Jurnal REKSA: Rekayasa Keuangan, Syariah dan Audit
Vol. 12, No. 1, March 2025, pp. 19-35
ISSN 2089-6581 (print) | 2614-3720 (online)
http://journal2.uad.ac.id/index.php/reksa/index

Good Governance and Ethical Value: Are They Sync in Harmony?

Mukhtasyarah Minhajul Qoshidah[a,1], An Nurrahmawati[a,2,*], Saifulrizan Bin Norizan[b,3]

[a]Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia
[b]Universiti Teknologi MARA, Sarawak, Malaysia
[1]mukhtasyarahm@gmail.com; [2]an_nurrahmawati@staff.uns.ac.id*; [3]saifulrizan@uitm.edu.my
*Corresponding Author

Abstract

This study aims to provide empirical evidence on the impact of good corporate governance, reflected in managerial ownership, audit quality, board size, independent board size, and board gender diversity, on corporate ethical value disclosure. The research focuses on mining sector companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange from 2017 to 2022, using a sample of 56 companies and 315 observations selected through purposive sampling. Applying multiple regression analysis on panel data, the findings highlight that audit quality, board size, and board gender diversity positively influence corporate ethical value disclosure, whereas managerial ownership and independent board size do not significantly impact. The novelty of this research lies in its application of the corporate ethical value index, comprising 40 items across 10 categories, and the utilization of five principles of good corporate governance. The study underscores the importance of implementing good corporate governance, particularly through audit quality, board size, and gender diversity, to enhance corporate ethical value disclosure. These practices can improve company transparency, strengthen stakeholder trust and reputation, and promote a more moral and accountable business environment. This study contributes to the literature by bridging the gap between governance structures and ethical disclosures in a developing market context, offering a comprehensive empirical model that integrates diverse governance indicators with a detailed ethical value index rarely used in previous research.

Check for updates

Article History
Received:
June 9, 2024
Revised:
August 27, 2024
March 19, 2025
April 10, 2025
Accepted:
April 22, 2025

Keywords

corporate ethical value disclosure, good corporate governance, managerial ownership, audit quality, board size

Introduction

Mining companies are a crucial industrial sector, significantly contributing to a country's development. In 2023, the mining sector in Indonesia generated Non-Tax State Revenue (*Penerimaan Negara Bukan Pajak*–PNBP) of IDR 146.07 trillion, surpassing the target of approximately 118.42% (DDTC, 2024). However, in the last six years, there have been fluctuations in the mining industry sector, which are influenced by the economic cycle in Indonesia (Bapepenas RI, 2023). Fluctuations in the mining sector occur due to fraud that has been reported to the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) and the Financial Services Authority (Wahyudi et al., 2022).

According to data from the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE Global, 2020), the mining industry sector globally committed fraud with a percentage of 1.13%, with 26 cases proven. These cases resulted in a financial loss of USD 475,000, making it the most significant loss compared to other industries. Previously, in 2019, the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners Indonesia conducted a study identifying 11 sectors with high levels of fraud, one of which was the mining industry sector (ACFE Indonesia, 2019). The findings of this study were reinforced by news reports of fraud cases involving mining companies in Indonesia.

The data additionally demonstrate that the level of fraud remains significantly prevalent in the mining sector, both globally and particularly in Indonesia. This requires significant attention as fraudulent activities can harm the company's image. In general, disclosure of corporate ethics can serve as a step to uphold the company's image in the eyes of stakeholders and establish its legitimacy. Ethics can guide companies in operational activities by forming an ethical culture. Corporate ethics is implemented through the disclosure in the company's annual report, or what is commonly called corporate ethical value disclosure (Nugraheni & Hastuti, 2022). Therefore, this study took the dependent variable as corporate ethical value disclosure, using the corporate ethical value index of 40 items in 10 categories (Joseph et al., 2023). This differs from the research by Nugraheni and Hastuti (2022), which employed the ethical identity index (Haniffa & Hudaib, 2007).

In corporate ethical value disclosure, it can be understood that ethics upheld within the work culture in a company align with good corporate governance (Giannarakis et al., 2020). Good Corporate Governance (GCG) is expected to enhance the transparency, accountability, responsibility, independence, and fairness of the company to help avoid or detect early-stage ethical violations (Joseph et al., 2023). Companies need GCG and corporate ethical values to create healthy competition in business and add value to the company.

In this study, the five principles of GCG were proxied through five variables: managerial ownership, audit quality, board size, independent commissioner size, and gender diversity of directors, different from the research of Nugraheni and Hastuti (2022), which only proxied three principles: transparency, responsibility, and fairness. These five variables are selected based on their direct influence on corporate governance mechanisms that operationalize transparency, accountability, and ethical decision-making, which are crucial for enhancing corporate ethical value disclosure. Managerial ownership increases managers' sensitivity to external pressures, encouraging transparency and disclosure of information (Waweru, 2020). High audit quality, especially from Big Four auditors, also strengthens the legitimacy of the company by ensuring accurate and transparent reporting (DeAngelo, 1981). In addition, gender diversity in the board of directors enhances the structural legitimacy and effectiveness of supervision, improving the company's ethical reputation (Ntim & Soobaroyen, 2013). Under the two-tier system in Indonesia, in Act of the Republic of Indonesia No. 40 of 2007 and institutional theory, companies must adjust their reporting practices by disclosing governance and ethical commitments, as stipulated in Financial Services Authority Regulation Number 33/POJK.04/2014 concerning the minimum number of directors and board of commissioners. This regulation aims to improve the implementation of GCG in public companies. On the other hand, Nugraheni and Hastuti (2022) looked at GCG in a more general way. This study looks at how specific governance mechanisms affect how companies disclose their ethical values. This gives us a more structured and measurable way to examine ethical corporate governance.

As suggested by the aforementioned explanation of the phenomena and research results above, research on corporate ethical value disclosure in public companies in the mining sector can be considered for several reasons. First, mining industry sector companies listed on the IDX for the period 2017-2022 were used as research objects, and different ethical disclosure indexes were employed (Nugraheni & Hastuti, 2022). Second, topics related to corporate ethical value disclosure remain relevant to discuss, as there are still numerous instances of fraud committed by companies and no regulations requiring companies in Indonesia to make corporate ethical value disclosure. The novelty of this study lies in its integration of the corporate ethical value index (Joseph et al., 2023), which consists of 40 items across 10 categories, as a measurement tool for ethical disclosure. This study adds to the conversation about GCG by using five governance mechanisms as stand-ins for corporate governance mechanisms. This gives a more thorough look at GCG than earlier studies that only looked at broad GCG principles like fairness, responsibility, and transparency. These principles of GCG are also proven to significantly affect the positive matter of a corporation, such as managerial performance (Hidayah & Ariesanti, 2018). Previous research findings generally highlight this positive relationship between GCG practices and firm value proxied by monetary-related value, and rarely from qualitative proxies such as corporate responsibility (Winarti & Imron, 2019).

Therefore, this study aims to offer empirical evidence regarding the influence of GCG and corporate ethical value disclosure in mining industry sector companies from 2017 through 2022. Even though corporate ethical value disclosure is getting more attention, most studies that have been done so far have only looked at general principles of GCG, like fairness, responsibility, and transparency, without looking at the specific governance mechanisms that lead to ethical disclosure (Nugraheni & Hastuti, 2022). This study fills this gap by integrating five governance-related variables to assess their role in shaping corporate ethical reporting. The novelty of this research lies in using the corporate ethical value index as a more comprehensive measurement tool and applying a more detailed GCG framework compared to previous studies. The results add to academic and practical discussions because they show how governance mechanisms improve ethical disclosure. This helps regulators and corporate policymakers understand how to improve ethical transparency in the mining industry. Overall, this study makes a meaningful contribution by examining how specific elements of GCG influence how mining companies in Indonesia disclose their ethical values. While previous research often focused on general principles like fairness or transparency, this study digs deeper by analyzing five concrete governance factors, like audit quality and board diversity, and how they shape ethical reporting. The detailed corporate ethical value index offers a clearer, more structured view of ethical disclosure than commonly seen in the literature. These insights enrich academic discussions and provide practical value for regulators and company leaders looking to strengthen ethical practices and build trust in the mining industry.

Literature Review

Legitimation Theory

Chariri and Ghozali (2007) define legitimacy theory based on social agreement between companies and society. This agreement appoints the government as a society representative, ensuring that compliance with the government's rules reflects the wishes of society. In Indonesia, corporate legitimacy is closely linked to regulatory compliance, as seen in enforcing Financial Services Authority Regulation Number 33/POJK.04/2014, which mandates governance transparency. A relevant example is PT Bumi Resources Tbk, which faced financial misreporting issues that led to regulatory scrutiny and investor distrust (Kompasiana, 2025). The company had to improve governance transparency and adhere to stricter reporting standards to regain legitimacy. Corporate legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders can be achieved through integrity in implementing business ethics, which provides various benefits, such as improving reputation and maintaining corporate image (Waweru, 2020). In the context of corporate ethical value disclosure, the annual report legitimizes and conveys the company's ethical business activities to stakeholders and shareholders (Waweru, 2020). This is because the annual report permanently discloses social issues every year, which are considered necessary by top management and must be communicated to shareholders and the public. Also, the annual report is a record of the entity's ethical business activities and historical social awareness (Huhmann & Conner, 2014).

In realizing corporate legitimacy, managerial ownership, audit quality, and gender diversity of directors play an essential role. Managers with shared ownership tend to be more sensitive to external pressures and more committed to increasing transparency and disclosure of information (Waweru, 2020). High audit quality strengthens public trust by ensuring that published reports are accurate and transparent (DeAngelo, 1981). Gender diversity on the board of directors enhances legitimacy through fairer and more inclusive representation, reflecting the interests of various stakeholders and strengthening support from the community (Ntim & Soobaroyen, 2013; Waweru, 2020). These factors can help companies improve their legitimacy in the eyes of the public and create long-term value for all stakeholders.

ISSN 2089-6581 (print) | 2614-3720 (online)
Jurnal REKSA: Rekayasa Keuangan, Syariah dan Audit
Vol. 12, No. 1, March 2025, pp. 19-35

Institutional Theory

According to institutional theory, organizations that comply with standards, regulations, and ethics are deemed legitimate and recognized as such (Burdon & Sorour, 2020). Compliance with these norms is key to gaining corporate recognition and credibility. In the context of corporate ethical value disclosure, companies must demonstrate ethical commitment to maintain legitimacy, particularly in industries with high environmental and social impacts, such as mining (Mahmood & Uddin, 2021). This theory underpins the hypothesis that companies with strong governance mechanisms, such as high audit quality and diverse board composition, are more likely to disclose ethical values to align with societal expectations and regulatory pressures. In Indonesia, regulatory frameworks such as POJK No. 51/POJK.03/2017 have pressured firms to integrate sustainability principles into their reporting, illustrating institutional theory in action. Furthermore, DiMaggio and Powell (1983) stated that organizations that comply with existing regulatory requirements and rules tend to meet industry expectations and standards better.

Institutional theory provides an in-depth analysis of corporate social reporting practices, including corporate ethics reporting (Albu et al., 2021; Deegan, 2017; Mahmood & Uddin, 2021). In this context, companies in Indonesia must adjust their reporting practices by disclosing ethical commitments, especially since there are regulations such as POJK No. 33/POJK.04/2014 (Otoritas Jasa Keuangan, 2014). This regulation polices the roles, responsibilities, and minimum number of directors and commissioners in public companies, thus ensuring transparency and accountability.

Corporate Ethical Value Disclosure

Disclosure of the company's business ethics, or in this study referred to as Corporate Ethical Value Disclosure (CEVD), is understood as a communication tool between management and the public to ensure that the company's activities do not harm other parties, prevent corporate fraud, and become a driver of ethical behavior for all internal parties of the company (Nugraheni & Hastuti, 2022; Salin et al., 2017). The corporate ethical value implemented and communicated by the company will increase stakeholder satisfaction and have an impact on the company's reputation and image (Baselga-Pascual et al., 2018). This study used the corporate ethical value index consisting of 40 items (Joseph, et al., 2023). This index includes 10 categories: code of ethics, business values, company policies on ethical issues, ethical commitment, regular reporting/communication and awareness, program monitoring and accountability, ethical performance, ethical infrastructure, reports to governance and integrity committees or directors, and organizational responsibility. These categories adopt SDG 16 to promote ethical values, prevent or reduce fraud, and increase corporate accountability and transparency.

Good Corporate Governance

Good corporate governance is a commitment, regulation, and ethical and healthy business practices that manage interactions between shareholders and stakeholders to generate added value for the company and all stakeholders (Sergakis, 2022). Companies in Indonesia implement good corporate governance based on TARIF's five principles: transparency, accountability, responsibility, independence, and fairness.

Managerial Ownership

Managerial ownership is the ownership of shares by company management, which is active in decision-making (Utami & Prasasti, 2011). According to legitimacy theory, this ownership drives company effectiveness because management is directly incentivized to ensure efficient and profitable operations (Darmayanti & Sanusi, 2018). Managerial ownership also makes managers more sensitive to external pressures, increasing transparency and disclosure of information (Waweru, 2020). However, several studies have shown a significant positive effect of managerial ownership on corporate ethical value disclosure (Waweru, 2020; Nugraheni & Hastuti, 2022). Theoretically, the greater the managerial

ownership, the greater the expected increase in corporate ethical value disclosure, as managers who own shares tend to be more committed to maintaining the company's reputation and legitimacy in the eyes of the public. Based on this explanation, the following hypothesis is stated:
H1. Managerial ownership has a positive effect on corporate ethical value disclosure.

Audit Quality

Audit quality is related to the quality of financial and non-financial disclosures audited by external auditors, especially the Big Four Public Accounting Firms. According to legitimacy theory, high audit quality increases a company's legitimacy by ensuring accurate and transparent financial reports, strengthening public trust (DeAngelo, 1981). Big Four auditors play an essential role in improving reporting quality, with companies audited by them having higher quality and reliability of disclosure information than non-Big Four auditors (Clinch et al., 2012; Chen et al., 2016). Previous studies by Al-Bassam et al. (2018), Chan et al. (2021), and Handayati et al. (2022) stated that high audit quality from Big Four auditors is related to increased corporate ethical value disclosure. However, several other studies, such as Makhfudloh et al. (2018) and Sencal and Asutay (2021), revealed that audit quality does not always affect disclosure. Despite the differences in findings, it can be theoretically argued that the higher the audit quality of a company, the more capable the company is of disclosing corporate ethics in an accurate and transparent annual report, which ultimately increases its legitimacy in the eyes of the public. Based on this explanation, the following hypothesis is stated:
H2. Audit quality has a positive effect on corporate ethical value disclosure.

Size of the Board of Directors

Board size refers to the number of internal and external directors in a company (Khaireddine et al., 2020). In Indonesia, the minimum number of directors is two, in accordance with POJK Number 33/POJK.04/2014. Compliance with this regulation indicates compliance with institutional theory, which increases the company's legitimacy in the eyes of stakeholders. A larger board of directors allows companies to gain more diverse expertise and experience, so they can make better decisions and oversee the implementation of business ethics more effectively (Baselga-Pascual et al., 2018; Setiawan et al., 2018). Previous studies by Baselga-Pascual et al. (2018), Setiawan et al. (2018), and Mukhibad et al. (2022) found that companies with a larger board of directors tend to have higher levels of disclosure. However, other studies state that the size of the board of directors does not affect disclosure (Khaireddine et al., 2020; Nugraheni & Hastuti, 2022). Although the research results are varied, theoretically, it can be argued that the larger the board of directors, the higher the corporate ethical value disclosure because the larger number of members allows for more effective supervision and implementation of business ethics. Based on this explanation, the hypothesis is stated as follows:
H3. The size of the board of directors has a positive effect on corporate ethical value disclosure.

Size of the Independent Commissioner

Independent commissioners are members of the board of commissioners from an external party who are not bound and are responsible for providing high-quality information to the market (Waweru, 2020). In accordance with POJK Number 33 / POJK.04 / 2014, the minimum number of independent commissioners in a company is 30% of the total number of commissioners. From stakeholders' perspectives, the company's legitimacy is enhanced by its adherence to institutional theory, which is demonstrated by its compliance with this regulation (Meyer et al., 1977). Independent commissioners can improve information disclosure by ensuring alignment between company practices and community expectations, strengthening public trust, and increasing the company's legitimacy. Previous studies have revealed that independent commissioners positively impact business ethics disclosure, with more independent commissioners improving the quality of company disclosure and transparency (Waweru,

2020; Khaireddine et al., 2020). However, this is not in line with research conducted by Fatmawati et al. (2018), showing that the independence of independent commissioners is still questionable, as it does not always improve disclosure. Even though the research results are varied, it is theoretically possible to argue that the corporate ethical value disclosure is higher when independent commissioners are larger. This is because the commissioners are expected to be able to supervise and enforce improved ethical practices within the company. Based on the explanation, the hypothesis is formulated as follows:
H4. The size of independent commissioners positively affects corporate ethical value disclosure.

Gender Diversity of the Board of Directors

Gender diversity of directors refers to the presence of men and women in the company's board structure. According to legitimacy theory, gender diversity can increase corporate legitimacy through three forms: structural legitimacy, influence legitimacy, and exchange legitimacy (Waweru, 2020). Liu (2018) argues that women on the board of directors tend to be more concerned about business ethics and have better monitoring, thereby reducing corporate violations. The presence of women can also encourage the implementation of higher ethics, increasing the transparency of corporate ethics (Khaireddine et al., 2020). Previous studies have uncovered a positive relationship between the gender diversity of directors and the disclosure of business ethics (Khaireddine et al., 2020; Waweru, 2020). However, this does not align with the research of Nugraheni and Hastuti (2022), which found no effect between gender diversity and disclosure of business ethics. Theoretically, the higher the gender diversity of the board of directors, the higher the corporate ethical value disclosure because women on the board of directors can improve supervision and implementation of ethical practices. Based on the above explanation, the following hypothesis is stated:
H5. Gender diversity on the board of directors positively affects corporate ethical value disclosure.

Research Method

Population and Sample

This quantitative research approach with secondary data focused on mining companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) from 2017 to 2022. The mining sector was chosen due to its significant economic contribution to Indonesia, high environmental and social risk exposure, and frequent ethical concerns related to governance and sustainability reporting. In 2023, the mining sector generated Non-Tax State Revenue (PNBP) of IDR 146.07 trillion, surpassing the target by approximately 118.42% (DDTC, 2024). However, the industry has also been associated with various fraudulent activities, making corporate ethical value disclosure a crucial aspect of its corporate governance practices (Wahyudi et al., 2022). The purposive sampling method was employed in determining the sample with several criteria, namely mining sector companies listed on the IDX in 2017, not delisted during the research period, namely 2017-2022, and companies that published annual reports for 2017-2022. Based on these research criteria, 56 companies were obtained throughout 2017-2022, with 315 data points after outliers were removed.

Operational Definition and Measurement of Variables

Corporate ethical value disclosure was measured by analyzing the content in the annual report using the corporate ethical value disclosure index, divided into 10 categories with a total of 40 items (Joseph, et al., 2023). This index was selected because it comprehensively captures various dimensions of corporate ethical values, aligning with international standards for ethical reporting and corporate governance. The categories within this index ensure a holistic evaluation of a company's ethical commitments, covering aspects such as ethical policies, reporting mechanisms, accountability structures, and compliance with governance regulations. This selection aligns with the perspective that ethical disclosure should reflect a company's integrity, transparency, and adherence to sustainability principles, as emphasized in previous research on corporate ethical reporting (Joseph et al., 2024). These categories form a unity that is equally essential to representing a company's ethical application. The score for the ethics index is given by giving a value of 1 for disclosure and 0 for the absence of disclosure (Joseph et al., 2024). Content analysis was performed using keywords from each item and understanding the information in the annual report according to the index items. The more items disclosed, the better the application of corporate ethical values. The variable of corporate ethical value disclosure is measured using formula (1) (Joseph et al., 2024).

$$CEVD = \frac{Total\ items\ disclosed}{Total\ items\ in\ index} \quad (1)$$

Good Corporate Governance (GCG) was measured using five variables: managerial ownership, audit quality, board size, independent commissioner size, and gender diversity of the board of directors. Since these variables represent different dimensions of governance rather than a single construct, a Principal Component Analysis (PCA) was performed to test whether they could be aggregated into a composite measure of GCG. If the PCA results indicate low factor loadings, the variables will be analyzed separately to maintain their contributions to corporate ethical value disclosure.

Managerial ownership is the ownership of shares by the company's management (board of directors and commissioners), who actively participate in the company's decision-making (Utami & Prasasti, 2011). In this study, managerial ownership was measured by the percentage of shares owned by managers compared to the company's total outstanding shares. The variable of managerial ownership is measured using formula (2) (Hakri et al., 2013; Nugraheni & Hastuti, 2022; Utami & Prasasti, 2011).

$$MAN = \frac{The\ number\ of\ shares\ owned\ by\ the\ manager}{Total\ number\ of\ shares\ of\ the\ company\ outstanding}\ x\ 100\% \quad (2)$$

The size of the Public Accounting Firm (KAP) is a classification of audit quality (Agustin & Oktavianna, 2019). Public Accounting Firms are generally classified into large KAPs with global coverage (Big Four) and small KAPs with domestic coverage (non-Big Four). The Big Four KAPs are Deloitte, Klynveld Peat Marwick Goerdeler (KPMG), Ernst and Young (EY), and PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC). Audit quality is a dummy variable, where companies audited by Big Four auditors were given a score of 1, and companies audited by KAPs other than the Big Four were given a score of 0 (Al-Bassam et al., 2018).

Board size is the number of inside and outside directors on a company's board (Khaireddine et al., 2020). Board size was calculated from the number of members of the company's board of directors. Its information is contained in the annual report, especially in the section that reviews commissioners and directors. The names of the board of directors and their positions are listed in the annual report.

Independent commissioners refer to members of the board of commissioners who are not related to the board of directors, other commissioners, or majority shareholders, which can affect independence in decisions. The size of the independent commissioner was determined from the percentage comparison of the number of independent commissioners to the total members of the company's board of commissioners (Fatmawati et al., 2018). The information is contained in the company's annual report, especially in the section discussing the board of commissioners and directors. The size of the board of commissioners variable is measured using formula (3).

$$KOMI = \frac{Number\ of\ independent\ commissioners}{Total\ members\ of\ the\ company's\ board\ of\ commissioners}\ x\ 100 \quad (3)$$

ISSN 2089-6581 (print) | 2614-3720 (online)
Vol. 12, No. 1, March 2025, pp. 19-35

Board diversity is the composition and combination of various characteristics, knowledge, and expertise each member possesses, which can influence the final decision (Purnomo & Rizki, 2020). Diversity in this study is related to the board of directors' characteristics, namely gender. There are male directors and female directors on the board of directors. In this study, gender diversity was measured using the percentage comparison of female directors to the total directors in the company (Khaireddine et al., 2020; Nugraheni & Hastuti, 2022). The board diversity variable is measured using formula (4).

$$GEN = \frac{Number\ of\ female\ board\ directors}{Total\ board\ of\ directors\ in\ the\ company}\ x\ 100\% \tag{4}$$

Company size (SIZE), profitability (ROA), and leverage (LEV) are control variables (Setiawan et al., 2018; Nugraheni & Hastuti, 2022). Company size can be determined through the relationship between the company's total assets by measuring the company's total assets on a natural logarithmic scale. Company profitability was measured using Return on Assets, describing how it uses its assets to generate profits. Leverage was measured by Debt to Equity, which provides an overview of the company's debt level.

Analysis Method

This panel data study combines time series and cross-sectional data (Blundell & Bond, 1998). Data analysis began with data tabulation using Microsoft Excel, followed by descriptive statistical analysis to describe the data through mean, standard deviation, maximum value, and minimum value. Then, a regression model test was carried out, namely the Chow test, the Hausman test, and the Lagrange Multiplier test, to select an estimation model, such as a fixed effect model, a random effect model, and a common effect model (Gujarati, 2013). The EViews 12 application was utilized for data processing, including model testing, classical assumption testing, and multiple regression. The regression equation used in this study is shown in formula (5).

$$CEVD = \alpha + \beta_1 MAN + \beta_2 KA + \beta_3 DIR + \beta_4 KOMI + \beta_5 GEN + \beta_6 SIZE + \beta_7 ROA + \beta_8 LEV + e \tag{5}$$

where CEVD is corporate ethical value disclosure, MAN is managerial ownership, KA is audit quality, DIR is board of directors size, KOMI is independent commissioner size, GEN is board of directors gender diversity, SIZE is company size, ROA is profitability, and LEV is leverage.

Results and Discussion

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics is an analysis method that describes data distribution (Ghozali, 2013). Descriptive statistical analysis in this study describes the number of observation data, mean, maximum value, minimum value, and standard deviation. Table 1 details the output of descriptive statistical analysis. Table 1 reveals that the descriptive statistical analysis results were carried out with 315 observation data. Corporate Ethical Value Disclosure (CEVD) was the dependent variable. Corporate ethical value disclosure in this study was measured by 40 items of the corporate ethical value index (Joseph, et al., 2023). Table 1 indicates that the mean value of corporate ethical value disclosure was 0.5749, and the standard deviation was 0.1842, suggesting relatively low variation in the data. While the maximum value of corporate ethical value disclosure was 0.9000, the minimum value was 0.1250.

The results of the descriptive statistical analysis of the first independent variable, namely managerial ownership, showed a mean of 0.0328 and a standard deviation of 0.0834, indicating that the average managerial ownership in mining companies was 3.2%, with relatively high data variation. The maximum value was 0.4100, and several companies had managerial ownership of 0.0000, the minimum value. Audit quality, as the following independent variable, produced a mean of 0.3525 with a standard deviation of 0.4784, indicating the large spread of the data. The maximum value was 1.0000, while the minimum value was 0.0000. Furthermore, the size of the board of directors demonstrated the results of the descriptive statistical analysis with a mean of 4.3428 and a standard deviation of 1.4398, implying low data variation. The largest number of board members was 9.0000, whereas the minimum value was 2.0000. The next independent variable is the size of independent commissioners, with a mean of 0.3918 and a standard deviation of 0.966, denoting high data variation. While the maximum value was 0.6670, the minimum value was 0.2000. As the last independent variable, gender diversity of the board of directors had a mean of 0.0901 and a standard deviation of 0.1491, indicating a large spread of data. The maximum value was 0.5000, while the minimum value was 0.0000, which most companies owned.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistical Analysis Output

Variable	Observation	Mean	Maximum	Minimum	Std. Dev.
CEVD	315	0.5749	0.9	0.125	0.1842
MAN	315	0.0328	0.41	0	0.0834
KA	315	0.3523	1	0	0.4784
DIR	315	4.3428	9	2	1.4398
KOMI	315	0.3918	0.667	0.2	0.0966
GEN	315	0.0901	0.5	0	0.1491
SIZE	315	28.9575	32.75	24.041	1.6146
ROA	315	0.0343	0.457	-0.355	0.1081
LEV	315	1.2455	43.086	0	3.2481

CEVD = corporate ethical value disclosure, MAN = managerial ownership, KA = audit quality, DIR = board of directors size, KOMI = independent commissioner size, GEN = board of directors gender diversity, SIZE = company size, ROA = profitability, LEV = leverage

Source: Secondary data processed (2024)

Three control variables were considered in this study, namely company size (SIZE), profitability (ROA), and leverage (LEV). As measured using Ln Assets, company size revealed a mean of 28.9575 with a standard deviation of 1.6146. The maximum value was 32.7500, while the minimum value was 24.0410. As represented by Return on Assets, profitability yielded a mean of 0.03343 and a standard deviation of 0.1081. The maximum value reached 0.4570, while the minimum value was -0.3550. Furthermore, leverage generated a mean of 1.2455 with a standard deviation of 3.2481. While the maximum leverage value reached 43.0860, the minimum value was 0.0000.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is an essential step in evaluating the truth of the population based on sample data that has been collected and analyzed (Ghozali, 2013). In this study, the hypothesis tests applied were the determination coefficient test (adjusted R-squared), the simultaneous regression test (F), and the partial regression test (t). Before conducting the hypothesis test, the stages carried out were the regression model test and the classical assumption test. The output of the hypothesis testing process is presented in Table 2.

In this study, model tests were conducted, namely the Chow test, the Hausman test, and the Lagrange Multiplier test. The results of the model tests, as documented in Table 2, reveal that the most optimal estimation model was the Random Effect Model, with the Generalized Least Squares (GLS) approach (Gujarati & Porter, 2009). According to Gujarati and Porter (2009), using the GLS approach, the classical assumption test is unnecessary, as it is considered the Best Linear Unbiased Estimator (BLUE).

The determination coefficient test is recorded in Table 2, resulting in an adjusted R-squared value of 0.2384. This indicates that about 23% of the variation in corporate ethical value disclosure can be explained by GCG, which was proxied by management ownership, audit quality, board size, independent commissioner size, and gender diversity of the board of directors. Meanwhile, about 77% of the remaining variance was influenced by other variables not included in this study.

Table 2. Hypothesis Test Output and Model (Random Effect Model)

Variable	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-Statistic	Prob.
C	-0.6263	0.2116	-2.595	0.0033
Managerial Ownership (MAN)	-0.0218	0.1383	-0.1582	0.8744
Audit Quality (KA)	0.0515	0.0238	2.1635	0.0313**
Board of Directors Size (DIR)	0.0200	0.0078	2.5578	0.0110**
Independent Commissioner Size (KOMI)	0.1128	0.0841	1.3422	0.1809
Board of Directors Gender Diversity (GEN)	0.162	0.0656	2.4678	0.0141**
Company Size (SIZE)	0.0341	0.0081	4.1913	0.0000***
Profitability (ROA)	0.1116	0.0739	1.5088	0.1324
Leverage (LEV)	-0.0048	0.0024	-1.9462	0.0525*
Adjusted R-squared	0.2384			
Prob (F-Statistic)	0.0000			
***significant at the 1% level, **significant at the 5% level, *significant at the 10% level				
Chow Test				
Cross-section Chi-square	0.0000			
Hausman Test				
Cross-section random	0.9912			
Lagrange Multiplier Test				
Cross-section Breusch- Pagan	0.0000			

Source: Secondary data processed (2024)

The simultaneous regression test documented in Table 2 yielded the probability of an F-statistic of 0.0000. This value was below the significance level of α (0.05). Thus, it can be concluded that the study model is feasible for analyzing the relationship between good corporate governance and the dependent variable, namely, corporate ethical value disclosure.

The t-statistic test documented in Table 2 shows that the first variable of GCG, namely managerial ownership (MAN), had a probability of 0.8744, > (0.05), with a negative coefficient of 0.0218. The second variable, audit quality (KA), had a probability of 0.0313, smaller than α (0.05), with a positive coefficient of 0.0515. The size of the board of directors (DIR) was also an independent variable that had a probability of 0.0110 < α (0.05) with a positive coefficient of 0.0200. The independent commissioner size variable (KOMI) had a probability of 0.1809 > 0.05, with a positive coefficient of 0.1128. The gender diversity variable of the board of directors (GEN) had a probability of 0.0141, smaller than α (0.05), with a positive coefficient of 0.1620. This indicates that audit quality, board size, and board gender diversity positively affected corporate ethical value disclosure, thus supporting H2, H3, and H5. Meanwhile, managerial ownership (H1) and board size (H4) did not affect corporate ethical value disclosure.

Furthermore, the control variable, company size, yielded a probability value of 0.0000 < 0.05, with a positive coefficient value of 0.0341. Meanwhile, the profitability variable's probability value was 0.1324 > 0.05, with a positive coefficient value of 0.1116. The last control variable, leverage, had a probability value of 0.0525 > 0.05, with a negative coefficient value of 0.0048. In addition, the results of the hypothesis test also showed a constant value of -0.6263. Thus, if one average unit increases in the independent variable, the dependent variable will decrease by 0.6263.

The Influence of Managerial Ownership on Corporate Ethical Disclosure

The first hypothesis in this study states that managerial ownership has the potential to influence corporate ethical value disclosure positively. However, the results in Table 2 indicate that managerial ownership did not have a significant impact on corporate ethical value disclosure, which is in line with previous studies (Asiah & Muniruddin, 2018; Sari & Rani, 2015). This finding suggests that in mining sector companies, the higher or lower share ownership by the board of commissioners and board of directors does not affect the disclosure of corporate ethical values in the company's annual report.

The findings support the reason for the low percentage of managerial ownership in companies in Indonesia (Asiah & Muniruddin, 2018; Sari & Rani, 2015). According to the data of this study, mining sector companies in Indonesia in 2017-2018 had an average low percentage of managerial ownership, which was 3%, and nine companies out of 56 mining companies sampled in this study had managerial ownership of 0%. Low managerial ownership occurs because the mining sector requires huge investment costs, is long-term, has risk requirements, and has a high level of uncertainty, making stock ownership less attractive for managers who have large amounts of stock ownership (Primadhanny, 2016). In addition, managerial ownership does not significantly affect disclosure since management is more focused on increasing company profits (Sari & Rini, 2015). These results do not represent the legitimacy theory, stating that if a company has managerial ownership, it is predicted that it will provide more information to the public, so that the company gains public legitimacy (Septiani et al., 2018).

The Influence of Audit Quality on Corporate Ethical Disclosure

The company's audit quality can positively impact corporate ethical value disclosure, which is the second hypothesis of this study. In the results of the panel data regression analysis in Table 2, audit quality is significant and contributes positively to corporate ethical value disclosure. The level of audit quality, which is determined by the participation of Big Four auditors in the audit process in this context, uncovered a positive correlation with the level of disclosure (Al-Bassam et al., 2018; Chan et al., 2021; Handayati et al., 2022).

According to Agustin and Oktavianna (2019), the scope of public accounting firms represents audit quality, namely large KAP (big four) and small KAP (non-big four). Big Four KAPs are believed to be of higher quality than non-Big Four KAPs because auditors in Big Four KAPs are considered to have high capabilities and quality, so that they can maintain their reputation by providing high audit quality (Handayati et al., 2022). Companies audited by the Big Four usually exhibit higher transparency and accountability in disclosing financial and non-financial reports, thereby increasing public and stakeholder trust. In addition, Big Four KAPs have stricter internal policies regarding ethics and compliance than non-Big Four KAPs. These results corroborate the legitimacy theory that high audit quality can help companies achieve this legitimacy by assuring that the company's financial statements are accurate and transparent, strengthening public trust (DeAngelo, 1981).

The Influence of Board of Directors Size on Corporate Ethical Disclosure

The results of the panel data regression analysis in Table 2 reveal that the size of the board of directors had a positive impact on corporate ethical value disclosure with a probability lower than the significance level α, which is supported by a positive coefficient. This finding consistently supports the third hypothesis in this study, confirming that the size of the board of directors has a positive impact on corporate ethical value disclosure. This finding is also reinforced by previous studies related to the size of the board of directors contributing positively to the level of disclosure (Mukhibad et al., 2022; Setiawan et al., 2018).

ISSN 2089-6581 (print) | 2614-3720 (online)
Vol. 12, No. 1, March 2025, pp. 19-35

According to Baselga-Pascual et al. (2018), the characteristics of a company's board, especially the composition of the board of directors, have a significant role in creating and maintaining a company's ethical reputation. One of the characteristics of the board of directors is its size, where an adequate number of board members can significantly contribute to the company's operations (Setiawan et al., 2018). Sadou et al. (2017) stated that the number of directors has a positive impact on increasing disclosure. More directors tend to create a more conducive environment for ethical disclosure. It is more likely that a large board of directors will include individuals with high integrity (Sankara et al., 2017). The results of this study are under the institutional theory by complying with POJK Number 33/POJK.04/2014 concerning directors and boards of commissioners of issuers or public companies, where the minimum limit for boards of directors in a company is two. Since the mining sector companies have a minimum number of boards of directors of more than two, the number of boards of directors strengthens ethical business practices and their disclosure.

The Influence of Independent Commissioner Size on Corporate Ethical Disclosure

The following hypothesis is that the size of independent commissioners positively impacts corporate ethical value disclosure. However, the panel data regression analysis results in Table 2 demonstrate that the influence of the size of independent commissioners and corporate ethical value disclosure was not found. This finding indicates that independence in the mining sector, as reflected in the size of independent commissioners, had no impact on corporate ethical value disclosure. The findings in this study are supported by previous studies, showing that the size of independent commissioners does not affect disclosure (Asiah & Muniruddin, 2018; Agustin & Oktavianna, 2019; Purnomo & Rizki, 2020).

This finding can be based on the fact that independent commissioners could not influence decision-making because they are not directly involved in the company's day-to-day operations (Purnomo & Rizki, 2020). In addition, according to Siregar and Priantinah (2017), another reason that causes the size of independent commissioners not to affect disclosure significantly is the minimum limit for the size of independent commissioners in a company according to POJK Number 33 / POJK.04 / 2014 concerning the Board of Directors and Board of Commissioners of Issuers, which is only 30%. With a relatively small size, the voices and views of independent commissioners can easily be ignored or do not get adequate weight in the company's strategic discussions and decisions, including in terms of disclosure. The effect of the size of independent commissioners on corporate ethical value disclosure did not represent institutional theory, where several companies have an independent commissioner size of less than 30%.

The Influence of Board of Directors Gender Diversity on Corporate Ethical Disclosure

The panel data regression analysis results in Table 2 suggest that gender diversity on the board of directors positively impacted corporate ethical value disclosure, with a probability value below α and a positive coefficient. These results support the last hypothesis in this study, proposing a positive influence between gender diversity on the board of directors and corporate ethical value disclosure. The higher the percentage of female directors in a company, the higher the corporate ethical value disclosure reported in the company's annual report. This finding agrees with previous studies by Khaireddine et al. (2020) and Waweru (2020), which confirm that gender diversity on the board of directors positively contributes to corporate ethical value disclosure.

Psychologically, women tend to be more sensitive to the dynamics of interpersonal relationships and are more careful in making ethical decisions, using a different ethical framework than men (Rodriguez-Dominguez et al., 2009). A gender-diverse board of directors can produce exclusive and valuable information and make more informed decisions (Carter et al., 2010). This is emphasized by Mason & Mudrack (1996) that decisions made by a more gender-diverse board of directors tend to be more ethical and of higher quality because women often show higher levels of ethical concern. Gender diversity on the board of directors increases corporate legitimacy by reflecting the interests of diverse stakeholders

(Waweru, 2020) and providing better networks with influential stakeholders (Ntim & Soobaroyen, 2013). In addition, women on the board of directors can improve corporate monitoring and disclosure, which supports structural legitimacy, influence legitimacy, and exchange legitimacy (Khaireddine et al., 2020; Waweru, 2020).

The Influence of Control Variables on Corporate Ethical Disclosure

Company size (SIZE), profitability (ROA), and leverage (LEV) served as control variables. Company size, represented by the company's total assets on a natural logarithmic scale, significantly impacted corporate ethical value disclosure in a positive direction. The size of the company, reflected by total assets, could affect corporate ethical value disclosure. Meanwhile, as seen through Return on Asset, profitability did not affect corporate ethical value disclosure. Also, leverage, observed through Debt of Equity, affected corporate ethical value disclosure. This denotes that the level of company profitability from its assets and debt level is not always a determining factor in the high or low corporate ethical value disclosure reported in the company's annual report.

Conclusion

This study aims to provide empirical support for the influence of GCG and corporate ethical value disclosure. The research data came from the annual reports of mining sector companies listed on the IDX for 2017-2022, with 315 observations. The study results indicate that this research model is feasible for GCG research on corporate ethical value disclosure. In this context, the variables of audit quality, board size, and gender diversity of the board of directors contribute positively to corporate ethical value disclosure. However, the variables of managerial ownership and the size of independent commissioners did not significantly impact corporate ethical value disclosure.

This study emphasizes the importance of implementing GCG, especially through audit quality, board size, and gender diversity, in improving corporate ethical value disclosure in companies. These findings suggest that companies managed with good governance and diverse gender representation tend to be more transparent in disclosing their ethical values. This can increase the company's trust and reputation in the eyes of stakeholders while encouraging a more ethical and accountable business environment. Therefore, companies are expected to pay more attention to these factors to strengthen ethical disclosure and achieve long-term sustainability.

This study, in its implementation, has several limitations. First, it has limitations on observation data, which were limited to the mining sector from 2017 to 2022. Second is manual content analysis, which is still susceptible to subjectivity and limited to annual report sources because the index in corporate ethical value disclosure used was developed for analysis in annual reports. Therefore, suggestions for future research are to consider using more representative data samples, such as all companies or broader categories, so that the results can be used generally. Also, in content analysis, other, more holistic corporate ethical value disclosure indexes can be developed, which can use sustainability reports and integrated report sources to make the results more accurate. Despite these limitations, this study offers valuable contributions to understanding how corporate governance structures relate to ethical disclosure practices, particularly in the mining sector, which has often been overlooked in this context. By applying a more detailed and structured corporate ethical value index alongside five governance variables, this research provides a richer, more practical perspective on ethical transparency. It also highlights the importance of board diversity and audit quality as key drivers of ethical behavior in corporate reporting. These insights can inform future academic studies and guide regulators and company leaders in developing governance policies that support ethical business practices.

Acknowledgement

This research was funded by Universitas Sebelas Maret through the research grant under Contract No. 371/UN27.22/PT.01.03/2025. The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude for the financial support provided, which has been instrumental in the successful completion of this study.

References

ACFE Global. (2020). *Report to the nations on occupational fraud and abuse: 2020 global fraud study*. Association of Certified Fraud Examiners.

ACFE Indonesia. (2019). *Survei fraud Indonesia 2019*. Jakarta: ACFE Indonesia Chapter.

Agustin, H. E., & Oktavianna, R. (2019). Pengaruh porsi kepemilikan publik, proporsi dewan komisaris independen, dan ukuran kap terhadap pengungkapan sukarela. *Jurnal Akuntansi Berkelanjutan Indonesia*, *2*(1), 93. https://doi.org/10.32493/jabi.v2i1.y2019.p093-103

Al-Bassam, W. M., Ntim, C. G., Opong, K. K., & Downs, Y. (2018). Corporate boards and ownership structure as antecedents of corporate governance disclosure in Saudi Arabian publicly listed corporations. *Business & Society*, *57*(2), 335–377. https://doi.org/10.1177/0007650315610611

Albu, N., Albu, C. N., Apostol, O., & Cho, C. H. (2021). The past is never dead: the role of imprints in shaping social and environmental reporting in a post-communist context. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *34*(5), 1109–1136. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-08-2019-4131

Asiah, N., & Muniruddin, S. (2018). Pengaruh ukuran perusahaan, kepemilikan manajerial, kepemilikan asing, dan dewan komisaris independen terhadap pengungkapan corporate social responsibility (Studi empiris pada perusahaan manufaktur yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2010-2014). *Jurnal Ilmiah Mahasiswa Ekonomi Akuntansi*, *3*(2), 265–275.

Bapepenas RI. (2023). *Perkembangan Ekonomi Indonesia dan Dunia Triwulan 1 Tahun 2023*.

Baselga-Pascual, L., Trujillo-Ponce, A., Vähämaa, E., & Vähämaa, S. (2018). Ethical reputation of financial institutions: Do board characteristics matter? *Journal of Business Ethics*, *148*, 489–510. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-015-2949-x

Burdon, W. M., & Sorour, M. K. (2020). Institutional theory and evolution of 'a legitimate'compliance culture: The case of the UK financial service sector. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *162*, 47–80. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3981-4

Carter, D. A., D'Souza, F., Simkins, B. J., & Simpson, W. G. (2010). The gender and ethnic diversity of US boards and board committees and firm financial performance. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, *18*(5), 396–414. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467- 8683.2010.00809.x

Chan, S. H., Creel, T. S., Song, Q., & Yurova, Y. V. (2021). Does CSR reporting indicate strong corporate governance? *International Journal of Accounting & Information Management*, *29*(1), 27–42. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJAIM-07-2020-0099

Chariri, A., & Ghozali, I. (2007). Teori akuntansi. In *Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro* (Vol. 409).

Darmayanti, F. E., & Sanusi, F. (2018). Pengaruh kepemilikan manajerial, kepemilikan institusional dan kebijakan hutang terhadap nilai perusahaan. *Sains: Jurnal Manajemen Dan Bisnis*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.35448/jmb.v11i1.4284

DDTC. (2024). *Sektor Minerba dominasi kontribusi PNBP ESDM, tembus Rp172,96 Triliun. Redaksi DDTC News*.

DeAngelo, L. E. (1981). Auditor size and audit quality. *Journal of Accounting and Economics*, *3*(3), 183–199. https://doi.org/10.1016/0165-4101(81)90002-1

Deegan, C. (2017). Twenty five years of social and environmental accounting research within Critical Perspectives of Accounting: Hits, misses and ways forward. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, *43*, 65–87. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2016.06.005

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, *48*(2), 147–160.

Fatmawati, R., Astuti, D. W., & Suhardjanto, D. (2018). Peran corporate governance dalam meningkatkan voluntary disclosure. *Jurnal Akuntansi Multiparadigma*, *9*(1), 57–69. https://doi.org/10.18202/jamal.2018.04.9004

Ghozali, I. (2013). Aplikasi analisis multivariate dengan program. In *Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro* (Vol. 7).

Giannarakis, G., Andronikidis, A., & Sariannidis, N. (2020). Determinants of environmental disclosure: investigating new and conventional corporate governance characteristics. *Annals of Operations Research*, *294*(1), 87–105. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10479-019-03323-x

Gujarati, D. N. (2013). *Dasar-Dasar Ekonometrika*. Salemba Empat.

Hakri, T. D., Kurnia, P., & Nasir, A. (2013). Pengaruh kepemilikan manajerial, leverage, profitabilitas, ukuran, dan umur perusahaan terhadap pengungkapan informasi pertanggungjawaban sosial perusahaan pada perusahaan food and beverage yang terdaftar di BEI. *Jurnal Ekonomi Universitas Riau*, *21*(04), 8705.

Handayati, P., Tham, Y. H., Yuningsih, Y., Rochayatun, S., & Meldona. (2022). Audit quality, corporate governance, firm characteristics and CSR disclosures—Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Corporate Accounting & Finance*, *33*(3), 65–78. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcaf.22548

Haniffa, R., & Hudaib, M. (2007). Exploring the ethical identity of Islamic banks via communication in annual reports. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *76*, 97–116. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-006-9272-5

Hidayah, N., & Ariesanti, A. (2018). Pengaruh implementasi prinsip-prinsip good corporate governance terhadap kinerja manajerial pada Bank Pembangunan Daerah (BPD) Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta. *Jurnal REKSA: Rekayasa Keuangan, Syariah Dan Audit*, *2*(1), 42. https://doi.org/10.12928/j.reksa.v2i1.18

Huhmann, B. A., & Conner, S. L. (2014). Promoting business ethics through annual reports. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, *19*, 17–28. https://doi.org/10.1057/fsm.2014.2

Joseph, C., Cahaya, F. R., Yusuf, S. N. S., Probohudono, A. N., & Kurniawati, E. M. (2024). Corporate ethical values disclosure: evidence from Malaysian and Indonesian top companies. *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, *32*(3), 369–389. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJAIM-01-2023-0007

Joseph, C., Rahmat, M., Syed Yusuf, S. N., Janang, J. T., & Madi, N. (2023). The ethical value disclosure index from the lens of SDG 16 and institutional theory. *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*, *39*(3), 612–628. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJOES-05-2021-0109

Khaireddine, H., Salhi, B., Aljabr, J., & Jarboui, A. (2020). Impact of board characteristics on governance, environmental and ethical disclosure. *Society and Business Review*, *15*(3), 273–295. https://doi.org/10.1108/SBR-05-2019-0067

Kompasiana. (2025). *Analisis Fraud Dalam Laporan Keuangan: Studi Kasus PT Bumi Resources Dan Implikasi Terhadap Tata Kelola Perusahaan di Indonesia*.

Liu, C. (2018). Are women greener? Corporate gender diversity and environmental violations. *Journal of Corporate Finance*, *52*, 118–142. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcorpfin.2018.08.004

Mahmood, Z., & Uddin, S. (2021). Institutional logics and practice variations in sustainability reporting: evidence from an emerging field. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, *34*(5), 1163–1189. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-07-2019-4086

Makhfudloh, F., Herawati, N., & Wulandari, A. (2018). Pengaruh corporate governance terhadap pengungkapan forward-looking information. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Bisnis*, *18*(1), 48–60.

Mason, E. S., & Mudrack, P. E. (1996). Gender and ethical orientation: A test of gender and occupational socialization theories. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *15*, 599–604. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00411793

Meyer, J. W., Rowan, B., Acland, H., Bergesen, A., Boli-Bennett, J., Deal, T., Freeman, J., Hirsch, P., March, J. G., Scott, W. R., & Starbuck, W. (1977). Made helpful suggestions. *AJS*, *340*(2), 340–363.

Mukhibad, H., Yudo Jayanto, P., Suryarini, T., & Bagas Hapsoro, B. (2022). Corporate governance and Islamic bank accountability based on disclosure—a study on Islamic banks in Indonesia. *Cogent Business & Management*, *9*(1), 2080151. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2022.2080151

Ntim, C. G., & Soobaroyen, T. (2013). Corporate governance and performance in socially responsible corporations: New empirical insights from a Neo-Institutional framework. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, *21*(5), 468–494. https://doi.org/10.1111/corg.12026

Nugraheni, P., & Hastuti, F. N. (2022). Determinants of business ethics disclosure in Indonesian companies. *Media Riset Akuntansi, Auditing & Informasi*, *22*(1), 1–18. https://doi.org/10.25105/mraai.v22i1.12436

Otoritas Jasa Keuangan. (2014). *Peraturan otoritas jasa keuangan nomor 33/pojk. 04/2014 tentang direksi dan dewan komisaris emiten atau perusahaan publik*.

Primadhanny, R. (2016). Pengaruh struktur kepemilikan terhadap struktur modal pada perusahaan sektor pertambangan yang tercatat di BEI periode 2010-2014. *Jurnal Ilmu Manajemen (JIM)*, *4*(3), 1–9.

Purnomo, D. W., & Rizki, A. (2020). Board diversity and corporate social responsibility disclosure in the property, real estate and construction sectors. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, *13*(4), 727–744.

Rodriguez-Dominguez, L., Gallego-Alvarez, I., & Garcia-Sanchez, I. M. (2009). Corporate governance and codes of ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *90*, 187–202. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0035-y

Sadou, A., Alom, F., & Laluddin, H. (2017). Corporate social responsibility disclosures in Malaysia: Evidence from large companies. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *13*(1), 177–202. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-06-2016-0104

Salin, A. S. A. P., Ab Manan, S. K., Kamaluddin, N., & Nawawi, A. (2017). The role of Islamic ethics to prevent corporate fraud. *International Journal of Business and Society*, *18*(S1), 113–128.

Sankara, J., Lindberg, D., & Nowland, J. (2017). Are board governance characteristics associated with ethical corporate social responsibility disclosures? *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, *14*(3), 103–116.

Sari, W. N., & Rani, P. (2015). Pengaruh kepemilikan institusional, kepemilikan manajerial, return on assets (ROA) dan ukuran perusahaan terhadap pengungkapan corporate social responsibility (CSR) pada perusahaan manufaktur yang terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia periode 2011-2013. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan*, *4*(1).

Sencal, H., & Asutay, M. (2021). Ethical disclosure in the Shari'ah annual reports of Islamic banks: discourse on Shari'ah governance, quantitative empirics and qualitative analysis. *Corporate Governance: The International Journal of Business in Society*, *21*(1), 175–211.

Septiani, H., Mukhzarudfa, M., & Yudi, Y. (2018). Pengaruh karakteristik perusahaan dan kepemilikan manajerial terhadap kualitas pengungkapan sustainability report pada perusahaan yang terdaftar di BEI periode 2014-2017. *JAKU (Jurnal Akuntansi & Keuangan Unja)(E-Journal)*, *3*(6), 57–67.

Sergakis, K. (2022). *EU Corporate Governance. European Journal of Law Reform*. *16*(4), 728–746. https://doi.org/10.5553/ejlr/138723702014016004005

Setiawan, D., Hapsari, R. T., & Wibawa, A. (2018). Impact of the characteristics of the board of directors on disclosure of corporate social responsibility on mining companies in Indonesia. *Mix: Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen*, *9*(1), 1–15.

Siregar, R. M. M., & Priantinah, D. (2017). Pengaruh good corporate governance dan kepemilikan saham publik terhadap tingkat pengungkapan corporate social responsibility. *Jurnal Profita*, *9*(1), 261–272. https://doi.org/10.31932/jpe.v9i1.3388

Winarti, D. & Imron, M. (2019). Pengaruh corporate social responsibility dan good corporate governance terhadap nilai perusahaan dengan ukuran perusahaan sebagai variabel pemoderasi: Studi kasus pada perusahaan manufaktur yang terdaftar di BEI. *Jurnal REKSA: Rekayasa Keuangan, Syariah, dan Audit, Vol. 2 No. 1 (2013).* https://doi.org/10.12928/j.reksa.v2i1.20

Utami, S., & Prasasti, S. D. (2011). Pengaruh karakteristik perusahaan terhadap social disclosure. *Jurnal Ekonomi Bisnis*, *16*(1).

Wahyudi, I., Boedi, S., & & Kadir, A. (2022). Kecurangan laporan keuangan (fraudulent) sektor tambang di Indonesia. *Krisna: Kumpulan Riset Akuntansi*, *13*(2), 180–190. https://doi.org/10.22225/kr.13.2.2022.180-190

Waweru, N. (2020). Business ethics disclosure and corporate governance in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). *International Journal of Accounting and Information Management*, *28*(2), 363–387. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJAIM-07-2019-0091