International Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting Research (IJEBAR)
Peer Reviewed – International Journal
Vol-5, Issue-2, 2021 (IJEBAR)
E-ISSN: 2614-1280 P-ISSN 2622-4771
https://jurnal.stie-aas.ac.id/index.php/IJEBAR

EFFECT OF OWNERSHIP STRUCTURES AND CEO POWER TO CSR PERFORMANCE MODERATED BY PROFITABILITY

Ayu Rachmawati, Roekhudin, Arum Prastiwi
Faculty of Economics and Business, Brawijaya University, Indonesia
Email: *ayu.rachmawati25@gmail.com*

Abstract: *Effect of Ownership Structures and CEO Power to CSR Performance Moderated by Profitability. This study aimed to analyze effects which affect CSR Performance in Indonesia's companies. Ownership structures which are used in this study are family ownership and managerial ownership in a company. Samples are companies listed in Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) in 2017-2019, selected using probability sampling technique and purposive sampling method. Secondary data used and collected from Sustainability Report in every selected company. Data were analyzed by SPSS 26.0. This study found that family ownership in public companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) in 2017-2019, except companies engaged in finance support the realization of CSR Performance. This study does not support that managerial ownership and CEO power affect CSR Performance. Profitability strengthens the positive relationship of managerial ownership to CSR Performance, but does not support that profitability strengthens the positive relationship of family ownership and CEO power to CSR Performance.*

Keywords: *CSR Performance, Ownership Structure, CEO Power, Profitability.*

1. Introduction

The development of the increasingly advanced era has an impact on the increasingly intense competition between companies in all business fields. The company is required to always improve the performance of all existing stakeholders in order to survive in its business field. In recent decades, many companies have realized the importance of implementing Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as part of their business strategy. The application of social responsibility is getting more attention among businesses because of the increasing social control and critical actions of the community. In relation to problems arising related to the company, the company needs to disclose corporate social responsibility information (CSR Performance). Therefore, there needs to be corporate governance that prospers the community and ensures environmental sustainability (triple bottom line) such as CSR practices.

Along with the increasing number of companies reporting their activities to the public, the development of the types of CSR reports that are published also creates a striking diversity (Perrini, 2005). One of the ups and downs in company value is influenced by the ownership structure which is considered as a form of shareholder commitment to delegate a certain level of control to managers. Sa'diyah, Diana, and Mawardi (2019) researching the influence of ownership structures on companies registered in LQ45 in Indonesia and the results showed that management ownership and family ownership had a positive effect on CSR.

Outside company owners are different from managers because they are less likely to engage in the business affairs of everyday companies. Basically, managerial ownership is a compensation of the company to employees and managers that aims to motivate managers to improve performance and act in accordance with the wishes of the principals. However, on the other hand, there are also management parties that have other objectives and interests that are contrary to the main objectives of the company and often ignore the interests of shareholders. This difference of interest resulted in an agency conflict that encouraged the owner of the company to appoint professional agents who had been first selected through selection and would carry out the task of managing the company. These professionals are ultimately required to be able to maximize the value of the company which is one part of the achievements of the president director or Chief Executive Officer (CEO).

Tien, Chen and Chuang (2014) explain that the CEO position has always been considered one of the most powerful positions in the company and the strength of the CEO's decision-making as a top executive has a significant impact on the company's operations. Sudana &Aristina (2017) revealed that the strength of the CEO can have a positive impact when investors make investment decisions by looking at the quality of the company's CEO.One of the benchmarks of a company's ability to be able to obtain funds through its operational activities is profitability. Companies with good profitability can be said to have healthy finances and are one of the factors for companies implementing CSR. Kamil and Herusetya (2012) argue that a greater level of profitability indicates that the company is able to get greater profits so that the company is able to increase social responsibility activities and disclose it in a wider annual report.

Empirical studies mostly use accounting-based performance measures to investigate CSR and profitability such as asset return (ROA), sales growth, and total assets, and their findings show a positive relationship between CSR and profitability (Javeed &Lefen, 2019). Based on previous studies, it is shown that increased profitability will also improve CSR performance due to increased public trust in the company.

Perrini, Russo, & Tencati, 2005 explained that large companies (firm size) tend to increase CSR performance because large companies have more resources and can commit to CSR activities. This study replicates the research conducted by Lamb & Butler (2016) which was developed with research from Salehi, Tarighi & Rezanezhad (2017) and research by Javeed & Lefen (2019). Lamb & Butler (2016) argues that when company owners and managers are considered as caretakers of the company, institutional owners tend to control for the significant percentage of company equity and want different results and expectations of CSR performance. Salehi, Tarighi & Rezanezhad (2017) use variables of institutional ownership, managerial ownership, family ownership, and family ownership who hold managerial positions. Javeed & Lefen (2019) examined CSR and company performance in manufacturing companies in Pakistan through CEO Power and ownership structures.

Based on the advice of Lamb &Butler research (2016) to consider other variables, this study adds power CEO and CSR performance measurements that are different from previous research. This study uses measurements as conducted in saraswati research (2020), namely quantity disclosure and then conducted industry classification of each sample company. There are still differences in the results of previous research, this study becomes an enrichment of literature with the current conditions of the company and uses different measurements. Based on the description above this study will test CSR performance through the company's ownership structure and the strength of the CEO with profitability as a moderation in managing the company.

Agency Theory

Agency theory explains the relationship between the agent (management of a business) and the principal (business owner) which emphasizes the relationship between owner and manager. This theory implies that there will be differences in the interests of the agent and the principal. This difference in interests will lead to agency costs which include monitoring expenditure by the principle and bounding expenditure by the agent (Jensen & Meckeling, 1976). The differences that exist cannot be separated from the fact that management tries to increase the company's profit without paying attention to the interests of its stakeholders. This difference in interests can be overcome by the existence of ownership structures. Because the control owned by the principal is believed to affect the running of the company, which in turn can affect CSR disclosure in a company (Adnantara, 2013).

Stakeholder Theory

Gozali and Chariri (2007) explain that according to stakeholder theory, companies are not entities that only operate for their own interests but must provide benefits to their stakeholders. The existence of a company is very much determined and influenced by the support provided by stakeholders to the company. Utama (2010) states that corporate social responsibility is not only for owners or shareholders but also for stakeholders who are related and / or affected by the company's existence. In setting and executing its business strategy, companies that carry out CSR will pay attention to the impact of their activities on social and environmental conditions, and strive to have a positive impact. Stakeholders have the right to be provided with information about how the operation activities in the environment around the company. Therefore, if the company does not pay attention to its stakeholders, it is likely to generate protests. Therefore, it should be noted that CSR disclosures made by companies are used to fulfill the rights of stakeholders.

Corporate Social Responsibility Performance

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is a form of corporate social responsibility towards the community environment that can be carried out by carrying out various social activities that are beneficial to the communities around the company environment. Resturiyani (2012) explains that CSR is an integrated concept that combines business and social aspects in harmony so that companies can help achieve stakeholder welfare, and can achieve maximum profit so as to increase share prices. The implementation of CSR in a company is expected to have a financial commitment to the owners or shareholders, but also to have a social commitment to other interested parties. Therefore, CSR is a part of the company's long-term business strategy.

Ownership Structure

Ownership structure arises as a result of the difference in the number of shareholders in the company. A company can be owned by an individual, the wider community, the government, foreign parties or people in the company (managerial). Sudana (2011) explains that the ownership structure is the separation of company owners and company managers. The owner of the company is the party that includes capital in the company, and the manager is the party appointed by the owner and given the authority to make decisions in managing the company in the hope that the manager acts in the interests of the owner. Ownership structure in a company explains that as the owner of the company has the responsibility and commitment to manage and save the company (Annisa & Nazar, 2015).

Carlock *et al*., (2007) revealed that most business companies in the world are family business companies, whether it's just a small shop or a large company that has various branches around the world. Dyer & Whetten (2006) stated that companies owned by a family tend to have good reputation characteristics. McGuire, Dow & Ibrahim (2012) explained that this can be seen in the company's actions towards its shareholders and its high CSR performance. Lamb et al., (2017) revealed that family firms show fewer CSR issues related to the environment and employees. Based on the explanation above, a hypothesis can be drawn

H1 : Family ownership has a positive effect on CSR Performance.

Bernandhi (2013) states that managerial ownership is the level of share ownership by management who is actively involved in decision making. Separation of share ownership and company supervision will create a conflict of interest between shareholders and management to increase prosperity in themselves (agency theory). With the presence of managerial ownership of company shares, it is seen to be able to align the potential differences in interests between management and other shareholders so that the problems between agents and principals are assumed to disappear if a manager is also a shareholder. Jia & Zhang (2012) examined the effect of managerial ownership on CSR Performance in private companies in China regarding the company's response to the earthquake in Sichuan. The results show that high managerial ownership also affects a much higher probability of donations and charities. This means that managerial ownership has a positive effect on the CSR of companies in China. Based on the explanation above, a hypothesis can be drawn

H2 : Managerial ownership has a positive effect on CSR Performance.

CEO Power

CEO or Chief Executive Officer is a position for the highest ranks of executives in a company who are responsible for the running of the company. Tien et al., (2014) explained that CEOs are considered as one of the most powerful positions in companies because CEOs are expected to position their companies to create wealth and maximize future opportunities for stakeholders. This study measures the strength of the CEO by using CEO compensation as a proxy. CEO power is calculated as the CEO's annual compensation divided by the compensation of all boards of directors.

Bahloul *et al.,* (2013) revealed that CEO strength affects productivity growth and optimal CEO strength can enable companies to be more productive and more efficient. Huang (2015) explores the relationship between CEO demographic characteristics and the consistency of CSR performance in public companies. The results showed that there was a strong relationship between the level of education of the CEO, education specialization, the tenure of the CEO and the gender of the CEO with CSR Performance. Sudana & Aristina (2017) reveal that when investors decide to invest by looking at the quality of the company's CEO, the CEO's strength can have a positive impact. Based on the explanation above, a hypothesis can be drawn

H3 : CEO Power has a positive effect on CSR Performance

Profitability

Profitability is the company's ability to obtain funds through its operational activities. Profitability can be a measure of the efficiency of a company in earning a profit so that it becomes one of the main indicators for shareholders before investing. Companies with good profitability can be said to have healthy finances and are one of the company's factors in implementing CSR. Herawati (2015) argues that profitability is related to CSR disclosure which shows that the performance of a company to generate profits can have an influence on decision making. The results of research by Ramdhaningsih & Utama (2013) show that profitability has a positive effect on CSR disclosure. CSR carried out by companies can be a business strategy for companies to maintain competitiveness through reputation and product brand loyalty or a good image of the company so that the company's competitive advantage will be difficult to imitate by competitors.

ROA measures the level of productivity of assets used in getting profit. ROA is measured by dividing net income by the company's total assets. Jananti & Setiawan (2018) conducted a study on the effect of tax aggressiveness on CSR with profitability as a moderating variable. The results show that profitability strengthens the effect of tax aggressiveness on CSR. Companies with a high level of profitability will provide CSR information to prove their existence. Tsoutsoura (2004) states that ROA has a positive effect on CSR disclosure. Based on the explanation above, a hypothesis can be drawn

H4 : Profitability strengthens the effect of family ownership on CSR Performance.
H5 : Profitability strengthens the effect of managerial ownership on CSR Performance
H6 : Profitability strengthens the influence of CEO Power on CSR Performance

2. Research Method

This study aims to examine the effect of ownership structure and CEO Power on CSR performance and to use the moderating variable of profitability (ROA). This study uses a quantitative approach and uses data analysis using statistical procedures. This research can be categorized as explanatory research, namely research that aims to obtain an explanation of the

E-ISSN: 2614-1280 P-ISSN 2622-4771
https://jurnal.stie-aas.ac.id/index.php/IJEBAR

relationship or causality between variables by testing the hypothesis. The research sample was selected using purposive sampling method. Data obtained from the Sustainability Report and Annual Report. This study uses a measurement as done in Saraswati's (2020) research, namely the quantity of disclosure and then the industry classification of each sample company is carried out. The unit of analysis used to determine the quantity of disclosure is a combination of individual sentences which, when collected in the report, amount to one paragraph, half a page, one page, or more than one page. The use of sentence count and page length is justified on the basis that more accuracy can be attributed to the calculation of sentences than to words. The sample of companies is classified by industry into mining; basic and chemical industry; infrastructure and transportation; agriculture; property, real estate and building construction; trading, services and investment; equipment; consumer goods; other industries. The assessment indicators in this study use 46 indicators from Gunawan's research (2010). To achieve the final CSR weighting, the total weight of all indicators is divided by the maximum weight of 230. (a total of 46 indicators multiplied by the maximum weight of each indicator, namely 5).

3. Results and Discussion

This study uses seven variables, including family ownership, managerial ownership, CEO power, CSR performance, profitability, leverage and firm size. The dependent variable is CSR performance, the independent variable is family ownership, managerial ownership, and CEO power, the moderating variable is profitability, and the control variables are leverage and firm size. The seven variables were tested for descriptive statistics, then evaluated the feasibility of the regression model by performing a classical assumption test, and finally testing the hypothesis.

Descriptive statistical testing was carried out on the 164 firm years of the study sample using SPSS 25.

Table 1
Descriptive Statistics Test Results

Information	Minimum	Maximum	Average	Standard Deviation
CSR	146	219	194,23	16,399
FO	451	8718150	606684,71	945829,415
MO	0,00	0,81	0,0256	0,10844
CEO	0,00	4,87	0,6762	0,50541
Prof	-0,45	0,46	0,1418	0,14321
FS	4,10	8,55	7,0307	0,81972
LEV	0,13	0,90	0,5261	0,20895

Based on the results of data presentation in table 1, it shows that the average value of CSR performance shows the number 194.23, indicating that on average public companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2017-2019, except companies engaged in finance disclose high CSR because 194 of 230 indicators have been met. CSR performance has a standard deviation of 16.399.

This value is lower than the average value so that it shows that in the observation period there was no high variation between the minimum and maximum values, namely 146 and 219.

The classical assumption test in this research includes data normality test, multicollinearity, heteroscedasticity, and autocorrelation. The data normality test is shown by a histogram that forms a bell curve and the distribution of the data on the "Normal P-Plot of Regression Standarized Residual" graph shows a point that spreads around the diagonal line and follows the diagonal line, so that the data is normally distributed.

The results of the multicollinearity test can be shown in appendix 2 of model 2, the tolerance values for FO, MO, CEO, FS, LEV and ROA are 0.585; 0.929; 0.984; 0.564; 0.870 and 0.979 and VIF of 1.710; 1,077; 1,016; 1,773; 1,149 and 1,021. Tolerance value> 0.1 and VIF value above <10, it can be concluded that there is no multicollinearity between independent variables in a regression model. Heteroscedasticity testing was carried out by looking at the scatterplot data distribution, the results showed that the scatterplot was evenly distributed and did not form a pattern so it was not proven that there was homocedastasis. Autocorrelation testing is done by doing a run test. The results of the run test showed a significance value of 0.065. The result is 0.065> 0.05 or not significant, this result shows that there is no correlation between the confounding error at period t and t-1 (previous).

The results of the regression analysis are carried out in stages, namely: (1) Stage 1: testing the dependent variable, namely CSR performance and the independent variables, namely family ownership, managerial ownership and CEO power, with the addition of leverage control variables and firm size. (2) Stage 2: examining the dependent variable, namely CSR performance and the independent variables, namely family ownership, managerial ownership, CEO power and profitability, with the addition of leverage control variables and firm size. (3) Stage 3: examining the dependent variable, namely CSR performance and the independent variables, namely family ownership, managerial ownership, CEO power and profitability with the addition of leverage and firm size control variables, as well as the multiplication of family ownership and profitability, managerial ownership and profitability, and CEO. power with profitability. Model 1 is used to test hypothesis 1, Models 2 and 3 are used to test hypothesis 2, which has been adjusted to be one tailed, because the results of the SPSS output are two tailed, with the results of regression testing and the coefficient of determination shown in Table 2 Regression Test Results and the coefficient of determination.

Hypothesis 1, which states that there is a positive effect of family ownership on CSR performance, is tested by looking at model 1 in table 2. Based on table 2, it shows that the coefficient value and t test results are positive and significant, namely the value of 0,000 and 1,900 and a significance of 0.029 (0.029 <0.05, so it is significant). This shows that there is a positive influence of family ownership on CSR performance, so that Hypothesis 1 is accepted.

Hypothesis 2, which states that there is a positive effect of managerial ownership on CSR performance, is tested by looking at model 1 in table 2. Based on table 2, it shows that the coefficient value and t test results are positive but not significant, namely 1.528 and 1.005, and a significance of 0.158 (0.158> 0.05 so it is not significant). This shows that there is no influence from managerial ownership on CSR performance, so that Hypothesis 2 is rejected.

Table 2
Regression Test Results and The Coefficient of Determination

Model	Variable	Beta Coefficient	T Test	Sig.	Adj R^2	Testing
Model 1	Constant (α)	82,029	15,880	0.000	0,091	
	FO	0,000	1,900	0,029		Hypothesis 1
	MO	1,528	1,005	0,158		Hypothesis 2
	CEO	-0,265	-1,116	0,867		Hypothesis 3
	FS	2,682	1,679	0,095		
	LEV	0,017	1,102	0,272		
Model 2	Constant (α)	82,058	15,843	0.000		
	FO	0,000	1,896	0.030	0,086	
	MO	1,563	1,023	0.154		
	CEO	-0,271	-1,137	0.872		
	Prof	2,730	1,699	0.045		
	FS	0,017	1,096	0.275		
	LEV	-2,827	-0,383	0.702		
Model 3	Constant (α)	-14,877	-0,540	0.590		
	FO	0,000	1,952	0.026	0,149	
	MO	12,291	3,631	0.000		
	CEO	-0,549	-1,126	0.869		
	Prof	2,532	1,625	0.053		
	FS	0,016	1,039	0.300		
	LEV	1,641	0,170	0.865		
	MOD1	-0,000	-1,053	0.853		Hypothesis 4
	MOD2	80,675	3,556	0.000		Hypothesis 5
	MOD3	3,333	0,646	0.259		Hypothesis 6

See appendix 3
Information: FO = family ownership, MO = managerial ownership, CEO = CEO power, Prof = profitability, FS = firm size, and LEV = leverage, MOD1 = family ownership * profitability, MOD2 = managerial ownership * profitability, MOD3 = CEO power * profitability.

Hypothesis 3 which states that there is a positive effect of CEO power on CSR performance, tested by looking at model 1 in table 2. Based on table 2, it shows that the coefficient value and t-test results are negative and insignificant, namely -0.265 and -1.116 and a significance of 0.872

(0.872> 0.05 so it is not significant). This shows that there is no influence of CEO power on CSR performance, so Hypothesis 3 is rejected.

Hypothesis 4, which states that profitability moderates the positive influence of family ownership on CSR performance, is tested by looking at model 3 in table 2. Based on table 2, it shows that the coefficient value and the t test results are negative and insignificant, namely -0,000 and -1,116 and significance. 0.865 (0.865> 0.05 so it is not significant). This shows that there is no effect of profitability which strengthens the positive influence of family ownership on CSR performance so that Hypothesis 4 is rejected. For profitability is a moderating predictor variable, this is because in model 2 profitability has a positive and significant coefficient value and t-test results, which are 2.730 and 1.699 and a significance value of 0.045 (0.045 <0.05, so it is significant), thus profitability can only be an independent variable only.

Hypothesis 5, which states that profitability moderates the positive influence of managerial ownership on CSR performance, is tested by looking at model 3 in table 2. Based on table 2, it shows that the coefficient value and t-test results are positive and significant, namely 80.676 and 3.556 and a significance of 0.000 (0.000 <0.05 so significant). This shows that there is an effect of profitability which strengthens the positive influence of managerial ownership on CSR performance so that Hypothesis 5 is accepted. For profitability is a moderating quasi variable this is because in model 2 profitability has a coefficient value and a positive and significant t test result, namely a value of 2.730 and 1.699 and a significance of 0.045 (0.045 <0.05 so it is significant), thus profitability can be a moderating variable and can be an independent variable.

Hypothesis 6 which states that profitability moderates the positive influence of CEO power on CSR performance, tested by looking at model 3 in table 2. Based on table 2, it shows the coefficient value and the t test results are positive but not significant, namely -3.333 and 0.646 and a significance of 0.259 (0.259> 0.05 so it is not significant). This shows that there is no influence of profitability to strengthen the positive influence of CEO power on CSR performance so that Hypothesis 6 is rejected.

The results of this study indicate that family ownership in public companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2017-2019, except companies engaged in finance support the realization of CSR performance. These results support Chua et al. (1999) because it considers family involvement in firms to mean substantial family presence in ownership, governance, management, succession, and / or work. With the presence of the family, it will also encourage CSR performance.

Managerial Ownership and CSR Performance

The results of this study do not support that managerial ownership supports CSR performance. Managers as company managers know more information than shareholders. Managerial ownership in the company is seen to be able to align differences in interests between institutional and managerial, so that the tendency for opportunistic behavior to occur will decrease. Bernandhi (2013) revealed that managerial ownership is the level of share ownership by management who is actively involved in decision making. Separation of share ownership and company supervision will create a conflict of interest between shareholders and management and will increase in line with the management's desire to increase their own welfare (agency theory). With the presence of managerial ownership of company shares, it is seen as being able to align potential differences in interests between management and other shareholders so that problems between agents and principals are assumed to disappear if a manager is also a shareholder. However, this research is not proven because in companies in Indonesia based on descriptive statistics on average only 2% is owned by managerial, so that managerial does not have a significant influence on the company.

The results of this study do not support the research of Jia and Zhang (2012) who examined the effect of managerial ownership on CSR performance in private companies in China by conducting research on the response of private companies in China to the earthquake in Sichuan. The results of Jia and Zhang's (2012) study show that high managerial ownership also affects a much higher probability of donations and charity. This means that managerial ownership has a positive effect on the CSR of companies in China. In addition, Ningrum and Faisal (2014) also conducted research on the relationship of ownership structure to CSR disclosure of public companies in Indonesia. These results indicate that in this study, managerial ownership in pubic companies has no effect because the percentage of ownership is insignificant.

CEO Power and CSR Performance

The results of this study do not support the relationship between CEO power and CSR performance so that it does not support the stakeholder theory which states that stakeholders are parties with an interest in the company that can influence or be influenced by company activities. These results also do not support that the presence of the CEO provides important policy guidelines for a better understanding of CSR.

The results of this study are not in line with research by Tien et al., (2014) explaining that the CEO position is always considered one of the strongest positions in a company because CEOs are expected to position their companies to create wealth and maximize future opportunities for stakeholders. As a top executive who stands on top of the top-level organizational structure, the CEO's decision-making power has a significant impact on the company's operations. In addition, Sudana and Aristina's research (2017) reveals that when investors make investment decisions by looking at the quality of the company's CEO, the CEO's strength can have a positive impact. Bahoul et al., (2013) found that CEO strength affects productivity growth and optimal CEO strength can enable companies to be more productive and more efficient. However, research is in line with Han et al., (2016) who revealed that great CEOs perform much worse than other CEOs when industrial conditions deteriorate. F Li, T Li and D Minor (2016) also stated that the power relationship between CEO power and CSR performance is negative between CEO power and the choice of companies to engage in CSR activities in developed countries.

The results showed that there was no strong relationship between CEO education level, educational specialization, CEO tenure and CEO gender with CSR Performance. This can be possible because there are more financial problems that are considered more by the CEO than considering CSR Performance.

Profitability Moderation in the Relationship of Family Ownership and CSR Performance

The results of this study do not support that profitability strengthens the positive relationship of family ownership on CSR performance. This result does not support the fact that profitability causes the company to be flexible in disclosing its social activities to shareholders. The company will be more profitable when the company cares about the community. The company's rate of return that is higher than the industry average should have the initiative to communicate more information related to the company, including social and environmental information that allows it to become good news in the company's annual report. The results of this study also do not support the previous research, namely Jananti and Setiawan (2018). The results showed that profitability strengthens the effect of tax aggressiveness on corporate social responsibility. Several theories reveal why companies in general and family firms in particular tend to be socially responsible. The tendency of the family to take responsibility for the company's success has an impact on increasing company profits. These results also do not support the research of Ramdhaningsih and Utama (2013) which shows that profitability has a positive effect on CSR disclosure. The reason why profitability does not support increasing CSR performance in family ownership is because companies with family ownership have supported the realization of CSR performance, so regardless of how big the level of profitability is, they will still carry out CSR performance.

Profitability Moderation in Managerial Ownership Relationship and CSR Performance

The results of this study support that profitability strengthens the positive relationship of managerial ownership on CSR performance. These results are in accordance with agency theory emphasizing the relationship between management and company owners. This theory assumes that the owner will prioritize increased investment returns, while management will receive financial compensation and the terms of the contract with the owner. This shows that there are differences in interests and owners feel they need control over management.

Profitability is the company's ability to generate profit so as to increase the value of the company's shareholders. High profitability will provide more opportunities to management in disclosing and conducting CSR programs. Syahnaz (2013) revealed that profitability can also be said to be a factor that influences the broad disclosure of corporate social responsibility, thus reflecting that social reaction requires a managerial style of the company. In other words, the higher the level of profitability that companies generate, the greater the disclosure of social responsibility information. Managerial ownership in the company is seen as aligning differences in interests between institutional and managerial, so the tendency of opportunistic behavior will decrease. Thus, the high control of managers can improve the company's CSR performance and be strengthened by the profitability of the company.

Profitability Moderation in the Relationship between CEO Power and CSR Performance

The results of this study do not support that profitability strengthens CEO Power's positive relationship to CSR Performance. This result contradicts Hui and Matsunaga's opinion (2014) which revealed that the CEO is an important position in corporate governance and is considered a very influential person in a company. CEOs may influence the disclosure of company information relating to corporate social responsibility and values. These results contradict Yasser, Ammun, and Suriya (2015) who revealed that CEO qualifications and affiliations had a positive impact on the company's performance, as well as Sheikh, Shah, and Akbar's (2018) research which emphasized that the concentration of ownership positively influenced CEO compensation and CEO compensation positively impacted the company's performance. These results also do not support Sudana and Aristina's research (2017) which revealed that when investors make investment decisions by looking at the quality of the company's CEO, the strength of the CEO can have a positive impact, as well as Bahoul et al., (2013) which found that the power of CEOs affects productivity growth and optimal CEO strength can enable companies to be more productive and more efficient.

The CEO's ability to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the company is related to the increase in the company's CSR performance. Thus, the high influence of the CEO can increase the company's CSR performance and be strengthened by the company's profitability. This result could be due to the fact that the CEO has more financial goals, so that even though there is high profitability it does not encourage CSR performance.

4. Conclusion

This study aims to examine whether CSR Performance is influenced by family ownership, managerial ownership, and CEO Power, and is moderated by profitability. The results of this study indicate that family ownership in public companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange in 2017-2019, except companies engaged in finance support the realization of CSR performance. However, the results of this study do not support that managerial ownership and CEO power affect CSR performance. The reason is because in this study, companies in Indonesia based on descriptive statistics on average are only 2% owned by managerial, so that managerial does not have a significant influence on the company, and more financial problems are considered by the CEO than considering CSR Performance.

This study also supports profitability strengthening the positive relationship of managerial ownership to CSR Performance, but does not support that profitability strengthens the positive relationship of family ownership and CEO power to CSR Performance. The reason why profitability does not support increasing CSR performance in family ownership is because companies with family ownership have supported the realization of CSR performance, so regardless of how big the level of profitability is, they will still carry out CSR performance, and CEOs have more financial goals, so even though there is high profitability that does not encourage CSR performance.

E-ISSN: 2614-1280 P-ISSN 2622-4771
https://jurnal.stie-aas.ac.id/index.php/IJEBAR

Reference

Adnantara, K. F. 2013. "Pengaruh Struktur Kepemilikan Saham Dan Corporate Social Responsibility Pada Nilai Perusahaan." *Jurnal Buletin Studi Ekonomi* 18: 107–13.

Annisa, Noor. I dan M. Rafki Nazar. 2015. Pengaruh Struktur Kepemilikan dengan Variabel Kontrol Profitabilitas, Umur dan Ukuran Perusahaan terhadap Luas Pengungkapan Corporate Social Responsibility (Studi Empiris Perusahaan Manufaktur di BEI Tahun 2011-2013). Eproceeding telkom university.

Bahloul, Walid, N. Hachicha dan A. Bouri. 2013. Modeling The Effect of CEO Power on Efficiency Evidence from The European Non-Life Insurance Market. 14 (3). 266-285.

Bernandhi, R. 2013. Pengaruh Kepemilikan Manajerial, Kepemilikan Institusional, Kebijakan Dividen, Leverage dan Ukuran Perusahaan Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. *Diponegoro Journal of Accounting* 3(1) :1 – 14.

Dyer, W.G. and Whetten, D. (2006). Family Firms and Social Responsibility: Preliminary Evidence from the S&P 500. *Entrepreneurship, Theory and Practice*, 30(6), 785-802.

Ghozali, I dan A. Chariri. 2007. *Teori Akuntansi*. Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro: Semarang.

Giannarakis, G. 2014. Corporate Governance and Financial Characteristic Effects on The Extent of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure. *Social Responsibility Journal*. 10(4): 569-590.

Herawati, H. 2015. Corporate Governance, Karakteristik Perusahaan dan Pengungkapan Corporate Social Responsibility. *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi dan Perpajakan (JRAP)*. 2 (2). 203-217

Javeed, S. A., & Lefen, L. 2019. An Analysis of Corporate Social Responsibility and Firm Performance with Moderating Effects of CEO Power and Ownership Structure: A Case Study of the Manufacturing Sector of Pakistan. *Sustainability*. 11, 248.

Jensen, M., Meckling, W. 1976. Theory of the firm: Managerial behavior, agency costs and ownership structure. *Journal of Financial Economics*, 3, 305-360.

Jia, M., Zhang, Z. 2012. Managerial Ownership and Corporate Social Performance: Evidence from Privately Owned Chinese Firm's Response to the Sichuan Eartquake. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. 20 (5). https://doi.org/10.1002/csr.1289

Jananti, N. W. R., Setiawan, P. E. 2018. Pengaruh Agresivitas Pajak pada Corporate Social Responsibility dengan Profitabilitas Sebagai Variabel Moderasi. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana, 24(01)*. 170-195.

Kamil, Ahmad dan Antonius Herusetya. 2012. Pengaruh Karakteristik Perusahaan Terhadap Luas Pengungkapan Kegiatan Corporate Social Responsibility. Jurnal Media Riset Akuntansi. Vol. 2, No. 1. ISSN 2088-2106.

Lamb, N. H., & Butler, F. C. 2016. The Influence of Family Firms and Institutional Owners on Corporate Social Responsibility Performance. *Business & Society*. 1-33.

Perrini, F. 2005. Building a European Portrait of Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting. *European Management Journal*. 23: 611-627.

Putri, R. W. E. 2014. Pengaruh Profitabilitas Terhadap Pengungkapan Corporate Social Rsponsibility (Studi Empiris Pada Perusahaan Pertambangan yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia (BEI) Pada Tahun 2010-2012). Jurusan Akuntansi Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Brawijaya: Malang.

Ramdhaningsih, A., Utama, I. M. K. 2013. Pengaruh Indikator Good Corporate Governance Social Responsibility. *E-Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Udayana*. 3 (3): 65-82.

Resturiyani, Novi. 2012. "Pengaruh Pengungkapan Corporate Social Responsibility Terhadap Kinerja Keuangan (Studi Pada Perusahaan Pertambangan yang Terdaftar di Bursa Efek Indonesia Tahun 2011)". Skripsi Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Pasundan: Bandung.

Sa'diyah, A.N.B., Diana, N., Mawardi, C. 2019. Analisis Pengaruh Kepemilikan Manajemen, Kepemilikan Institusional, Kepemilikan Keluarga dan *Corporate Social Responsibility* Terhadap Nilai Perusahaan. *E-JRA*, 8(01).

Salehi, M., Tarighi, H., Rezanezhad, M. 2017. The Relationship Between Board of Director's Structure and Compay Ownership with Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure. *Humanomics*, 33(4): 398-418.

Saraswati, E., Sagitaputri, A., Rahadian, Y. 2020. Political Connections and CSR Disclosures in Indonesia. *Journal of Asian Finance, Economics and Business*. 7(11): 1097-1104.

Sudana, I. M. 2011. *Manajemen Keuangan Perusahaan Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Sudana, I Made, dan Ni Putu N. Aristina. 2017. Chief Executive Officer (CEO) Power, CEO Keluarga, dan Nilai IPO Premium Perusahaan Keluarga di Indonesia. *Jurnal Akuntansi, 21(02)*. 219-231.

Tsoutsoura, M. 2004. "Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance". Haas School of Business University of California at Berkeley.

Utami, W. T & Setyawan, H. 2013. Pengaruh Kepemilikan Keluarga Terhadap Tindakan Pajak Agresif dengan Corporate Governance sebagai Variabel Moderating. Prosiding Simposium Nasional Akuntansi XIV. 413– 421.