THE EFFECT OF DISCLOSURE OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY ON COMPANY VALUE WITH FAMILY COMPANY MODERATION (STUDY IN PUBLIC COMPANIES IN INDONESIA)

Widiya Pratiwi[1]

Erwin Saraswati[2]

Roekhudin[3]

ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine and analyze the effect of corporate social responsibility disclosure on company value, with the moderation of family companies. This study used a purposive sampling technique to obtain 164 samples during 2010-2017 from companies across industries (except natural and financial resources companies) that were listed on the Indonesian stock exchange. The analysis technique is used the moderated regression analysis. The results of the study proved that corporate social responsibility disclosure can increase the company value. But, with the moderation of a company can weaken the effect corporate social responsibility disclosure on the company value.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility disclosure, family company, company value.

INTRODUCTION

Company value is an investor's perception of a public company that is often associated with stock prices (Sujoko & Soebiantoro, 2007). The company value can be measured through several aspects, one of which is the value of the equity market. The value of the equity market is based on market prices that are often associated with the price of a company's stock in the capital market (Hariati & Prihatiningtyas, 2015). The ups and downs of stock prices in the capital market have become an interesting phenomenon to study the issue of fluctuations in the value of the company itself. Indonesia's consumer news and business channel (CNBC) on 27 February 2018 stated that there was a decline in the share price of PT Telekomunikasi Indonesia (TLKM) by 9.46% from the beginning of the year until Tuesday 27 February 2018, caused the stock market capitalization value to decrease by Rp. 42.34 trillion. In addition to Telkom, other issuers have experienced a decline in market capitalization, namely PT Unilever Indonesia (UNVR). Unilever's market capitalization value fell by Rp 14.34 trillion, from Rp 426.52 trillion at the end of 2017 to Rp 411.83 trillion on February 27, 2018 (CNBC Indonesia, 2018).

Decreasing stock market value has an impact on decreasing firm value (Orbaningsing, 2018). Decreasing company value can reduce investor confidence to the company, thus it can threatening an survival of the company. Therefore, many effort are needed to increase the company value by implementing of good corporate management (Baek et al. 2004). A good company must be able to control the financial potential and non-financial potential in increasing the company's value for the company's sustainability in the long run (Yao et al. 2013). Company value can grow sustainably if the company is not only based on a single bottom line concept, which is reflected in financial conditions, but the company's responsibility must also rest on the triple bottom line concept, namely paying attention to economic, social and environmental aspects because sustainability is a balance between interests economic, environmental and community interests. Therefore, with good CSR practices, it is expected that the value of the company will be valued well by investors (Nurlela and Islahudin, 2008).

Corporate social responsibility disclosure is information that strengthens perceptions of external parties on the company's financial statements, for example for investors to be taken into consideration in decision making (Hajezi & Hesari, 2012). Social responsibility disclosure can strengthen the trust users of the information on the company condition, and reduce information asymmetry between companies and stakeholders (Cui et al. 2012). Disclosure of CSR is a long-term policy whose performance cannot be measured in the short term, so that short-term decisions made by companies can hurt the long-term sustainability of the company (Handajani et al. 2014).

Several previous studies examined that the effect corporate social responsibility disclosure on the company value gave mixed results, including the research conducted by Nurlela and Islahudin (2008); Jo and Harjoto (2011); Rosiana et al. (2013); Buchana (2018), which showed that corporate social responsibility disclosure is positively related to company value. But, it is different from the results of research conducted by Wardhani (2013); Primady and Wahyudi (2015); Wibowo et al. (2016) showed the results that contradict the previous research, which is social responsibility hurts firm value.

This study used family company variables in moderating to the relationship between disclosure of CSR and company value. Family companies are chosen as reducing variables because, in developing countries, most are still controlled by family ownership (Siregar & Utama, 2008; Thesman & Juniarti, 2014; Silitonga & Juniarti, 2017). PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) Indonesia has also conducted a family business survey in Indonesia in 2014 and stated that more than 95% of businesses in

Indonesia are owned by families. Also, the development of family companies in Indonesia also has the potential to grow well. This is evidenced by family companies that are included in the high 500 global family index in 2017.

Table 1. A List of Family Companies in Indonesia with The Global Family Index.

Rank	Company	Est	Revenue	Employees	Country	Family	Share
113	PT Astra International	1957	13.3	149,532	Indonesia	Keswick family	50.1%
304	PT Gudang Garam	1958	5.1	36,995	Indonesia	Wonowidjojo family	76.5%
474	Bank Central Asia	1957	3.2	24,814	Indonesia	Hartono family	47.2%

Source: http://familybusinessindex.com

The global family index ranks family companies based on the income that the company receives. A family company that has an excellent rating is occupied by PT Astra International Tbk. Zaky (2018) stated that the role of family business leaders is very vital in the management of the company. The vision and mission gave influence the overall aspects, both internal and external aspects. That is what caused the family business to be included in the top 500 of the global family index survey institution and can survive until now.

The results of this research related to the family firm that still provided inconsistent results, such as the research conducted by Thesman and Juniarti (2014) showed that family control as an independent variable negatively affects to the company value. Unlike, the study undertaken by Nekhili et al. (2017), provided results that the company's market value is positively related to CSR disclosure for family companies. Therefore, in this study raised the family company variable as a moderating variable. The use of moderating variables in this study is because as expressed by Nekhili et al. (2017) that research is still rarely investigating how shareholders consider the status of family companies when assessing the relevance of corporate social responsibility reporting. An existence of differences in results between previous researchers made researchers motivated to re-test to get more impressive results.

This study aims to examine and analyze the effect corporate social responsibility disclosure on the company value. Also, the researchers tested and analyzed the impact corporate social responsibility disclosure on corporate value through family company status as a moderating variable.

THEORETICAL REVIEW

Corporate Social Responsibility

Corporate social responsibility disclosure is the provision of financial and non-financial information related to organizational interactions with the organization's social environment, which is presented in annual reports or separate social reports. Corporate social responsibility disclosure are includes details of physical, energy, human resource, product, and community empowerment issues (Hackston & Milne, 1996). Corporate social responsibility, better known is a concept that has captured the world's attention and gained new resonance in the global economy. The increasing interest in CSR in recent years comes from the emergence of globalization and international trade which has been reflected to the increasing complexity of business and new demands for increased transparency and corporate citizenship (Jamali et al. 2008).

The Value of The Company

Company value can be interpreted as an assessment conducted by investors on the level of success of the company in managing its resources. Company value can increase if institutions can become practical monitoring tools (Gunawan and Utami, 2008). To achieve this, the company expects financial managers to take the best actions for the company by maximizing the value of the company so that the prosperity (welfare) of the owner or shareholders can be achieved (Husnan, 2001). Company value can describe the condition of the company. The better the value of the company, the better the prospective investors will look at the company.

Family Firm

Family companies are companies owned and managed by family members of their founders (Susanto et al. 2007). Fama & Jensen (1983) stated that companies with family ownership are more efficient than companies that are owned by the public because the cost of supervision is issued or monitoring costs are smaller. Maury & Pajuste (2006) argued that with family ownership in a company, the company could increase profitability within the company when compared to companies controlled by non-family owners. This means that businesses with well-managed family ownership have the opportunity to produce better company performance than companies owned by non-families. According to Hoover (2000) said that the main strength of a family business lies in the power of kinship relationships and is supported by excellent communication to run a family business.

Stakeholders Theory

Friedman and Miles (2006) suggested that companies must have a relationship between stakeholders with each other, and must identify different ways when dealing with stakeholders in each segment for both primary and secondary groups. Branco & Rodrigues (2006) definedstakeholder theory as a company perspective that does not only prioritize shareholders but also those who have an interest in company actions and decisions. Social disclosure is considered as part of a dialogue between companies and their stakeholders (Gray et al. 1995). The company is not an entity that only operates for its interests, and to get support from stakeholders, the company must provide benefits to its stakeholders. Corporate social responsibility disclosure is one of the company's policies that does not only have an impact on shareholders but also on stakeholders, especially the community. When companies consistently pay attention to the condition of society through CSR activities, this can benefit the company. This is because the public trust in the company, so many community will support all forms of company activities which will ultimately increase the company value. So, it can encourage investors to be able to invest in the company.

Signaling Theory

Signaling theory indicated that the organization will try to show signals in the form of positive information to potential investors through disclosures in financial statements (Whiting & Miller, 2008). Leland & Pyle (1977) stated that signals are actions taken by the old owner in communicating the information he has to investors. Past owners have the motivation to voluntarily disclose private information because they hope that this information can be interpreted as a positive signal about company performance and able to reduce information asymmetry. Signaling Theory is an action taken by company management that gives investors guidance on how management views the company's prospects (Brigham & Houston, 2006). Signaling theory assumes that management has more complete and accurate information about company values that are not known to outside investors. Leland and Pyle (1977) state that corporate executives who have better information about their companies will be compelled to convey that information to prospective investors where companies can increase the company value that reporting by sending signals through their annual reports.

HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

The Effect of corporate social responsibility disclosure on company value

Stakeholder theory holds that companies must make social disclosures as one of their responsibilities to stakeholders. Through CSR disclosure, the market will give a real appreciation, as indicated by an increase in the company's stock price. This increase will cause the company. Stakeholder theory can provided a useful framework for understanding a positive impact of social responsibility disclosure on firm value. Stakeholder theory emphasizes that a company can be seen as a series of interdependent relationships between stakeholders, which consist of not only shareholders, but all groups or individuals who can influence or be influenced by company activities (Clarkson, 1995).

Corporate social responsibility disclosure is expected to be able to increase company value seen from stock prices and company profits as a result of investors who invest shares in the company because social responsibility activities are the company's alignments with the community (Lestari & Fidiana, 2015). Based on signaling theory, managers who have right information about the company try to convey, that information to outside investors, so the company's shares can increase (Sugiarto, 2009). The research conducted by Nurlela and Islahudin (2008), Jo and Harjoto (2011), Rosiana et al. (2013) showed that companies that implement social responsibility tend to be able to increase reputation and sales. As a result, able to increase profits that can increase company value. Based on the description, the following hypothesis is formulated:

H1: Corporate social responsibility disclosure has a positive effect to firm value

Family companies Effect to corporate social responsibility disclosure on company value as Moderation Variable

Family companies have a high sense of ownership and concern for the company's reputation because family companies have a goal to pass on their business to the next generation, thus encouraging family members to carry out closer supervision (Amran & Ahmad, 2010; Shyu, 2011; Westhead & Howorth, 2012). Family companies are long-term oriented, so family members prefer to make profitable long-term investments. This showed a good prospect for the company going forward, so investors will respond positively and ultimately will increase the company value (Ong and Gan, 2013).

Family companies tend not to damage the company's reputation through irresponsible actions (Berrone et al. 2012). Therefore, family companies can benefit from a positive image formed by the company's efforts on social and environmental issues. These actions are expected to influence the perceptions of stakeholders positively. Research conducted by Nekhili et al. (2017) showed that the company's market value is positively related to the disclosure of social responsibility for family companies. Family companies will benefit more from the commitment to communicate with social responsibility; also, individually, family companies can obtain shareholder support more efficiently than can be done by non-family companies. Based on the description, the hypothesis proposed in this study are:

H2: Family companies strengthen influence on corporate social responsibility disclosure on company value.

RESEARCH METHODS

Population and Samples

The population is public companies are listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange that corporate social responsibility disclosure both presented in annual reports and sustainability reports in the period 2010-2017. The period of 2010 until 2017 was chosen as the sample of this study based on the consideration that the practice of corporate social responsibility became effective in 2007 through Law No. 40 of 2007; then in 2008, there was a global crisis which caused the company's value to decline. In 2009, the company's performance did not fully recover due to the worldwide crisis. Thus the period 2010-2017 was used in this study because, in that year, the company was considered to have been able and ready to do social responsibility disclosure good Also, the 2010-2017 period was chosen in this study because corporate social responsibility disclosure is a long-term policy whose performance cannot be measured in the short term (Handajani et al. 2014). This study is used purposive sampling with the following criteria:

1. Non-financial companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange from 2010 to 2017, because this sector has more influence on the surrounding environment as a result of the activities carried out by the company (Suwana, 2017). Companies engaged in finance are not included in the sample because these companies have different asset characteristics. Some previous studies (Qiu et al. 2016; Cabeza-garcia, 2017) also states that financial companies have different social and environmental responsibility disclosure characteristics and requirements from non-financial companies.

2. All industries, except the natural resources industry (SDA). This selection is based on the existence of different obligations in reporting corporate social responsibility. Companies engaged in the SDA sector are required to report their social responsibility by Law number 40 of 2007 article 74, while companies in other fields are still voluntary.

3. Companies can express social responsibility by using the global reporting initiatives (GRI) guidelines both presented in annual reports and sustainability reports during the observation period.

Operational Definition and Variable Measurement

Independent Variables

This study used corporate social responsibility disclosure as an independent variable. Corporate social responsibility disclosure is the organization's responsibility for the impact of decisions and activities on society and the environment, through transparent and ethical behavior that contributes to sustainable development, health and welfare of the community, considers the expectations of stakeholders, complies with applicable laws and is consistent with norms norms of international behavior, and integrated with organizations as a whole (ISO 26000: Guidance on social responsibility, 2010).

In this study, social responsibility disclosures were measured using the Global Reporting Initiatives (GRI) G3.1, G4, and GRI Standards guidelines, obtained through the website www.globalreporting.org. The measurement of corporate social responsibility by calculating the total items of categories of social responsibility disclosed by the company. The researcher will give a score of 1 if the company discloses all indicators in each aspect of the disclosure, and the researcher will divide the score one by the number of indicators in each aspect if the company only reveals a few indicators in one aspect. After scoring all items, the score is then added to get the total score for each company. The formula used to measure index scores from the disclosure of corporate social responsibility is as follows:

$$\mathrm{CSRD}ij = \frac{\sum \mathrm{X}ij}{\mathrm{N}j}$$

Noted :
$\mathrm{CSRD}ij$ = The CSR disclosure index value of each company
$\sum \mathrm{X}ij$ = The number of items disclosed by the company
$\mathrm{N}j$ = Expected number of items

Dependent Variable

The dependent variable in this study is of substantial value. Company value is an investor's perception of a public company that is often associated with stock prices (Sujoko & Soebiantoro, 2007). The high amount of the company reflects the level of prosperity of shareholders and is an essential indicator for investors before deciding to invest.

The value of the company in this study was measured using Tobins' Q. The use of Tobins'Q as a proxy for company value for several reasons: First, Tobins'Q is a measure of the future because it is based on stock prices. Second, market-based actions reflect the ideas of external stakeholders and can capture the long-term value of corporate social responsibility activities (Orlitzky et al. 2003). Third, Tobins'Q can be used to compare companies in the industry because they are not affected by accounting conventions (Chakravarthy, 1986). Therefore, in this study, Tobins'Q measurements were as follows:

$$Tobins'Q = \frac{\text{EMV} + \text{D}}{\text{EBV}}$$

Noted:
EMV = Equity market value (EMV = closing price X number of shares outstanding)
D = Book value of total debt
EBV = Book value of total assets

Moderation variable
In this study, family firms are used as moderating variables, because in developing countries most are still controlled by family ownership (Siregar & Utama, 2008; Thesman & Juniarti, 2014; Silitonga & Juniarti, 2017). Companies are categorized as family companies when founders or family members have at least 10% voting rights over companies through investment, and at least one family member of the supervisor is on the board or is part of top management (Gomez-mejia et al. 2010; Nekhili et al. 2017). Family company variables in this study were measured using dummy variables. Companies classified as family companies are given a value of 1, whereas non-family companies are given a value of 0.

Control Variables
Leverage
Debt companies are more motivated to consider creditor expectations regarding the information relating to CSR (Roberts, 1992). In this study, leverage is proxied by using DAR (Debt to assets ratio), which is the debt ratio used to measure the ratio between total debt and total assets formulated as follows:

Debttoassetsratio=TotalHutangTotalAsetx100%

Company size
Large companies face higher communication requests and therefore, have more incentives to implement social responsibility disclosures (Roberts, 1992). The measurement used in this study is the natural logarithm of total assets (Ln TA), this is used to reduce the significant difference between the size of the company that is too large and the size of the company that is too small, then the total value of assets is formed into natural logarithms. Total assets are typically distributed.

Board Size
Giannarkis (2014) argues that a larger council helps companies obtain more diverse and vital resources to carry out CSR activities. The size of the board of directors is measured according to the number of board of directors. According to KNKG (2006), directors as corporate organs are responsible and collegially responsible for managing the company. Directors are responsible for maintaining the company to generate profits and ensure the sustainability of the company's business. The size of the board directors is measured according to the number of board directors.

Board meeting
The number of board meetings shows directors' attention regarding stakeholder interests, such as CSR tasks (Giannarkis, 2014). Also, regular board meetings allow the director to discuss the company's performance. Supervision of the running of the company is an essential director's responsibility (Soobaroyen and Mahadeo, 2012; Siddiqui et al. 2013). Therefore, regular board director meetings can improve company performance (Schwartz-Ziv and Weisbach, 2013). The board meeting in this study was measured using the number of annual board meetings.

Company Age
The age of the company has been generally accepted as one of the characteristics of the company (Suttipun & Santoso, 2012). The older the age of the company, the more ready to face the development of the business world. Based on this, researchers used the age of the company as a control variable in this study. The age of the company is the time since the company first stood up to the period under review.

AGE = $\sum$ Company Age

Data analysis method

Data analysis in this study used moderation regression analysis. The regression analysis model in this study can be explained in the following equations:

Tobins'Q = $\alpha + \beta_1$ CSRD + ξ_1 ……………………………………………………………..… (1)
Tobins'Q = $\alpha + \beta_2$ CSRD + β_3 FF + β_4 CSRD * FF + ξ_2 …………………………………..... (2)
Tobins'Q = $\alpha + \beta_5$ CSRD + β_6 FF + β_7 CSRD * FF + β_8 BZ + β_9 BM + β_{10} Leverage + β_{11} FZ + β_8 AGE + ξ_3 ……………………………………………………………………..... (3)

Noted:

Tobins'Q	= Company value
CSRD	= Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure
FF	= Family Firm
BZ	= Board size
BM	= Board meeting
Leverage	= Leverage
FZ	= Firm size
Age	= Company Age
α	= Constanta
β	= Regression Coefficient
ξ	= Error

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive statistical tests are carried out to get an overview or distribution characteristics of the data studied, including minimum values, maximum values, mean values, and standard deviations. After going through the clear statistical test process, the results shown in Table 1 are as follows:

Table 1. Description of Research Variables

Variables	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure	0.07	1.00	0.3869	0.25892
Company value	0.12	3.87	1.6100	0.76780
Family Firm	0.00	1.00	0.3831	0.48773
Leverage	0.07	1.92	0.5699	0.24687
Company size	27.61	33.32	30.7864	1.24480
Board size	3.00	12.00	6.4870	2.09649
Number of board meetings	3.00	75.00	34.4286	16.42167
Company Age	2.00	67.00	41.6234	13.39451

Source: secondary data processed, 2019

Based on the table, it can be seen that the average value of CSRD is 0.3869 with a standard deviation of 0.25892. The company value variable has an average of 1.6100 with a standard deviation of 0.76780, for family company variables obtained an average of 0.3831 with a standard deviation of 0.48773. Furthermore, leverage has an average value of 0.5699 with a standard deviation of 0.24687. Company size has an average cost of 30.7864 with a standard deviation of 1.24480. The board size obtained an average of 6.4870 with a standard deviation of 2.09649. The number of board meetings obtained an average value of 34.4286 with a standard deviation of 16.42167. Finally, the company age has an average cost of 41.6234 with a standard deviation of 13.39451.

If the significance value is < 0.05, the hypothesis is accepted. This means that the independent variable affects the dependent variable. The results of hypothesis testing can be seen in the following table:

Table 3. The Results of Hypothesis Testing

	Variable	Coefficient	t	Sig
Model 1	Constanta	1.397	12.708	0.000
	Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure	0.552	2.334	0.021
Model 2	Constanta	1.127	8.562	0.000
	Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure	1.655	5.192	0.000
	Family firm	0.478	2.218	0.028
	Interaction (CSRD*FF)	-1.959	-4.360	0.000
Model 3	Constanta	2.704	1.886	0.064
	Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure	1.548	4.983	0.000
	FF	0.496	2.366	0.019
	Interaction (CSRD*FF)	-1.767	-3.718	0.000
	Leverage	-0.678	-2.703	0.008
	Firm Size	-0.070	-1.446	0.150
	Board size	0.034	0.958	0.340
	Number of board meetings	0.007	1.746	0.083
	Company Age	0.012	2.635	0.009

Source: secondary data processed, 2019

Based on the table shows that in model 1, the corporate social responsibility disclosure variable has a coefficient of 0.552 with a significance of 0.021, which means that the corporate social responsibility disclosure variable has a positive effect on firm value. Model 2 showed that the interaction between corporate social responsibility disclosure and family company as a moderating variable has a coefficient of -1.959 with a significance of 0.000, which means that there is a negative influence between corporate social responsibility disclosure, which is moderated by the family company towards substantial value. In model 3, control variables that influence the value of the company, such as leverage with a coefficient of -0.678 with a significance of 0.008, which indicates that leverage hurts firm value. Also, the age of the company has a coefficient of 0.012 with a significance level of 0.009, which means that the age of the company has a positive effect on firm value. For the other control variables, namely company size, board size and number of board meetings does not affect the value of the company because the significance value of each variable is greater than 0.05, where for company size variables the significance value is 0.150, 0.340 board size, and variable the number of board meetings is 0.083.

The Effect of corporate social responsibility disclosure on company value

The first hypothesis (H1) states that the disclosure of CSR has a positive effect on firm value. This test output shows the first hypothesis (H1) is accepted. The results of this study are in line with the research conducted (Jo and Harjoto, 2011; Rosiana et al. 2013; Nekhili et al. 2017; Buchanan 2018) which provide evidence that social responsibility disclosure has a positive effect on firm value, meaning that more companies disclose social and environmental disclosure items, and the better the quality of exposure, the higher the value of the company. Stakeholder theory explains that a company can be seen as a series of interdependent relationships between stakeholders, which consist of not only shareholders but all groups or individuals who can influence or be influenced by company activities (Clarkson, 1995). Based on this perspective, information on social responsibility is an element that companies can use to manage or respond to various stakeholders such as investors, consumers, suppliers, legislators, non-governmental organizations, and others to get the support and approval of these parties (Gray et al. 1995). Stakeholder theory holds that companies must make social disclosures as one of their responsibilities to stakeholders. Through social responsibility disclosure, the market will give a real appreciation, as indicated by an increase in the company's stock price. It will cause increase the company value.

Family companies moderate the effect of social responsibility disclosure on company value

The second hypothesis (H2) stated that family companies strengthen the influence of social responsibility disclosure on firm value. The output of this test shows a negative relationship from the moderation of family companies to firm value, meaning that the second hypothesis (H2) is rejected. This is not in line with the research conducted by Nekhili et al. (2017), showed that the company's market value is positively related to the disclosure of social responsibility for family companies. The results of this study are precisely in line with previous research, which states that companies with majority shareholders are families who will control decisions within the company through the right of control they have. The choice is often based solely on the interests of the majority shareholders and not for the benefit of all shareholders. It showed the prospect of a lousy company going forward, so investors will respond negatively and ultimately will reduce the company value (Thesman and Juniarti, 2014; Gama and Galvao, 2012;).

The Effect of Control Variables on Firm Value

The leverage control variable has a significant negative effect on company value. This is because an increase in debt will increase the risk of bankruptcy and financial difficulties (financial distress). The higher the leverage, the greater the business risk, and vice versa (Horne and Marchowicz, 2005). This financial difficulty will reduce the company's profits, which in turn can reduce the company value (Adelegan, 2007).

Furthermore, company size control variables do not affect the company value. This is because investors buy shares of a company not only in terms of how substantial the company's assets are but also in terms of financial statements, proper names, and dividend policies. The company size can be seen from the total assets. Companies with substantial total assets and with the dominant component in accounts receivable and inventory may not necessarily pay dividends (retained earnings) because assets accumulate on accounts receivable and inventory. Therefore, it can be said that companies that have significant total assets may not necessarily provide confidence to investors about the company's ability to manage existing assets so that the size of the company has not been able to influence the company value itself (Mahatma et al. 2013)

Board size control variables also do not influence company value. This is because the company size on the board directors will cause fraud in the financial statements and the reduced ability of the board directors to monitor. So, various problems will arise such as in terms of coordination, communication, and decision making.

The number of board meetings is also a control variable in this study. The results show that the number of board meetings does not affect the value of the company. This may be due to the more frequent board meetings, the more inefficient the company. Companies will usually bear costs related to sessions conducted by the company. The more frequent meetings are held, the more meeting costs will be incurred. The frequency of the board of directors meeting by itself is not enough to improve company performance.

The company age variable is also a control variable in this study. The results show that the company age has a significant positive effect on firm value. This is because the longer the company can survive, the more the company discloses its social information as a form of responsibility to be accepted in the community (Prastiti and Utami, 2011). Also, by knowing the company age, it will be known to what extent the company can survive. The longer the life of the company, the higher the company value.

The test results of the effect of corporate social responsibility disclosure on the company value with family companies as moderating variables. In this study can be summarized in the following table:

Table 4. An Overview of The results of Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis		Coefficient of Regression	Sig.	Conclusion
H_1	Corporate social responsibility disclosure positive effect to firm value	0.552	0.021	Accepted
H_2	Family companies strengthen influence to corporate social responsibility disclosure on the company value	-1.959	0.000	Rejected

CONCLUSION

Empirically, this research proved that the higher value of corporate social responsibility disclosure will increase the company value. An existence of a family firm variable in moderating the effect of CSR disclosure on firm value provides different facts. Family firm proven empirically can weaken the impact of CSR disclosure on firm value. Also, the control variables indicated that only leverage and age variables affect to the company value. While, other variables, such as company size, the board size, and several board meetings do not affect the company value.

LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

The limited information on family ownership of the company shares that listed on the Indonesian stock exchange, in the company's annual report. This resulted in not many families being detected. For the next researchers, who want to do research related to family companies, they can trace the percentage of shares presently owned by the family through the OSIRIS or ORBIS database. This is because, in the annual report, the company only presents the interest of share ownership in pediatrics so it does not support the acquisition of complete data. Also, the measurement of family company variables uses a dummy variable because of the limitations of the number of samples in this study. For further research in measuring family, company variables can use the percentage of ownership. Also, the limitations are the measurement of CSRD index scores, because to obtain a CSRD index using a checklist, so that the subjectivity of researchers with one another can be different. Therefore for future research in getting CSRD index using list should be triangulated (examined by several people). So, from each CSRD index disclosure used is the average value of each researcher.

REFERENCES

Adelegan, O., (2007). Effect of Taxes on Business Financing Decision and Firm Value in Nigeria. International Research Journal of Finance and Economics, 12, 1450-2887.

Amran, N., & Ahmad, A. (2010). Family Succession and Firm Performance among Malaysian Companies. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 1(2), 193-203.

Baek, J. S., Kang, J. K., & Park, K. S. (2004). Corporate governance and firm value: evidence from the Korean financial crisis. Journal of Financial Economics, 71(2), 265-313.

Berrone, P., Cruz, C., & Gomez-Mejia, L. R. (2012). Socioemotional wealth in family firms theoretical dimensions, assessment approaches, and agenda for future research. Family Business Review, 25(3), 258-279.

Branco, M. C., & Rodrigues, L. L. (2006). Corporate Social Responsibility and Resource-Based Perspectives. Journal of Business Ethics, 69(2), 111-132.

Brigham, E. F., & Houston , J. F. (2006). Dasar-dasar Manajemen Keuangan (Edisi 10). Jakarta, Indonesia: Salemba Empat.

Buchanan, B., Cao, C. X., & Chen, C. (2018). Corporate social responsibility, firm value, and influential institutional ownership. Journal of Corporate Finance, 52, 73-95.

Cabeza-Garcia, L., Sacristan-Navarro, M., & Gomez-Anson, S. (2017). Family Involvement and Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure. Journal of Family Business Strategy, 8(2), 109-122.

Chakravarthy, B., (1986). Measuring strategic performance. Strategic Management Journal, 7(5), 437-458.

Clarkson, M. B., (1995). A Stakeholder Framework for Analyzing and Evaluating Corporate Social Performance. The Academy of Management Review, 20(1), 92-117.

CNBC Indonesia. (2018). Telkom Kehilangan Nilai Kapitalisasi Pasar Rp 42,34 T. https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/market/20180228142421-175778/telkom-kehilangan-nilai-kapitalisasi-pasar-rp-4234-t. Diakses pada 05 Januari 2019.

Cui, J., Jo, H., & Na, H. (2012). Does Corporate Social Responsibility Reduce Information Asimetri? Leavey School of Business, Santa Clara University.

Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Agency Problems and Residual Claims. Journal of Law & Economics, 26(2), 327-349.

Friedman, A. L., & Miles, S. (2006). Stakeholders: Theory and Practice. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gama, A. P., & Galvao, J. M. (2012). Performance, valuation, and capital structure: a survey of family firms. Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society, 12(2), 199-214.

Giannarakis, G., (2014). The determinants are influencing the extent of CSR disclosure. International Journal of Law and Management, 56(5), 393 - 416.

Global Family Busines Index. (2017). http://familybusinessindex.com/. Diakses pada 8 Januari 2019.

Gomez-Mejia, L. R., Makri, M., & Kintana, M. L. (2010). Diversification Decisions in Family-Controlled Firms. Journal of Management Studies, 47(2), 223-252.

Gray, R., Kouhy, R., & Lavers, S., (1995). Corporate social and environmental reporting A review of the literature and a longitudinal study of UK disclosure. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 8(2), 47-77.

Gunawan., B., Utami, S. S. (2008). Peranan Corporate Social Responsibility dalam Nilai Perusahaan. Jurnal Akuntansi dan Keuangan. 7(2), 174-185.

Hackston, D., & Milne, M. J., (1996). Some determinants of social and environmental disclosures in New Zealand companies. Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal, 9(1), 77-108.

Handajani, L., Subroto, B., Sutrisno, & Saraswati, E. (2014). Are Indonesian Corporates Ethical? Exploring Corporate Governance and Corporate Social Responsibility Linkage. International Jurnal of Business and Behavioral Sciences, 4(5), 1-10.

Hariati, I., & Prihatiningtyas, Y. W. (2015). Pengaruh Tata Kelola Perusahaan dan Kinerja Lingkungan Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. Simposium Nasional Akuntansi XVIII (pp. 1-16). Medan: Universitas Sumatera Utara.

Hejazi, R., & Hesari, S. (2012). Investor's Reaction to the Disclosure Types of Corporate Social Responsibilities. International Conference on Social Science and Humanity, 31, 1-5.

Hoover, K. R., (2000). The Elements of Scientific Thinking. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Horne, J. C. V & Wachowicz JR., John M. (2005). Financial Manajemen: Prinsip-prinsip Manajemen Keuangan Buku 1. Edisi 12. Jakarta: Salemba Empat.

Husnan, S. (2000). Manajemen Keuangan - Teori dan Penerapan (Keputusan Jangka Panjang). BPFE. Yogyakarta, pp.7.

Jamali, D., Safieddine, A. M., & Rabbath, M. (2008). Corporate Governance and Corporate Social Responsibility Synergies and Interrelationships. Corporate Responsibility Research Conference, 16(5), 443-459.

Jo, H., & Harjoto, M. A., (2011). Corporate Governance and Firm Value: The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility. Journal of Business Ethics, 103(3), 351–383.

Leland, H. E., & Pyle, D. H. (1977). Informational Asymmetries, Financial Structure, and Financial Intermediation. The Journal of Finance, 32(2), 371-387.

Lestari, H. M., & Fidiana. (2015). Pengaruh Corporate Social Responsibility terhadap Nilai Perusahaan dengan Profitabilitas sebagai Variabel Pemoderasi. Jurnal Ilmu & Riset Akuntansi, 4(12), 1-19.

Mahatma, D., Ayu, S., & Wirajaya, A. (2013). Pengaruh Struktur Modal, Profitabilitas dan Ukuran Perusahaan pada Nilai Perusahaan. EJurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana. 4(2): 358-372.

Maury, B., & Pajuste, A., (2006). Multiple Large Shareholders and Firm Value. Journal of Banking and Finance, 29(7), 1813-1834.

Nekhili, M., Nagati, H., Chtioui, T., & Rebolledo, C. (2017). Corporate Social Responsibility disclosure and market value: Family versus nonfamily firms. Journal of Business Research, 77, 41-52.

Nurlela, R., & Islahuddin. (2008). Pengaruh corporate social responsibility terhadap nilai perusahaan dengan prosentase kepemilikan manajemen sebagai variabel moderating: Studi empiris pada perusahaan yang terdaftar di bursa efek jakarta. Simposium Nasional Akuntansi XI (pp. 1-25). Pontianak: Universitas Tanjung Pura.

Ong, T. S., & Gan, S. (2013). Do Family-Owned Banks Perform Better? A Study of Malaysian Banking Industry. Asian Social Science, 9(7), 124-135.

Orbaningsih, D. (2018). Pengungkapan tanggung jawab sosial: Determinan dan dampaknya terhadap nilai perusahaan. Disertasi. Universitas Brawijaya. Malang.

Orlitzky, M., Schmidt, F. L., Rynes, S. L. (2003). Corporate Social and Financial Performance: A Meta-Analysis. Organization Studies, 43(3), 403-441.

Prastiti & Utami. (2011). Pengaruh Karakteristik Perusahaan terhadap Social Disclosure.Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis Th.16: pp. 1.

PricewaterhouseCoopers. (2014). Survey Bisnis Keluarga - Indonesia. https://www.pwc.com/id/en/publications/assets/indonesia-report-family-business survey-2014.pdf. Diakses pada 17 December 2017.

Primady, G. R., & Wahyudi, S. (2015). Pengaruh corporate social responsibility dan profitabilitas terhadap nilai perusahaan dengan kepemilikan manajerial sebagai variabel pemoderasi. Diponegoro Journal of Management, 4(3), 1-15.

Qiu, Y., Shaukat, A., & Tharyan, R. (2016). Environmental and Social Disclosures: Link with Corporate Financial Performance. The British Accounting Review, 48(1). 102-116.

Roberts, R. W., (1992). Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosure: An application of stakeholder theory. Accounting, Organizations, and Society, 17(6), 595-612.

Rosiana, G. A., Juliarsa, G., & Sari, M. M. (2013). Pengaruh pengungkapan CSR terhadap nilai perusahaan dengan profitabilitas sebagai variabel pemoderasi. E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana, 5(3), 723-738.

Schwartz-Ziv, M., Weisbach, M. S., (2013). What Do Boards Do? Evidence from Minutes of Board Meetings. Journal of Financial Economics, 108(2), 349-366.

Shyu, J., (2011). Family ownership and firm performance: evidence from Taiwanese firms. International Journal of Managerial Finance, 7(4), 397-441.
Siddiqui, M., Razzaq, N., Malik, F., & Gul, S. (2013). Internal Corporate Governance Mechanisms and Agency Cost: Evidence from Large KSE Listed Firms. European Journal of Business and Management, 5(23), 103-109.
Silitonga, A. D. D., & Juniarti. (2017). Struktur kepemilikan keluarga dan kinerja perusahaan pada sektor industri dasar dan kimia. Business Accounting Review, 5(2), 757-766.
Siregar, S. V., & Utama, S. (2008). Type of earnings management and the effect of ownership structure, firm size, and corporate-governance practices: Evidence from Indonesia. The International Journal of Accounting, 43(1), 1-27.
Soobaroyen, T. & Mahadeo, J. D. (2012). Do Corporate Governance Codes Improve Board accountability?. Evidence from an Emerging Economy. Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management, 9(4), 337-362.
Sujoko, & Soebiantoro, U. (2007). Pengaruh Struktur Kepemilikan Saham, Leverage, Faktor Intern dan Faktor Ekstern Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. Jurnal Manajemen dan Kewirausahaan, 9(1), 41-48.
Susanto, A. B., Wijanarko, H., Susanto, P., & Mertosono, S. (2007). The Jakarta Consulting Group on Family Business. Jakarta: The Consulting Group.
Suttipun, M., & Stanton, P., (2012). A study of Environmental Disclosures by Thai listed Companies on Websites, Procedia – Economics and Finance, 2, 9-15.
Suwana, M. A. J. (2017). Pengaruh tata kelola perusahaan, struktur kepemilikan, dan auditor eksternal terhadap pengungkapan tanggungjawab sosial perusahaan dengan manajemen laba sebagai variabel pemoderasi. Tesis. Universitas Brawijaya. Malang.
Thesman, C., & Juniarti. (2014). Pengaruh Family Control Terhadap Profitabilitas dan Nilai Perusahaan Pada Sektor Pertanian. Business Accounting Review, 2(1), 190-199.
Wardhani, R. S. (2013). Pengaruh CSR Disclosure terhadap nilai perusahaan dengan kinerja keuangan sebagai variabel intervening (studi kasus perusahaan manufaktur yang terdaftar di BEI). Jurnal Ekonomi Akuntansi dan Manajemen, 12(1), 54-86.
Whiting, R. H., & Miller, J. C. (2008). Voluntary disclosure of intellectual capital in New Zealand annual reports and the "hidden value." Journal of Human Resource Costing & Accounting, 12(1), 26-50.
Wibowo, S., Yokhebed, & Tampubolon, L. D. (2016). Pengaruh CSR disclosure dan GCG terhadap nilai perusahaan dengan kinerja keuangan sebagai variabel intervening di perusahaan manufaktur yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia. Prosiding Seminar Nasional Multi Disiplin Ilmu & Call for Papers Unisbank, 926-935.
Westhead, P., & Howorth, C., (2006). Ownership and Management Issues Associated with Family Firm Performance and Company Objectives. Family Business Review, 19(4), 301-316.
Yao, S., Wang, J., & Song, L. (2013). The Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure: Evidence From China. Journal of Applied Business Research, 29(6), 1833-1848.
Zaky, A. (2018). Suksesi dalam Bisnis Keluarga (studi pada bisnis perlengkapan militer CV. Tumiran kabupaten Tulungagung). Tesis. Universitas Brawijaya. Malang.

Widiya Pratiwi[1]
[1,2,3] University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia

Widiyapratiwi19@gmail.com

Erwin Saraswati[2]
[1,2,3] University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia

Roekhudin[3]
[1,2,3] University of Brawijaya, Malang, Indonesia