RESEARCH ARTICLE
published:31 July 2024
doi: 10.21070/jas.v8i2.1785

Factors Influencing Sustainability Reporting Assurance: A Study of Indonesian Public Listed Companies

Riescha Utami[1], Fedi Ameraldo[2]*, Marsi Fella Rizki[3], Abdullah Jihad Rabaya[4]

[1,2,3] *Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas teknokrat indonesia, Indonesia*
[4] *Faculty of Business and Economics, Palestine Technical University, Palestine*

General Background: In the era of globalization, companies are evaluated not only on their financial performance but also on their social and environmental impact. **Specific Background:** Sustainability reporting serves as a critical medium for communicating a company's efforts to achieve its sustainability objectives, mitigating its negative impacts on society and the environment, and fostering trust. The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is widely regarded as the standard for these reports, enhancing their credibility. **Knowledge Gap:** While previous studies have largely focused on major multinational companies, there is limited research on the assurance of sustainability reports within the context of developing economies, particularly Indonesia. **Aims:** This study aims to examine the effects of the sustainability committee, industry type, and awards on sustainability reporting assurance among companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2022. **Results:** Logistic regression analysis reveals that both sustainability committees and awards positively influence sustainability reporting assurance, whereas industry type shows no significant impact. **Novelty:** This research fills a gap by analyzing sustainability assurance practices within Indonesia, providing insights into the factors influencing assurance in emerging markets. **Implications:** The findings suggest that sustainability committees and awards can enhance reporting assurance, thereby boosting stakeholder confidence in corporate sustainability practices. This underscores the importance of establishing effective sustainability governance structures and recognizing exemplary efforts to drive transparency and accountability in sustainability reporting.

Keywords: Sustainability Reporting Assurance, Sustainability Committee, Industry Type, Award, Indonesian Public Listed Companies

OPEN ACCESS
ISSN 2548-3501 (online)
*Correspondence:
Fedi Ameraldo
fedi_ameraldo@teknokrat.ac.id

Received: 30 November 2023
Accepted: 15 July 2024
Published: 31 July 2024
Citation:
Utami, Ameraldo, Rizki and Rabaya (2024) **Factors Influencing Sustainability Reporting Assurance: A Study of Indonesian Public Listed Companies**

INTRODUCTION

Companies in this age of globalization are evaluated not only on their financial performance but also on their social and environmental impact through their reporting. In addition, these reports serve as an essential medium for disseminating information about a company's efforts to meet its sustainability targets, mitigate its negative effects on the environment and society, and build trusting relationships with society at large. For environmental and social performance, modern organizations need sustainability drivers. In order to spur innovation, growth, and competitive advantage for businesses, this sustainability mandate calls for CSR initiatives (Arda et al., 2019). The Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) is widely accepted as the gold standard for sustainability reports. The idea, content, and indicators for specific sustainability reports are all laid out in detail in this standard. The credibility of a company's sustainability may be shown in its sustainability report, which has gained widespread attention. Stakeholders get reports on the company's performance in the area of sustainability (Khatri and Kjærland, 2023). According to Ong and Djajadikerta (2020), a higher degree of stakeholder trust correlates with a more robust commitment to the sustainability agenda.

One of the sustainability report's goals is to update both internal (management and staff) and external (stakeholders) parties on the advancements made by a company's sustainability committee. It helps the organization achieve long-term sustainability while also demonstrating its dedication to social and environmental responsibility. Furthermore, sustainability reporting assists companies in communicating their environmental and social initiatives in a transparent manner. The company and its stakeholders may avoid potential losses by limiting their exposure to misinformation (Orazalin and Mahmood, 2020). According to Du and Wu (2019), sustainability reports inspire more trust among users and improve their assessment of the information's integrity. In addition, participation in sustainability initiatives can help reduce greenwashing (Kurpierz and Smith, 2020).

A sustainability reporting assurance, as defined by Farooq & De Villiers (2019), is "an agreement whereby a third-party assurance service provider guarantees that the company's published sustainability report will be guaranteed." Readers of a sustainability report that includes an assurance report will be able to determine for themselves whether or not the report was created in compliance with the agreed-upon standards. There are five main ideas involved in the assurance procedure: choosing the assurance firm, learning the fundamentals of assurance, filtering out irrelevant information, verifying the procedures used, and reviewing the results. According to Ong and Djajadikerta (2020), firms that wish to enhance the credibility of the report and promote their corporate reputation are more likely to conduct sustainability report assurance. According to GRI (2013), sustainability report assurance is an activity that is meant to create public judgments regarding the quality of reports and the information that is included within them. The assurance of sustainability reports is a fast-developing field.

A PwC worldwide study conducted in 2023 revealed an increase in the number of firms in selected Asia Pacific countries obtaining external assurance from third parties regarding their sustainability disclosures (PwC, 2023). The percentage rose from 37% in 2021 to 49% in 2022. This development indicates the firms' attempts to give stakeholders genuine sustainability performance information, boosting trust in their company. However, the data has not solely informed the Indonesian context. By collecting the data and assessing the presence of assurance for the sustainability reports, we have concluded that only 26 companies provided assurance. This data only represents approximately 10 percent of the publicly listed companies that have sustainability reports.

According to the International Auditing & Assurance Standards Board (2016), the process of making conclusive assertions with the goal of building stakeholder trust is what constitutes the assurance process. The assurer uses the assurance process to produce a statement of assurance, which indicates that the information that was provided is trustworthy (Thompson et al., 2022). This statement may be obtained by the assurer by using the assurance process. In order to make more informed choices and build trust among stakeholders, companies may benefit from assurance since it provides independent verification and validation of the information contained in their sustainability report (Boiral et al., 2020).

It is the job of a corporate sustainability committee to establish guidelines for sustainable development and to ensure the reliability of the reports produced by the company. It plays a significant role in the philosophy and tactics of modern companies (Elmaghrabi, 2021). Sustainability committees are a kind of governance monitoring that may have an impact on the sustainability disclosures made by companies. Besides assisting companies in achieving their sustainability objectives in their operations, these committees also help companies accomplish their goals. Committees focused on sustainability could assist companies in meeting their social and environmental obligations (Shwairef et al., 2021). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) issues can be better prioritized with the help of a board's sustainability committee (Burke et al., 2019). For example, CSR strategies and policies can be better observed (Arayssi et al., 2020), CSR strategies can be more effective, and more sustainability disclosures can be made to stakeholders (Jamil et al., 2020). Corporate governance improves when attention is focused on sustainability via the establishment of a sustainability committee (Orazalin et al., 2024).

Industry is one element that affects assurance providers internally. This indicates that attitudes at the highest levels of management may have a role in sustainability reporting choices. Orazalin et al. (2024) highlight the role that environmental committees play in this particular sector of the business world. In addition, Buallay (2020) found that industries with significant environmental impact and liability are more likely to provide sustainability reports. This stands in contrast to businesses that are not concerned about their impact on the surrounding environment (Ahmad et al., 2019). The industrial sector has more of an effect on the natural world than most other industries. The manufacturing sector is often highlighted in sustainability reports because its natural resource consumption, waste, and carbon emissions from the social implications of physical production are more readily apparent. However, it is essential to keep in mind that every sector bears some degree of accountability for sustainability and that sustainability reports should demonstrate how businesses are working to lessen their negative effects on society and the environment. Sustainability reports may not always be assured by members of the auditing profession in nations with potentially ecologically destructive businesses (such as mining, manufacturing, or utilities) (Ong and Djajadikerta,2020). Sustainability reports are crucial for businesses in these sectors since doing so helps them build trust with customers and choose which sort of assurance provider to work with. According to Li et al. (2023), the presence of industry experts strengthens a committee's monitoring.

Awarding is one of the factors that has been under-researched in the past. Companies have been shown to be driven to reveal CSR information in order to win awards (Benjamin and Biswas, 2022). One way for a company to legitimize its place in the community is to get recognition for its CSR efforts. The award itself may also serve as recognition of the recipient's efforts in the realm of social and environmental responsibility. There is evidence that firms that have been recognized for their CSR efforts are more likely to disclose such efforts (Ameraldo and Mohd Ghazali, 2021). Earning recognition for outstanding or commendable sustainability reporting is one approach to demonstrating best practices in this area. Achieving a sustainability award reduces the legitimacy gap between the company and society, making the company more open to being transparent. As a result, the legitimacy factor may be indirectly approximated by including the award variable.

Hence, the objective of the study is to examine the influence of sustainability committees, industry types, and awards on sustainability reporting assurance. It is justified that previous research on the assurance procedures of sustainability reports has been scant. Most of the previous studies focused on the assurance of sustainability reports for major multinational companies (Boiral et al., 2020). This research looks specifically at the Indonesian setting to analyze the assurance of sustainability reports in developing economies. The kind of assurance provider, the extent and depth of assurance, and the applied standards may make a significant difference in the quality of an assurance engagement conducted in the context of sustainability reporting. Second, the existence or absence of sustainability report assurance is largely unexplored in the literature. Furthermore, the listed status is not being taken into account. Previous studies conducted by Clarkson et al. (2019) and Sierra Garcia et al. (2022) all compared accounting firm and non-accounting firm's assurance methods for sustainability reporting.

This study addresses an important knowledge gap by concentrating on the practices of sustainability assurance in Indonesia, which is one of the countries in the G20. Indonesia is an emerging country that is dealing with significant social, economic, and environmental challenges. Sustainability reporting is still in its infancy in Indonesia and is entirely voluntary, despite the fact that the government began CSR activities in the 1990s. As a result, studying more about the elements that influence assurance can strengthen stakeholder confidence in sustainability and lead to a better overall condition (Simoni et al., 2020). Thus, this study objectively examines empirically whether the sustainability committee, industry type, and award can affect sustainability reporting assurance listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2022.

Signaling theory

In this study, we utilize signaling theory to better understand why certain companies assure their sustainability initiatives while others do not. Based on the literature, this theory proposes that although a company is aware of the extent to which it engages in sustainable practices, its stakeholders are not (Bagnoli and Watts, 2017). According to the signaling theory, companies will only purchase assurance when the advantages of doing so are greater than the costs associated with doing so (Fernandez-Feijoo et al., 2015). This is based on the assumption that disclosure is expensive. Although there are expenses associated with sustainability assurance, signaling theory argues that ethical businesses might reap advantages as a result of their efforts (Braam & Peeters, 2018). Therefore, a corporation may decide to voluntarily submit a sustainability report in order to project the idea that the organization is committed to social and ecologically beneficial causes (Bagnoli & Watts, 2017).

Legitimacy theory

One of the most well-known notions to explain environmental CSR and sustainability reporting in corporate communication is the legitimacy theory. The notion contends that institutions (like businesses) mirror the values and standards of the society in which they operate. Thus, according to this idea, businesses should always act in accordance with societal norms and values (Sahari et al., 2018). According to Deegan (2019), the theory was developed from the concept of "organisational legitimacy." When an organization's values match those of the larger community, we say that it is "aligned." Consequently, the legitimacy of an organization may be impacted by any inconsistency or discrepancy between the two systems.

The influence of sustainability committee on sustainability reporting assurance

In order to ensure that relevant information is included in the company's reports, a sustainability committee can frequently serve as a governing body. A company needs a sustainability committee to make sure it considers the long-term impact of its actions on the environment and society. With the support of the sustainability committee's recommendations, the board of directors is convinced that the company's sustainability report is accurate and conforms to regulations. In addition, it involves ensuring businesses execute sustainability and provide reliable information to their stakeholders and the general public (Elmaghrabi, 2021); hence, it will be a form to legitimate their position in the public eye.

Sustainability disclosure, or sustainability reporting, is a method by which businesses tell their stakeholders about their operations and their long-term viability. Both Biswas et al. (2018) and Simoni et al., (2020) found that organizations with a dedicated sustainability committee had higher sustainability performance. Moreover, having a sustainability committee is an indicator for the wider public to at least see that the companies have a commitment to the sustainability goals, which is a signal to the public. However, the majority of this research examined how sustainability board committees affect companies. Al Matari (2019) argues that coordination and communication problems reduce the effectiveness of bigger boards. This is because bigger boards are more likely to establish board committees as a means of enhancing board effectiveness (Al Matari, 2019). Therefore, bigger boards have a better chance of appointing committees that possess the skills and expertise to address sustainability concerns. Thus, this study developed the following hypothesis:

H1: There is a positive relationship between sustainability committee and sustainability reports assurance

The influence of industry type on sustainability reporting assurance

The legitimacy theory has been used in the past to analyze how different sectors of industry affect environmental, CSR, and sustainability reporting. Prior studies in Turkey, such as Kuzey & Uyar, (2017) and Kilic & Kuzey, (2017), concluded that the environment and society were affected in different ways according to the aspects of different industries. This distinction arises from the dissimilarities in the character of corporate operations, economic potential, job prospects, market competitiveness, and regulatory oversight.

Sustainability reporting has been shown to vary widely depending on the type of industry (Jamil et al., 2020); Al Farooque & Ahulu, 2017). Faisal et al. (2012) analyzed companies from a number of different countries and found that industry type is a factor in the extent to which large companies throughout the globe engage in sustainability reporting. Studies have also shown a correlation between an industry's visibility and the volume of sustainability data that its businesses disclose. In addition, the study by Hamrouni et al. (2022) shows that environmentally conscious businesses are more likely to disclose CSR information and get a better CSR grade. They made all these efforts to support their stance that environmental impact-related companies should increase their disclosure and reporting assurance.

The legitimacy theory lends weight to this claim. Legitimacy theory seems to be the best explanation for the association between industry sensitivity and sustainability reporting levels (Faisal et al., 2012). According to legitimacy theory, manufacturing businesses (who are concerned with environmental concerns) strive to demonstrate to stakeholders that they record these actions in their sustainability reports. According to signaling theory, non-manufacturing enterprises wish to communicate to stakeholders that they prioritize sustainability concerns, as indicated by the fact that their sustainability reports have been confirmed by third parties. Therefore, the hypothesis is as follows:

H2: There is a positive relationship between industry type and sustainability reports assurance

The influence of award on sustainability reporting assurance

The findings of empirical research of Benjamin and Biswas (2022) and Ameraldo and Mohd Ghazali (2021), which assessed the influence of awards on social and environmental disclosure practices, showed substantial outcomes and motives to publish CSR information. For instance, the stances of publicly listed Malaysian companies on CSR disclosure policies can be analyzed by means of a survey questionnaire. As expected, they demonstrated that winning CSR awards is a driving factor for many businesses. Benjamin and Biswas (2022) and Ameraldo and Mohd Ghazali (2021) found that the degree of voluntary disclosure practices was correlated with the award variable. The gap between the firm's legitimacy and that of society is predicted to be narrower for companies that have won awards for strong CSR initiatives.

Awards are one way to communicate sustainability to stakeholders. This is due to the fact that awards demonstrate that the organization has achieved specific benchmarks in terms of its sustainability policies. A company's commitment to CSR and sustainability concerns may be shown by awards, which constitute external evidence. It, in turn, signals to broader stakeholders that the company is concerned about sustainability.

In addition, an independent assurance process was thought to aid in the reduction of potentially misleading data and the standardization of overall data collection. For stakeholders to trust a company's sustainability report and use it as a basis for making business decisions, assurance on sustainability reporting is essential. According to Sawani et al. (2010), assurance on sustainability reporting is necessary for the company to receive an award, which was derived from interviews with the senior managers of the sustainability departments of top Malaysian companies. Thus, the hypothesis is as follows:

H3: There is a positive relationship between award and sustainability reports assurance

METHODS

Data for the sample of 237 companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2022 was collected from the official website, which can be accessed at www.idx.co.id. Sampling for this research was conducted using purposeful sampling. The following criteria are taken into consideration by this method of sampling:

Table 1 about here

Variables and Variable Measurement

Dependent variable

Sustainability reporting assurance

This study measures the sustainability committee indicators with the following criteria:

If the company has a sustainability committee, it can be given a score of 1

If the company has no sustainability committee, then it can be given a score of 0

Independent variables

Sustainability committee

This study measures the sustainability committee indicators with the following criteria:

If the company has a sustainability committee, it can be given a score of 1

If the company has no sustainability committee, then it can be given a score of 0

Industry type

This study measures industry-type indicators with the following criteria:

If the company's industry type is manufacturing, then it can be given a score of 1

If the company's industry type is not manufacturing, then it can be given a score of 0

Award

Indicators of awards are evaluated in this research according to the following standards:

If the company has an award related to sustainability, then it can be given a score of 1

If the company has no award related to sustainability, then it can be given a score of 0

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistical Analysis

Table 2 about here

The descriptive analysis results presented in Table 2 above provide information on the number of data samples (N) obtained from a total of 237 companies. The industry type variable has the highest average value of 0.036, while the sustainability committee variable has a value of 0.011. Furthermore, the award variable exhibits a mean value of 0.030. Consequently, the highest standard deviation is obtained with the industry-type variable of 0.481. The award variable exhibits a standard deviation of 0.457, while the sustainability committee variable has a standard deviation of 0.313.

Asseing Overall Model Fit

Table 3 about here

Based on the Likelihood (-2logL) value, if there is a decrease in the initial (block number = 0) and final (block number = 1) Likelihood (-2logL) values, the hypothesized model is said to be suitable. Likelihood is the probability that the model can explain the input data. In this model, Likelihood Block 0, which displays the -2log likelihood (-2LogL) value at the beginning (block number = 0) of this model only includes a constant at step 5 with a value of 163.955.

Table 4 about here

In the table 4 above, displaying -2LogL which has added independent variables so that the final -2LogL result at step 6 displays a value of 145.271. The initial and final -2LogL values have a difference of 18. 684. This explains if there is a decrease from the initial -2LogL to the end so that it can be said that the hypothesized model fits the data.

Assessing Model Feasibility (Hosmer and Lemeshow)

Table 5 about here

From the Hosmer and Lemeshow Test table, displaying the test results seen in the sig value which results in a significance probability of 0.482, the value exceeds $\alpha = 0.05$. Based on the above results, it can be stated that the regression model is supported and suitable for use in further analysis to explain the relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable.

Coefficient Determination (Nagelkerke's R Square)

Table 6 about here

In the Nagelkerke's R Square table, the output of the Nagelkerke's R Square value displayed is 0.152, which means that as much as 15.2%, which means that the independent variables (X1, X2, X3) are able to explain the variability of the dependent variable (Y) in the study, while 84.8% is explained by other variables outside the independent variables in the research model.

Table 7 about here

Of the total sample data of 237, the number of samples in the sustainability report assurance category is 26 sample data, while not having a sustainability report assurance is 211 sample data, the table above displays an overall percentage value of 89.0%, which means that the predictive power of 89.0% can be predicted correctly by the regression model.

Logistic Regression Analysis

Table 8 about here

SRA = -2.498 + 1.481(SC)+ (-0.792) (IT)+ 0.884 (A) + e

The regression equation results display a constant value of -2.498. From these results it explains that if it is assumed that the value of the independent variable sustainability committee, industry type and award is 0, then -2.498. The regression coefficient value of sustainability committee is 1.481, which means that with the sustainability committee variable of 1, it will increase sustainability reporting assurance by 1.481. The industry type regression coefficient value of -0.792 means that it cannot affect and increase the sustainability committee because the value is 0 which can reduce sustainability reporting assurance. The award regression coefficient value of 0.884 means that it will increase changes in the award variable by 0.884 sustainability reporting assurance.

Hypothesis Testing

Table 9 about here

The influence of sustainability committee on sustainability reporting assurance

As can be seen in the result table 9 found above, the value of the sustainability committee variable is 0.004 for the significance level. The conclusion that can be drawn from these findings is that the value of 0.004 is less than the significance level of 0.05. This indicates that the first hypothesis (H1) in this research is accepted and that the sustainability committee has a positive impact on the assurance of sustainability reporting.

The influence of industry type on sustainability reporting assurance

As can be seen in the result table 9 shown above, the industry type variable has a significance value of 0.138 or above. It is possible to draw the conclusion that 0.138 is more than 0.05, and these findings provide an explanation for why the second hypothesis (H2) in this research is rejected and why the kind of industry does not have any impact on the assurance of sustainability reporting.

The influence of award on sustainability reporting assurance

The significance value of the award variable is 0.049, as shown in the output table 9 that can be seen above. Based on the findings of this research, it can be determined that the value of 0.049 is less than the significance level of 0.05. This indicates that the third hypothesis (H3) is supported and that awards have a favorable impact on the assurance of sustainability reporting.

Discussion

The findings show there is a substantial association between the sustainability committee and the assurance sustainability report. The assurance sustainability report is heavily influenced by the award variable. There was also no statistically significant correlation between the industry type variable and the assurance sustainability report.

Previous studies by Biswas et al. (2018) and Simoni et al., (2020) suggest that the presence of a sustainability committee is predictive of a company's commitment to and emphasis on sustainability principles, leading to superior sustainability performance. When it comes to developing and sustaining environmentally friendly and reliable business performance, sustainability committees may play a vital role. Amin et al. (2022) adds that problems with alignment and communication might detract from a bigger board's efficiency. This is because boards with a greater number of members often establish board committees to boost efficiency (Al Matari, 2019). Companies need to incorporate sustainability concepts into decision-making and hire directors who have the skills and competence to solve sustainability concerns, and bigger boards play a crucial role in this process. This research reveals that the sustainability committee has a considerable influence on sustainability reporting assurance.

The earlier research by Benjamin and Biswas (2022) and Ameraldo and Mohd Ghazali (2021) supports the award variable's implications. Benjamin and Biswas (2022) and Ameraldo and Mohd Ghazali (2021) determined that the influence of awards on social and environmental disclosure practices reveals major outcomes and reasons to disclose information about sustainability. This study lends support to the implications of the award variable. used a survey questionnaire to examine Malaysian firms' perspectives on sustainability disclosure rules. They demonstrated that many businesses are motivated to enhance their public image by the prospect of receiving environmental and social awards. Benjamin and Biswas (2022) and Ameraldo and Mohd Ghazali (2021) discovered a link between award characteristics and the prevalence of voluntary disclosure practices. Companies that have been recognised for their outstanding social and environmental activities are more likely to be seen as legitimate by the general public. This research demonstrates the importance of awards in bolstering confidence in sustainability reports. In addition, it will be more significant when the sustainability report also given the assurance from the third party, ensuring the independency of assurer and also the quality and validity of sustainability report.

Similar to the research conducted by Buallay (2020), we found that the kind of industry investigated had no impact on the level of sustainability information disclosed. This data demonstrates that the degree of CSR, or sustainability disclosure, is consistent across sectors. In addition, there is no correlation between the kind of industry and the guarantee provided in the sustainability report. Previous research has shown inconsistent results, which we attribute to a number of factors, including a lack of a theoretical framework for sustainability assurance and the use of diverse sector categories (De Beelde and Tuybens, 2015). Signaling theory claims that corporations pay assurance to communicate with stakeholders about their sustainability efforts (Clarkson et al., 2019), consequently, we are proposing industry sector studies to establish the relationship between assurance and industry involvement.

CONCLUSION

This study was conducted to test and prove the effect of sustainability committee, industry type, and award on sustainability reporting assurance of companies listed on the Indonesian stock exchange in 2022 using logistic regression analysis. Based on the data and analysis that has been done in this study, it can be concluded that the sustainability committee has a positive effect on sustainability reporting assurance. The results of this study indicate that the sustainability committee can monitor sustainability performance and manage sustainability issues in accordance with sustainability standards and applicable regulations. Second, industry type has no effect on sustainability reporting assurance, and the results of this study indicate that high-profile companies do not tend to ensure compliance with sustainability standards. Third, an award has a positive effect on sustainability reporting assurance, which shows that an award in the environmental field can improve the company's reputation in the eyes of stakeholders, including investors and consumers, which in turn can make the sustainability reporting assurance process more positive. In addition, winning the award shows that the company has fulfilled the regulations and standards of sustainability reporting assurance.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, N. N., Wan Abdullah, W. M. F, A., Manap, M. I., & Jamil, N. N. (2019). Green governance for environmentally sensitive industries in Malaysia: An overview. *IEBMC 2019 9th International Economics and Business Management Conference*, 2357–1330. https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.12.05.23

Al Farooque, O., & Ahulu, H. (2017). Determinants of Social and Economic Reporting: Evidence from Australia, the UK and South African Multinational Enterprises. *International Journal of Accounting & Information Management*, *25(2)*, 177–200. doi: 10.1108/%0AIJAIM-01-2016-0003

Al-Matari, E.M. (2019). Do characteristics of the board of directors and top executives have an effect on corporate performance among the financial sector? Evidence using stock. *Corporate Governance*, 20(1), 16-43. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-11-2018-0358

Amin, A., Ur Rehman, R., Ali, R. and Ntim, C.G. (2022). Does gender diversity on the board reduce agency cost? Evidence from Pakistan. *Gender in Management*, 37(2), 164-181. https://doi.org/10.1108/GM-10-2020-0303

Ameraldo, Fedi & Mohd Ghazali, N.A. (2021). Factors Influencing the Extent and Quality of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure in Indonesian Shari'ah Compliant Companies. *International Journal of Business and Society*, 22(2), 960–984. https://doi.org/10.33736/ijbs.3775.2021

Arayssi, M., Jizi, M., & Tabaja, H. H. (2020). The impact of board composition on the level of ESG discloser in GCC countries. *Sustainability Accounting, Management. Policy Journal*, *11*(1), 137–161. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-05-2018-0136

Arda, O. A., Bayraktar, E., & Tatoglu, E. (2019). Mediating roles of quality performance and environmental proactivity. Business Strategy and the Environment. *International Journal*, 64–78. https://doi.org/%0A10.1002/bse.2190

Bagnoli, M., & Watts, S. G. (2017). Voluntary assurance of voluntary CSR disclosure. *Journal Economics and Management Strategy*, *26*(1), 205–230. https://doi.org/10.1111/jems.12171

Benjamin, S.J. and Biswas, P.K. (2022). Does winning a CSR award increase firm value?. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, Vol. 19 No. 3, pp. 313-329, doi: 10.1057/s41310-022-00142-8.

Biswas, P. K., Mansi, M., & Pandey, R. (2018). Board composition sustainability committee and corporate social and environmental performance in Australia. *Pacific Accounting Review*, *30*(4), 517–540. https://doi.org/10.1108/PAR-12-2017-0107

Boiral, O., Heras-Saizarbitoria, I. and Brotherton, M.-C. (2020). Professionalizing the assurance of sustainability reports: the auditors' perspective. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 33 No. 2, pp. 309-334. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-03-2019-3918

Braam, G., & Peeters, R. (2018). Corporate sustainability performance and assurance on sustainability reports: diffusion of accounting practices in the realm of sustainable development. *Corporate Social Responsibility Environmental Management.*, *25*(2), 164–181. https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1447

Buallay, A. (2020). Sustainability reporting and firm's performance: Comparative study between manufacturing and banking sectors. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, Vol. 69 No. 3, pp. 431-445. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-10-2018-0371

Burke, J. J., Hoitash, R., & Hoitash, U. (2019). The Heterogeneity of Board-Level Sustainability Committees and Corporate Social Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *154*(4), 1161–1186. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-017-3453-2

Clarkson, P., Li, Y., Richardson, G. and Tsang, A. (2019). Causes and consequences of voluntary assurance of CSR reports: International evidence involving Dow Jones Sustainability Index Inclusion and Firm Valuation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 32(8), 2451-2474. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-03-2018-3424

De Beelde, I., & Tuybens, S. (2015). Enhancing the credibility of reporting on corporate social responsibility in Europe. Business Strategy and the Environment, 24(3), 190–216. https://doi.org/10.1002/bse.1814

Deegan, C.M. (2019). Legitimacy theory: Despite its enduring popularity and contribution, time is right for a necessary makeover. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, Vol. 32 No. 8, pp. 2307-2329. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-08-2018-3638

Du, K. and Wu, S. J. (2019). Does external assurance enhance the credibility of CSR reports? Evidence from CSR-related misconduct events in Taiwan. *Auditing: A Journal of Practice and Theory*, *38*(4), 101–130. doi: 10.2308/ajpt-52418.

Elmaghrabi, M. E. (2021). CSR committee attributes and CSR performance: UK evidence. *Corporate Governance*, *21*, 892–919. https://doi.org/10.1108/CG-01-2020-0036

Faisal, F., Tower, G., & Rusmin, R. (2012). Legitimising Corporate Sustainability Reporting Throughout the World. Australasian Accounting. *Business and Finance Journal*, *6*(2), 19–34. https://ro.uow.edu.au/aabfj/vol6/iss2/3/

Farooq, M. B., & De Villiers, C. (2019). How sustainability assurance engagement scopes are determined, and its impact on capture and credibility enhancement. *Account Audit. Account. J.*, *33*(2), 417–445. https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-11-2018-3727.

Fernandez-Feijoo, B., Romero, S., & Ruiz, S. (2015). Multilevel approach to sustainability report assurance decisions. *Aust. Account.*, *25*(4), 346–358. https://doi.org/%0A10.1111/auar.12104.

Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). (2013). The external assurance of sustainability reporting. Amsterdam: Author. Retrieved from https://www.globalreporting.org/resourcelibrary/GRI

Assurance.pdf

Jamil, A., Mohd Ghazali, N. A., & Nelson, S. P. (2020). The influence of corporate governance structure on sustainability reporting in Malaysia. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *17*(8), 1251–1278. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-08-2020-0310

Hamrouni, A., Bouattour, M., Ben Farhat Toumi, N. and Boussaada, R. (2022). Corporate social responsibility disclosure and information asymmetry: does boardroom attributes matter?. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, 23(5), 897-920. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAAR-03-2021-0056

International Auditing & Assurance Standards Board (IAASB). (2016). Discussion paper: Supporting credibility and trust in emerging forms of external reporting: Ten key challenges for assurance engagements. New York: Author. https://www.iaasb.org/publications/supporting-credibility-and-trust-emerging-forms-external-reporting-ten-key-challenges-assurance

Jensen, M. C. (1993). The modern industrial revolution, exit, and the failure of internal control systems. *Journal Finance*, *48*, 831–880. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6261.1993.tb04022.x

Khatri I, Kjærland F. (2023). Sustainability reporting practices and environmental performance amongst nordic listed firms. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 418:138172. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2023.138172

Kilic, M., & Kuzey, C. (2017). *Factors Influencing Sustainability Reporting: Evidence from Turkey*. *Recent Issues in Accounting Finance and Auditing Trakya University, Edirne*. 139–175. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3098812

Kurpierz, J.R. and Smith, K. (2020). The greenwashing triangle: adapting tools from fraud to improve CSR reporting, Sustainability Accounting. *Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 11 No. 6, pp. 1075-1093. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-10-2018-0272

Kuzey, C., & Uyar, A. (2017). Determinants of sustainability reporting and its impact on firm value: Evidence from the emerging market of Turkey. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, *143*, 27–39. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2016.12.153

Li, Z., Jia, J. and Chapple, L.(E). (2023). The corporate sustainability committee and its relation to corporate environmental performance. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, Vol. 31 No. 5, pp. 1292-1324. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-06-2021-1341

Ong, T. and Djajadikerta, H.G. (2020). Corporate governance and sustainability reporting in the Australian resources industry: an empirical analysis. *Social Responsibility Journal*, Vol. 16 No. 1, pp. 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-06-2018-0135

Orazalin, N. and Mahmood, M. (2020). Determinants of GRI-based sustainability reporting: evidence from an emerging economy. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, Vol. 10 No. 1, pp. 140-164. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAEE-12-2018-0137

Orazalin, N., Kuzey, C., Uyar, A. and Karaman, A.S. (2024). Does CSR contribute to the financial sector's financial stability? The moderating role of a sustainability committee. *Journal of Applied Accounting Research*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 105-125. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAAR-12-2022-0329

Pricewaterhouse Cooper (PwC). (2023). Global Investor Survey 2022. Retrieved from https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/issues/esg/global-investor-survey-2022.html#overview

Sahari, S., Ansari, N., & Yusof, E. (2018). Corporate Social Reporting: Construction Industry in Malaysia. *Journal of Global Business and Social Entrepreneurship*, *4*(10), 139–150. https://myjurnal.mohe.gov.my/filebank/published_article/77451/15.pdf

Sawani, Y., Zain, M. M., & Darus, F. (2010). Preliminary insights on sustainability reporting and assurance practices in Malaysia. *Social Responsibility Journal*, *6*(4), 627–645. https://doi.org/10.1108/17471111011083482

Shwairef, A., Amran, A., Iranmanesh, M., & Ahmad, N. H. (2021). The mediating effect of strategic posture on corporate governance and environmental reporting. *Review of Managerial Science*, *15*, 349–378. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-019-00343-6

Sierra García, L., Bollas-Araya, H.M. and García Benau, M.A. (2022). Sustainable development goals and assurance of non-financial information reporting in Spain. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 878-898. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-04-2021-0131

Simoni, L., Bini, L. and Bellucci, M. (2020). Effects of social, environmental, and institutional factors on sustainability report assurance: evidence from European countries. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, Vol. 28 No. 6, pp. 1059-1087. https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-03-2019-0462

Thompson, E.K., Ashimwe, O., Buertey, S. and Kim, S.-Y. (2022). The value relevance of sustainability reporting: does assurance and the type of assurer matter?. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, Vol. 13 No. 4, pp. 858-877. https://doi.org/10.1108/SAMPJ-08-2021-0329.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 / *Sample Selection Data Based on Criteria*

Criteria	Number of Companies
Companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2022	890
(-) Companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange that do not have a sustainability report during the research period in 2022	(653)
Total Company Sample Based on Criteria	237

Table 2 / *Descriptive Statistics*

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev
Y	237	0	1	0.11	0.313
X1	237	0	1	0.11	0.313
X2	237	0	1	0.36	0.481
X3	237	0	1	0.30	0.457
Valid N	237				

Table 3 / *Likelihood Block 0*

Iteration History[a,b,c]

Iteration		-2 Log likelihood	Coefficients
			Constant
Step 0	1	171.492	-1.561
	2	164.138	-2.006
	3	163.956	-2.091
	4	163.955	-2.094
	5	163.955	-2.094

a. Constant is included in the model.

b. Initial -2 Log Likelihood: 163.955

c. Estimation terminated at iteration number 5 because parameter estimates changed by less than .001.

Table 4 / *Likelihood Block 1*

Iteration History[a,b,c,d]

Iteration		-2 Log likelihood	Coefficients			
			Constant	X1	X2	X3
Step 1	1	159.447	-1.682	0.913	-0.241	0.362
	2	146.418	-2.278	1.344	-0.531	0.693
	3	145.292	-2.475	1.468	-0.743	0.859
	4	145.271	-2.497	1.481	-0.791	0.883
	5	145.271	-2.498	1.481	-0.792	0.884
	6	145.271	-2.498	1.481	-0.792	0.884

a. Method: Enter

b. Constant is included in the model.

c. Initial -2 Log Likelihood: 163.955

d. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than 0001.

Table 5 / *Hosmer and Lemeshow Test*

Hosmer and Lemeshow Test

Step	Chi-square	Df	Sig.
1	2.466	3	0.482

Table 6 / *Nagelkerke's R Square*

Model Summary

Step	-2 Log likelihood	Cox & Snell R Square	Nagelkerke R Square
1	145.271[a]	0.076	0.152

a. Estimation terminated at iteration number 6 because parameter estimates changed by less than 0. 001.

Table 7 / *Classification Prediction*

Classification Table [a]

Observed			Predicted: Y – The absence of sustainbility report assurance	Predicted: Y – The presence of sustainability report assurance	Percentage Correct
Step 1	Y	The absence of sustainbility report assurance	211	0	100.0
		The presence of sustainability report assurance	26	0	0.0
	Overall Percentage				89.0

a. The cut value is 0.500

Table 8 / *Logistic Regression Test results*

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)	Lower	Upper
Step 1[a]	X1	1.481	0.508	8.496	1	0.004	4.397	1.624	11.903
	X2	-0.792	0.534	2.201	1	0.138	0.453	0.159	1.290
	X3	0.884	0.449	3.880	1	0.049	2.420	1.004	5.829
	Constant	-2.498	0.342	53.205	1	0.000	0.082		

a. Variable(s) entered on step 1: X1, X2, X3.

Table 9 / *Hypothesis Result*

Variables in the Equation

		B	S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1[a]	X1	1.481	0.508	8.496	1	0.004	4.397
	X2	-0.792	0.534	2.201	1	0.138	0.453
	X3	0.884	0.449	3.880	1	0.049	2.420
	Constant	-2.498	0.342	53.205	1	0.000	0.082

a. Variable (s) entered on step 1: X1, X2, X3.