Universitas Bakrie: Skripsi.
- Purnasiwi, J. (2011). *Analisis pengaruh size, profitabilitas dan leverage terhadap pengungkapan CSR pada perusahaan yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia*. Universitas Diponegoro: Skripsi.
- Putra, A. A. (2009). *Analisis faktor-faktor yang mempengaruhi pengungkapan tanggungjawab sosial serta hubungan pengungkapan tanggungjawab sosial dengan reaksi investor*. Universitas Indonesia: Skripsi.
- Rahman, A., & Widyasari, K. N. (2008). The analysis of company characteristic influence toward CSR disclosure: empirical evidence of manufacturing companies listed in JSX. *Jurnal Akuntansi & Auditing Indonesia*, 12 (1), 25-35.
- Ronalde, R. R. (2006). *Analisis pengaruh karakteristik perusahaan terhadap tingkat pengungkapan sosial dalam laporan tahunan perusahaan go publik di Bursa Efek Jakarta*. Universitas Trisakti Jakarta: Skripsi.
- Sari, E. E. K. (2010). *Pengaruh return on assets (ROA), debt equity ratio (DER), dan earning per share (EPS) terhadap pengungkapan tanggungjawab sosial pada perusahaan high profile di Indonesia*. Universitas Negeri Malang: Skripsi.
- Sembiring, E. R. (2005). *Karakteristik perusahaan dan pengungkapan tanggungjawab sosial: Studi empiris pada perusahaan yang tercatat di Bursa Efek Jakarta*. Simposium Nasional Akuntansi 8, Solo.



- Sutanto, A. W. (2008). Social disclosure rating system for assessing firms' CSR reports. *Emerald Insight International Journal*, Vol. 14 No. 1, 34-48.
- Tampubolon, K. (2008). *Hubungan antarkinerjalingkungan, pengungkapan lingkungan dan kinerja ekonomi (Studi empiris pada perusahaan pertambangan yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia periode 2004-2006)*. Universitas Indonesia: Skripsi.
- Untari, L. (2010). *Effect on company characteristics corporate social responsibilities disclosures in corporate annual report of consumption listed in Indonesia Stock Exchange*. Universitas Gunadarma: Skripsi.
- Veronica, T. M. (2009). *Pengaruh karakteristik perusahaan terhadap pengungkapan tanggungjawab sosial pada perusahaan sektor pertambangan yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia*. Universitas Gunadarma: Skripsi.
- Yulita, L. (2010). *The effect characteristics of company toward corporate social responsibility in mining company listed at Indonesia Stock Exchange*. Universitas Gunadarma: Skripsi.



APPENDIX

Appendix 1: Sample

No.	Industries Type	Sample
1	Agriculture, Animal Husbandry, and Fishery	25
2	Minings and Mining Services	17
3	Constructions and Real Estate	67
4	Food and Beverages	20
5	Manufactures	54
6	Transportations	14
7	Telecommunications	15
8	Retails and Consumptions	26
9	Hotels and Travels	7
10	Others	28
Total		273

Source: Indonesian Capital Market Directory

Appendix 2: Sampling

Criteria	Total Amount
Total sample listed in Indonesia Stock Exchange for 2007-2009 period	1028
Total sample with incomplete data and information	(470)
Total sample which did not report CSR-related activities	(192)
Total sample which did not use rupiah	(28)
Total sample which did not have positive <i>net income</i>	(37)
Total sample with negative equity value	(1)
Total sample abandoned because of <i>outlier</i>	(27)
Total sample chosen	273

Source: Indonesian Capital Market Directory

Appendix 3: Statistics Descriptive

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
CSR	273	.01	.75	.1800	.11050
SIZE	273	9.71	13.99	12.3574	.57040
PROFIT	273	.00	.70	.0744	.08849
LEV	273	.00	28.55	1.7894	2.89020
KOM	273	2.00	22.00	4.9267	2.07447
PROFILE	273	.00	1.00	.4469	.49808
AGE	273	.00	4.00	1.8681	.91806
EPS	273	-2.00	19.15	1.6860	1.35270
ENV	273	.00	1.00	.1465	.35428
GROWTH	273	-1.00	5.18	.2864	.57799



KM	273	.00	.98	.0345	.11882
Valid N (listwise)	273				

Source: Output SPSS

Appendix 4: Normality Test

One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov Test

		Unstandardized Residual
N		273
Normal Parameters ^{a,,b}	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	.07650885
Most Extreme Differences	Absolute	.068
	Positive	.068
	Negative	-.042
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.120
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.162

Source: Output SPSS

Appendix 5: Multikolinearity Test

Model	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1		
	(Constant)	
	SIZE	.746 1.340
	PROFIT	.804 1.244
	LEV	.870 1.150
	KOM	.850 1.176
	PROFILE	.864 1.158
	AGE	.939 1.065
	EPS	.818 1.222
	ENV	.917 1.090
	GROWTH	.967 1.034
	KM	.954 1.049

Source: Output SPSS



Appendix 6: *White Heterocedasticity Test*
White Heteroskedasticity Test:

F-statistic	1.976221	Prob. F(63,209)	0.000179
Obs*R-squared	101.9155	Prob. Chi-Square(63)	0.001388

Dependent Variable: SER01
Method: Least Squares
Date: 09/16/11 Time: 16:14
Sample: 1 273

Included observations: 273

White Heteroskedasticity-Consistent Standard Errors & Covariance

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-0.466410	0.135986	-3.429853	0.0007
SER02	0.046648	0.010710	4.355408	0.0000
SER03	0.369336	0.057541	6.418617	0.0000
SER04	-0.000189	0.000958	-0.197570	0.8435
SER05	-0.001580	0.002679	-0.589564	0.5560
SER06	0.064672	0.009460	6.836327	0.0000
SER07	-0.003237	0.005971	-0.542221	0.5881
SER08	0.010562	0.004025	2.624153	0.0092
SER09	0.076698	0.018836	4.071941	0.0001
SER10	-0.000388	0.005395	-0.071970	0.9427
SER11	-0.033396	0.026777	-1.247197	0.2134

R-squared	0.520581	Mean dependent var	0.180022
Adjusted R-squared	0.502282	S.D. dependent var	0.110498
			-
S.E. of regression	0.077955	Akaike info criterion	2.225904
			-
Sum squared resid	1.592180	Schwarz criterion	2.080468
Log likelihood	314.8359	F-statistic	28.44945
Durbin-Watson stat	1.214845	Prob(F-statistic)	0.000000

Source: Output Views



Appendix 7: Coefficients Determinant (*adjusted R²*)

Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	R Square Change	Change Statistics			
						F Change	df ₁	df ₂	Sig. F Change
1	.722 ^a	.521	.502	.07796	.521	28.449	10	262	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), KM, ENV, KOM, AGE, GROWTH, PROFILE, PROFIT, LEV, EPS, SIZE

Source: Output SPSS

Appendix 8: Multiple Regression Analysis

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	Result
		B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	-.466	.114		-4.104	.000	
	SIZE	.047	.010	.241	4.864	.000	Significant
	PROFIT	.369	.060	.296	6.200	.000	Significant
	LEV	.000	.002	-.005	-.108	.914	No Significant
	KOM	-.002	.002	-.030	-.639	.523	No Significant
	PROFILE	.065	.010	.292	6.333	.000	Significant
	AGE	-.003	.005	-.027	-.609	.543	No Significant
	EPS	.011	.004	.129	2.734	.007	Significant
	ENV	.077	.014	.246	5.505	.000	Significant
	GROWTH	.000	.008	-.002	-.047	.963	No Significant
	KM	-.033	.041	-.036	-.820	.413	No Significant

Source: Output SPSS