

Determinant Factors of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosures in Hospitality and Tourism Companies in Indonesia and Thailand

Saarece Elsy Hatane^{1*}  | Jennifer Eugene Chandra² | Hatane Samuel³ |

I Gusti Ayu Purnamawati⁴

¹Universitas Kristen Petra, School of Business and Management, Surabaya, Indonesia

²Universitas Kristen Petra, School of Business and Management, Surabaya, Indonesia

³Universitas Kristen Petra, School of Business and Management, Surabaya, Indonesia

⁴Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha, Accounting Department, Bali, Indonesia

*Correspondence to: Saarece Elsy Hatane, Universitas Kristen Petra, School of Business and Management, Department of Business Accounting, Jalan Siwalankerto 121-131, Surabaya, Jawa Timur, 60235, Indonesia.

E-mail: elsyehat@petra.ac.id

Abstract: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is increasingly recognized as one aspect of sustainable business development. Within the tourism industry, CSR plays an important aspect in integrating social and environmental concerns in strategies, policies, and business operations in interactions with the community and the company's stakeholders. This study aims to assess and examine the critical factors that influence the formation of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure (CSRD) in hospitality and tourism sector companies. The motivation for this research stems from previous studies that showed contradictory results regarding the factors that influence CSRD. Furthermore, research on the factors that influence CSRD in Indonesia and Thailand's hospitality and tourism industries is rarely done. This study uses company data from 2015 to 2019 with the Generalized Least Square and Weighted Least Square methods in data analysis. This study examines the effect of Profitability, Leverage, Firm Value, Liquidity, and Firm Size on CSRD. In addition, this study contributes to research on the influence of Firm Value on CSRD, which is still rarely done. This study shows that Leverage and Firm Size have a significant positive effect on CSRD, while Firm Value has a significant negative impact on CSRD.

Keywords: corporate social responsibility, profitability, leverage, firm value, hospitality and tourism.

Article info: Received 15 March 2022 | revised 29 June 2022 | accepted 11 May 2023

Recommended citation: Hatane, S. E., Chandra, J. E., Samuel, H., & Purnamawati, I. G. A. (2023). Determinant Factors of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosures in Hospitality and Tourism Companies in Indonesia and Thailand. *Indonesian Journal of Sustainability Accounting and Management*, 7(1), 179-190. <https://doi.org/10.28992/ijSAM.v7i1.570>

INTRODUCTION

In the current business environment, Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is considered an important issue for the company's agenda (Bidari & Djajadikerta, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2021). The relationship between business activities and their impact on the environment and society has been discussed since the mid-1900s (Hermawan & Mulyawan, 2014; Masoud & Vij, 2021). The dimensions of CSR have emerged from economic, legal, ethical and philanthropic to be economic, environmental and social (Khuong & Anh, 2023, Trianaputri & Djakman, 2019, Devie et al., 2020). This study focuses on Indonesia and Thailand, known for their rich culture and natural



resources. This natural wealth makes visitors interested in adventuring and exploring Indonesia and Thailand. Therefore, companies in hospitality and tourism contribute a sizeable economic resource to the country's development. In the Asia Pacific region, the tourism industry has become one of the primary sources of foreign exchange earnings, such as in Thailand and Indonesia (Oxford Business Group, 2018; Oxford Business Group, 2019). In addition, the tourism sector has a vital role in the country's economic growth, such as reducing the number of unemployed by creating jobs, increasing foreign currency income, increasing tax revenues, and attracting international investment.

Along with the increasing demands in tourism and hospitality, the latest research from United National World Tourism Organization (UNWTO) released in 2019 predicted that carbon dioxide emissions from those industries will increase by around 25% by 2030 (UNWTO, 2021). This situation is due to the contribution of the hospitality and tourism industries to greenhouse gas emissions. Stakeholder theory assumes that the tourism industry should be responsible and pay more attention to problems caused by industry performance, such as climate change due to greenhouse gas emissions, rising sea levels, and global warming that disrupt the ecological balance (Archer et al., 2005; Toyota, 2018). Stakeholders have different interests; thus, a company can fulfil its stakeholder by disclosing its social responsibility activities (Hatane & Soewarno, 2022; Khuong et al., 2022). The CSR disclosure (CSRD) is also beneficial to the company to gain legitimation from society (Theodoulidis et al., 2017; Khuong et al., 2022). The CSRD can be a medium for stakeholders to ensure that a company is adaptable to social changes (Bayoud et al., 2012; Thao et al., 2019; Kabir & Thai, 2021).

This study aims to analyse factors that determine the CSRD and its components. Five variables are used in this research: Profitability, Leverage, Firm Value, Liquidity, and Firm Size. Profitability is an essential source for management to be free and flexible in disclosing information to stakeholders (Deswanto & Siregar, 2018; Ardi & Yulianto, 2020). Previous studies have examined the relationship between firm value and CSRD that larger firms gained stronger investor reactions due to their greater visibility of CSRD (Cordeiro & Tewari, 2015). A small firm value will motivate management to disclose more CSR and utilise CSRD as a firm resource that attracts the trust of stakeholders (Gonzalez-Padron et al., 2016; Nguyen et al., 2021). That company signal to stakeholders that it can carry out social activities better than other companies (Nguyen et al., 2021), indicating a higher level of voluntary CSRD. The company's size has a potential influence on disclosure in a company. As the company grows, the public and stakeholders require companies to disclose information more openly because they are increasingly interested in its performance (Semuel et al., 2019; Ardi & Yulianto, 2020).

Previous research found contradictory results in research on Profitability, Leverage, Liquidity, and Firm size (Bayoud et al., 2012; Esa & Ghazali, 2012; Kansal et al., 2014; Hermawan & Mulyawan, 2014; Hapsoro & Sulistyarini, 2019; Bidari & Djajadikerta, 2020; Lolo & Yuliandhari, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2021). At the same time, number of studies that discuss the impact of firm value on CSRD is still limited. The results from this study can give insight into tourism and hospitality companies, as the results promote the driving factors of CSR disclosures. This study investigates drivers to disclose three components of CSRD: community, corporate governance, and environment to provide more comprehensive results. The subject in this study is companies in the hospitality and tourism industry from 2015 to 2019, primarily from Indonesia and Thailand.

From the Resource-based view (RBV) perspective, the contribution of CSR can be viewed from two important things (Zahidy et al., 2019). First, RBV focuses on the outcome as the primary resource for stakeholders to disclose CSR. Second, RBV can be explicitly recognised as intangible resources such as corporate culture and reputation from the perspective of CSR itself. In developing CSRD, transparency and company's intention to carry out environmental care activities are important. However, the information disclosed is sometimes

inconsistent with company initiatives and shows low integrity and credibility (Luo et al., 2019; She & Michelon, 2019). Therefore, this study aims to investigate further the factors that influence CSRD, which helps increase company transparency and management's ability to improve business in the future.

Companies with high profitability have greater resources to fund CSR activities and then fund the disclosure costs in the annual report. On the other hand, companies with high profits gain legitimacy from stakeholders that they should carry out and report social responsibility (Semuel et al., 2019; Zahidy et al., 2019; Ardi & Yulianto, 2020, Nguyen et al., 2021). Companies with higher debt levels will tend to use their resources to service their loans. Limited financial resources reduce a firm's ability to invest in meaningful CSR activities (Zahidy et al., 2019). Thus, there are fewer resources for expressing social responsibility. On the other hand, this company also does not disclose too much to avoid attention from creditors (Deswanto & Siregar, 2018, Semuel et al., 2019; Ardi & Yulianto, 2020). Firm value describes the company's value from the market side compared to the company's book value. If the company value is not as expected, it will encourage the company to disclose its social responsibility to increase its reputation. The benefit of this enhanced reputation is not only to provide investors with higher cash flows but also to increase their competitive advantage and ease of doing business (Semuel et al., 2019).

Liquidity is the company's ability to use current assets to pay short-term liabilities. It indicates that company has sufficient short financial resources. Companies with high liquidity can provide a signal to stakeholders that the company can carry out social responsibility that is more meaningful than other companies (Semuel et al., 2019; Lolo & Yuliandhari, 2020, Nguyen et al., 2021). Bidari & Djajadikerta (2020) found that large companies have the potential to disclose more social responsibility than what is demanded by stakeholders. Based on the legitimacy theory, large organisations need to disclose more and more information (Bayoud et al., 2012; Masoud & Vij, 2021). Disclosure of more social responsibility aims to gain and maintain public trust, even though it absorbs larger resources (Bidari & Djajadikerta, 2020; Nguyen et al., 2021). This study extends its testing to the components of CSRD, namely community (a), corporate governance (b), environmental (c), and total CSRD (d).

METHODS

This study examines a sample of 26 companies in the hospitality and tourism sector, consisting of 14 Indonesian and 12 Thailand companies, obtained from Bloomberg and the 2015-2019 company annual reports. This quantitative research used a purposive sampling method to ensure that companies have adequate data availability, such as CSR disclosure information needed during 2015-2019. The total observations are in Table 1.

Table 1 Number of Observations

Sampling criteria	Number of Observations
Hospitality and tourism industry in Indonesia and Thailand from 2015-2019	53
(-) Hospitality and tourism companies which inconsistently published their annual reports and had insufficient financial and CSR data from 2015- 2019	27
Final Hospitality and tourism companies	26
The observations (26 x 5)	130 observations for 5 years

The dependent variable of this study is Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure (CSRD). As described previously, this study aims to determine the factors that influence CSR disclosure. This study used a measurement with the Kinder, Lydenberg, Domini & Co (KLD) index to provide a comprehensive and objective picture of CSRD disclosure. This study used seven dimensions of KLD; Community Disclosure (COMD), Corporate Governance Disclosure (CGD), Diversity Disclosure (DIVD), Employee Disclosure (EMPD), Environmental Disclosure (ENVD), Human Rights Disclosure (HUMD), and Product Disclosure (PROD) (Hatane et al., 2021). This study had two categories in each dimension: Strength and Concern of each disclosure. Strength indicators are used to evaluate the company's strengths or strengths the related to CSRD dimensions, while concerns evaluate the weaknesses or shortcomings caused by the company (Hatane et al., 2021; Hatane & Soewarno, 2022). CSRD calculation used a dichotomous approach where the value of "0" is non-disclosure, and "1" is the disclosed item.

Internationalisations persuade companies to implement CSR activities as a deliberate strategy to strengthen the corporate image (Hatane & Soewarno, 2022). This situation shows the importance of the community in the company's eyes and uses the Community Disclosure component to ascertain the nature of its social care to the community. In addition, if stakeholders can see CSRD opportunities well, they will place more importance on transparency and accountability in the companies' corporate governance. Disclosure of Corporate Governance can reduce the gap in the legitimacy of information between companies and the public (Semuel et al., 2019). Competencies possessed by stakeholders must be based on good communication about the company's goals as a driving force in corporate governance. Therefore, this study takes Community Disclosure (COMD) and Corporate Governance Disclosure (CGD) as specific dependent variables in this study. Many issues, such as global warming and climate change strengthen the business perspective of a caring environment (Zeppel & Beaumont, 2012). The hospitality and tourism industries, in particular, contribute to climate change and, at the same time, suffer from climate change (Solimar International, 2014). Responsibility for the environment is mutually beneficial for the company and the environment (Deswanto & Siregar, 2018). In addition to environmental care, companies with good environmental policies will save money in long-term business processes (Deswanto & Siregar, 2018; Ardi & Yulianto, 2020). Therefore, we used Environment Disclosure (ENVD) as one of the specific dependent variables in this study. The specific dependent variable in this study has considered legitimacy theory, stakeholder theory, and resource-based value as the theoretical basis. The specific dependent variables are Community Disclosure (COMD), Corporate Governance Disclosure (CGD), Environment Disclosure (ENVD), and Total CSR Disclosure (TOTD), which are described as Corporate Social Disclosure (CSRD) variables (Table 2).

Table 2 Operational Variables Definition

Variable	Indicator	Operational Definition	Measurement
Community Disclosure (COMD)	KLD	The measurement used to measure CSR disclosures in the community components.	COMD = Total community disclosures strength – Total community disclosures concern
Corporate Governance Disclosure (CGD)	KLD	The measurement used to measure CSR disclosures in the corporate governance components.	CGD = Total corporate governance disclosures strength – Total corporate governance disclosures concern
Environment Disclosure (ENVD)	KLD	The measurement used to measure CSR disclosures in the environmental components.	ENVD = Total environment disclosures strength – Total environment disclosures concern

Total CSR Disclosure (TOTD)	KLD	The measurement used to measure total CSR disclosures.	TOTD = (Total community disclosures strength – Total community disclosures concern) + (Total corporate governance disclosures strength – Total corporate governance disclosures concern) + (Total diversity disclosures strength – Total diversity disclosures concern) + (Total employee relations disclosures strength – Total employee relations disclosures concern) + (Total environment disclosures strength – Total environment disclosures concern) + (Total human rights disclosures strength – Total human rights disclosures concern) + (Total products disclosure strength – Total products disclosures concern)
Profitability	Return on Asset (ROA)	The relative numbers of company's profit on total assets	$ROA = \frac{\text{Earning Before Tax}}{\text{Total Assets}}$
Leverage	Debt-to-Asset	Measuring the company's external funding sources	$LEV = \frac{\text{Total Debt}}{\text{Total Assets}}$
Firm Value	Market-to-Book Ratio (MBR)	Measuring the market value of the company compared to the book value of the company	$MBR = \frac{\text{Market Capitalization}}{\text{Total Book Value of Equity}}$
Liquidity	Current Ratio	Measuring the company's ability to meet short-term obligations	$\text{Current Ratio} = \frac{\text{Current Asset}}{\text{Current Liability}}$
Firm Size	Log Total Asset	The size of the company based on the total assets	Log Total Asset

There are statistical equations to explain the research framework. Statistical equations for this research framework are:

$$COMD_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Profitability_{i,t} + \beta_2 Leverage_{i,t} + \beta_3 FirmValue_{i,t} + \beta_4 Liquidity_{i,t} + \beta_5 FirmSize_{i,t} + e$$

$$CGD_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Profitability_{i,t} + \beta_2 Leverage_{i,t} + \beta_3 FirmValue_{i,t} + \beta_4 Liquidity_{i,t} + \beta_5 FirmSize_{i,t} + e$$

$$ENV D_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Profitability_{i,t} + \beta_2 Leverage_{i,t} + \beta_3 FirmValue_{i,t} + \beta_4 Liquidity_{i,t} + \beta_5 FirmSize_{i,t} + e$$

$$TOTD_{i,t} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 Profitability_{i,t} + \beta_2 Leverage_{i,t} + \beta_3 FirmValue_{i,t} + \beta_4 Liquidity_{i,t} + \beta_5 FirmSize_{i,t} + e$$

In where:

$COMD_{i,t}$ = Community Disclosures score of company i in period t

$CGD_{i,t}$ = Corporate Governance Disclosures score of company i in period t

$ENV D_{i,t}$ = Environmental Disclosures score of company i in period t

$TOTD_{i,t}$ = Total CSR Disclosures (sum of COMD (Community Disclosures), CGD (Corporate Governance Disclosures), DIVD (Diversity Disclosures), EMPD (Employee Relation Disclosures), ENV D (Environmental Disclosures), HUMD (Human Rights Disclosures), PROD (Product Disclosures) of company i in period t

$Profitability_{i,t}$ = Return of asset of company i in period t

$Leverage_{i,t}$ = Total debt to asset of company i in period t

$FirmValue_{i,t}$ = Market to book value of company i in period t

$Liquidity_{i,t}$	= Current ratio of company i in period t
$FirmSize_{i,t}$	= Natural Logarithm Total Asset of company i in period t
β_0	= constant coefficient
$\beta_{1, 2, 3, 4, 5}$	= variables' regression coefficient
ϵ	= error

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data analysis method used is panel data regression with Generalized Least Square and Weighted Least Square techniques. The first data analysis performed was descriptive analysis, which showed the mean, standard deviation, minimum value, and maximum value of the independent and dependent variables based on Table III. Companies mostly made community disclosures, with an average of 4.046 and a maximum of 7.00. This analysis proves that companies disclosed many CSR activities in donating and dealing directly with the community. Diversity disclosures have a minimum value of -1, which indicates that the concern dimension is more dominant than the diversity strength component within the company. Employee disclosures, environmental disclosures, human rights disclosures, and product disclosures show a minimum value of 0 which means that there are still companies that do not disclose CSR or have balanced dimensions of strength and concern.

The majority of companies in the tourism industry in Indonesia and Thailand have low attention to the importance of CSR disclosures; the data showed that from 53 tourism industries, 27 companies did not consistently publish CSR in the company's annual report in 2015-2019. The standard deviation of the total CSR disclosures shown in Table 3 was also very high, with a value of 5,011. The maximum value of profitability after tax was 26.05 from the tourism industry of Indonesia and Thailand, where the minimum value of profitability shows a negative number of -8.63. The average profitability of the company is 5.7, with a standard deviation of 5.924.

Table 3 Descriptive Analysis

	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Standard Deviation
COMD	1.000	7.000	4.046	1.413
CGD	1.000	5.000	3.800	1.007
DIVD	-1.000	5.000	1.535	1.535
EMPD	0.000	6.000	3.438	1.093
ENVD	0.000	6.000	2.623	1.856
HUMD	0.000	3.000	2.069	0.8995
PROD	0.000	3.000	1.177	0.8396
TOTD	8.000	28.00	19.14	5.011
Profitability	-8.630	26.05	5.700	5.924
Leverage	0.000	0.6361	0.126	0.1476
Firm Value	0.000	13.56	2.604	2.883
Liquidity	0.06872	12.20	1.764	1.686
Firm Size	3.674	7.095	5.521	0.7941

Source: Data Hospitality dan Tourism Industry 2015-2019

Based on the panel test in Table 4, the right approach for panel data regression was found. Based on the tests, community disclosures, corporate governance disclosures, and total CSR disclosures used random effects, while environmental disclosures used a fixed effect approach. After determining the right approach, a heteroscedasticity test must be carried out first. Based on the Chi-square test from Table IV, the p-value of each variable shows the number <0.05 , which indicates that the hypothesis has a problem and does not meet the homoscedasticity. Therefore, the research method used is Generalised Least Square for the components of community disclosures (COMD), corporate governance disclosures (CGD), and total CSR disclosures (TOTD). In contrast, environmental disclosures (ENVD) used the Weighted Least Square method to solve the heteroskedasticity problem in the fixed panel effect.

Table 4 Panel Test

	Chow Test (p-value)	Breusch-Pagan Test (p-value)	Hausman Test (p-value)	Result	Heteroskedasticity Test Statistic (p-value)
COMD	4.77894e-020	2.8847e-025	0.348303	RANDOM EFFECT	P(Chi-square(20) > 34.900080) = 0.020643
CGD	1.53663e-024	4.39749e-033	0.88446	RANDOM EFFECT	P(Chi-square(20) > 38.018579) = 0.008809
ENVD	3.1743e-032	6.07581e-032	0.0155154	FIXED EFFECT	P(Chi-square(20) > 46.800426) = 0.000625
TOTD	3.71176e-022	3.5477e-028	0.391672	RANDOM EFFECT	P(Chi-square(20) > 43.130414) = 0.001965

Next, the collinearity test was done by checking the standard Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). Based on the results in Table 5, the independent variables were free from multicollinearity.

Table 5 Regression Panel

Variables	Predicted sign	Coefficient	Std. Error	t-ratio	p-value	Sig.
Community disclosures (F-value = 8.21307; Adjusted R ² = 0.175652)						
Constant		2.98275	1.51891	1.964	0.0496	**
Profitability	+	0.0165247	0.0201776	0.8190	0.4128	
Leverage	-	2.72874	1.20560	2.263	0.0236	**
Firm Value	-	-0.0597447	0.0455109	-1.313	0.1893	
Liquidity	+	-0.0305112	0.0565790	-0.5393	0.5897	
Firm Size	+	0.118275	0.281150	0.4207	0.6740	
Corporate Governance Disclosures (F-value = 18.7469; Adjusted R ² = 0.316308)						
Constant		0.423775	1.01843	0.4161	0.6773	
Profitability	+	-0.00141584	0.0119327	-0.1187	0.9056	
Leverage	-	1.92425	0.756805	2.543	0.0110	**
Firm Value	-	-0.00688767	0.0272386	-0.2529	0.8004	
Liquidity	+	0.0234162	0.0333811	0.7015	0.4830	
Firm Size	+	0.541660	0.187250	2.893	0.0038	***

Environmental Disclosures (F-value = 34.83431; Adjusted R ² = 0.567363)						
Constant		1.22600	0.647725	1.893	0.0607	*
Profitability	+	-0.0461907	0.0192643	-2.398	0.0180	**
Leverage	-	1.95403	0.918350	2.128	0.0353	**
Firm Value	-	-0.269613	0.0354158	-7.613	<0.0001	***
Liquidity	+	-0.252978	0.0694759	-3.641	0.0004	***
Firm Size	+	0.442150	0.127696	3.463	0.0007	***
Total CSR Disclosures (F-value = 19.148; Adjusted R ² = 0.289852)						
Constant		6.30444	5.01121	1.258	0.2084	
Profitability	+	-0.0751602	0.0635869	-1.182	0.2372	
Leverage	-	6.92174	3.88641	1.781	0.0749	*
Firm Value	-	-0.325112	0.144095	-2.256	0.0241	**
Liquidity	+	-0.00728400	0.178140	-0.04089	0.9674	
Firm Size	+	2.31652	0.925274	2.504	0.0123	**

Note : ***1% significance level, ** 5% significance level, * 10% significance level

Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) : Profitability = 2.099; Leverage = 1.366; Firm Value = 1.736; Liquidity = 1.362; Firm Size = 1.331

Table 6 Regression Panel Indonesia and Thailand in Total CSRD

Variables	Indonesia		Thailand	
	Coefficient	Sig.	Coefficient	Sig.
Profitability	-0.0644373		-0.0606473	
Leverage	15.2198	***	1.36862	
Firm Value	-1.02687	***	-0.481207	***
Liquidity	-0.0616472		-1.28636	***
Firm Size	3.82254	***	-3.27718	***

Note: ***1% significance level

Based on Table 6, the company's leverage shows a significant positive effect on CSRD in Indonesia. The smaller the firm value, the more companies disclose CSRD to improve the company's reputation in both countries. Low corporate liquidity triggers Thailand's companies to inform more about CSR. Firm size has a significant effect in both countries with different directions of influence. Indonesian hospitality and tourism industries will be more active in disclosing CSR if the company's size gets more prominent, while Thailand's industries are the opposite. Different management and understanding of top management in each sector and country can influence management decisions towards CSR disclosures. Therefore, all countries and sectors in the relationship between CSRD and its influencing factors cannot be equalised.

CSRD has a vital role in its social and environmental implementation. Therefore, analysing the factors that influence CSRD helps to understand the company's performance in disclosing CSR. CSRD reduces information asymmetry, showing company transparency and thereby increasing legitimacy. This CSRD can be achieved with good communication between stakeholders and awareness of ethics and social responsibility, which plays an essential role in corporate governance. In its implementation to employees, CSRD can motivate employees to

engage in CSR activities directly. This situation affects job satisfaction, feels work involvement, and can improve the quality of employees' work life. CSRD also affects the community through the company's concern for the environment by providing support, trust, and loyalty.

According to the descriptive statistic results, among the seven components of CSR in KLD measurement, four elements are still minimum in the level of disclosures. They are diversity, employee relations, environmental and product disclosures. This situation is presumably due to government regulations that oblige and are considered an external driving factor that forces companies to disclose CSR. CSRD in tourism and hospitality companies of Indonesia and Thailand are also suspected to be philanthropists. The CSR activities focus on financial contributions that aim to benefit the community to build the company's image in society. The tourism and hospitality companies in these countries look like they are not expanding their CSR activities in the implementation of humanitarianism that genuinely respects the value of human life. The contribution of humanitarianism can be seen not only financially but giving their lives to serve others. This study's highest number of disclosures is the community element, indicating that companies disclose many of their CSR activities in donating and maintaining relationships with the community.

The results of this study contribute to the government through support for the importance of monitoring the social responsibility of the tourism and hospitality industry. Environmental sustainability is a major concern in this industry. Because the social responsibility carried out by companies in this industry is still philanthropic in nature, the government needs to reinforce the social responsibility of this industry through government regulations. Climate change and global warming, which are world issues now, should be a particular concern in implementing corporate CSR. The hospitality and tourism industries must continue to contribute to reducing greenhouse gas development in tackling climate change. A hotel that can be used as an example in its implementation is the Intercontinental Hotels Group, committed to reducing greenhouse gas emissions through the Hotel Carbon Measurement Initiative (HCMI) by operating Crown Plaza and Holiday Inn. The hotel can track and manage carbon reductions (Intercontinental Hotels Group, 2015).

CONCLUSION

This study's main objective is to examine further the relationship between factors that influence CSRD using panel regression analysis for 130 annual reports as of 2015-2019 from the hospitality and tourism industries in Indonesia and Thailand. This study aimed to examine the relationship between Profitability, Leverage, Firm Value, Liquidity, Firm Size, and CSRD. The measurement of CSRD used the KLD method that was adjusted for companies in Indonesia and Thailand. This study takes three major components of CSR relevant to the tourism and hospitality industry: community, corporate governance, and environment. The results from this study contribute to RBV and stakeholder theories. Debt is essential for enhancing the disclosures of community, CG, environment and total CSR. Companies need to satisfy their stakeholders by arranging and disclosing their sustainability activities. Leverage and Firm Size were found favourable in enhancing the CSR disclosures. Lower market share prices in tourism and hospitality companies even force the companies to disclose more about their sustainability activities to gain legitimation from the investors. Furthermore, Profitability is not the essential factor that may influence CSR disclosures. There are some limitations to this study. First, this study only focuses on the tourism and hospitality industries in Indonesia and Thailand. Different sectors and countries can provide different perspectives on the relationship between CSRD and the factors that influence it. Second, the business environment dynamics can change unexpectedly; therefore, corporate social responsibility disclosures can be expanded.

ORCID

Saarec Elsye Hatane  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3797-1623>

REFERENCES

- Archer, B., Cooper, C., & Ruhanen, L. (2005). *Global Tourism: The positive and negative impacts of tourism* (3rd edition). Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-7506-7789-9.50011-X>
- Ardi, J. W., & Yulianto, A. (2020). The Effect of Profitability, Leverage, and Size on Environmental Disclosure with the Proportion of Independent Commissioners as Moderating. *Accounting Analysis Journal*, 9(2), 123–130. <https://doi.org/10.15294/aa.v9i2.36473>
- Asmery, R., Alvionita, T., & Gunardi, A. (2017). CSR Disclosures in the Mining Industry: Empirical Evidence from Listed Mining Firms in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Sustainability Accounting and Management*, 1(1), 16–22. <https://doi.org/10.28992/ijsam.v1i1.23>
- Bayoud, N. S., Kavanagh, M., & Slaughter, G. (2012). Factors Influencing Levels of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure by Libyan Firms: A Mixed Study. *International Journal of Economics and Finance*, 4(4), 13–29. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ijef.v4n4p13>
- Bidari, G., & Djajadikerta, H.G. (2020). Factors Influencing Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosures in Nepalese Banks. *Asian Journal of Accounting Research*, 5(2), 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AJAR-03-2020-0013>
- Cordeiro, J. J., & Tewari, M. (2015). Firm Characteristics, Industry Context, and Investor Reactions to Environmental CSR: A Stakeholder Theory Approach. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130(4), 833 – 849. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2115-x>
- Deswanto, R. B., & Siregar, S. V. (2018). The Associations between Environmental Disclosures with Financial Performance, Environmental Performance, and Firm Value. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 14(1), 180–193. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-01-2017-0005>
- Devie, D., Liman, L. P., Tarigan, J., & Jie, F. (2020). Corporate Social Responsibility, Financial Performance and Risk in Indonesian Natural Resources Industry. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 16(1), 73–90. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-06-2018-0155>
- Esa, E., & Ghazali, N. A. M. (2012). Corporate Social Responsibility and Corporate Governance in Malaysian Government-Linked Companies. *Corporate Governance*, 12(3), 292–305. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14720701211234564>
- Gonzalez-Padron, T. L., Hult, G. T. M., & Ferrell, O. C. (2016). A Stakeholder Marketing Approach to Sustainable Business. *Marketing in and for a Sustainable Society*, 61–101. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S1548-643520160000013012>
- Hapsoro, D., & Sulistayini, R. D. (2019). The Effect of Profitability and Liquidity on CSR Disclosure and Its Implication to Economic Consequences. *The Indonesian Review*, 9(2), 143–154. <http://dx.doi.org/10.14414/tiar.v9i2.1730>
- Hatane, S. E., Telim, J. H., Tjanlisan, R., Tandiono, G. A., & Tjandra, M. (2021). Corporate Social Responsibility Performance and Ownership Structures adding Value to Indonesia's Banking Sector. *Indonesian Journal of Sustainability Accounting and Management*, 5(1), 91–102. <https://doi.org/10.28992/ijsam.v5i1.191>
- Hatane, S. E., & Soewarno, N. (2022). Corporate social responsibility and internationalisation in mitigating risk. *International Journal of Sustainable Society*, 14(3), 221–242. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJSSOC.2022.125647>

- Hermawan, M. S., & Mulyawan, S. G. (2014). Profitability and Corporate Social Responsibility: An Analysis of Indonesia's Listed Company. *Asia Pacific Journal of Accounting and Finance*, 3(1), 15–31.
- Hussainey, K., Elsayed, M., & Razik, M. A. (2011). Factors Affecting Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure in Egypt. *Corporate Ownership and Control Journal*, 8(4), 432–443. <https://doi.org/10.22495/cocv8i4c4art5>
- Intercontinental Hotels Group. (2015). *PCC responsible tourism business Corporate social responsibility*. Available at: https://www.ihgplc.com/-/media/ihg/files/responsible-business/2018-responsiblebusiness/downloads/2015/2015_ihg_responsible_business_report.pdf (Accessed September 7, 2021).
- Kabir, R., & Thai, M. T. (2021). Key Factors Determining Corporate Social Responsibility Practices of Vietnamese Firms and the Joint Effects of Foreign Ownership. *Journal of Multinational Financial Management*, 59, 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mulfin.2020.100676>
- Kansal, M., Joshi, M., & Batra, G. S. (2014). Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosures: Evidence from India. *Advances in Accounting*, 30(1), 217–229. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adiac.2014.03.009>
- Khuong, N. V. & Anh, L. H. T. (2023). The nexus between corporate social responsibility and firm value: the moderating role of life-cycle stages. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 19(5), 949–969. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-09-2021-0370>
- Khuong, N. V., Rahman, A. A., Meero, A., Anh, L. H. T., Liem, N. T., Thuy, C. T., & Ly, H. T. (2022). The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure and Accounting Comparability on Earnings Persistence. *Sustainability*, 14(5), 2752. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su14052752>
- Lolo, Y. E. P, & Yuliandhari, W. S. (2020). The Effect of Profitability, Liquidity and Solvency on Corporate Social Responsibility. *Jurnal Akuntansi, Audit dan Sistem Informasi Akuntansi*, 4(3), 465–472. <https://doi.org/10.36555/jasa.v4i3.1408>
- Luo, W., Guo, X., Zhong, S., & Wang, J. (2019). Environmental Information Disclosure Quality, Media Attention and Debt Financing Costs: Evidence from Chinese Heavy Polluting Listed Companies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 231(2), 268–277. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.237>
- Masoud, N., & Vij, A. (2021). Factors Influencing Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure (CSR D) by Libyan State-Owned Enterprises (SOEs). *Cogent Business & Management*, 8(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2020.1859850>
- Nguyen, T. H., Vu, Q. T., Nguyen, D. M., & Le, H. L. (2021). Factors Influencing Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure and Its Impact on Financial Performance: The Case of Vietnam. *Sustainability*, 31(15), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13158197>
- Oxford Business Group. (2018). *Indonesia's Tourism Sector Indicates Strong Expansion*. available at: <https://oxfordbusinessgroup.com/overview/island-attraction-legacy-destinations-and-new-offerings-indicate-strong-expansion> (accessed September 1, 2021)
- Oxford Business Group. (2019). *Thailand Continues to Attract Growing Numbers of Visitors as it Diversifies its Tourism Offering*. available at: <https://oxfordbusinessgroup.com/overview/tapping-new-sources-visitor-numbers-increase-officials-look-diversify-offering> (accessed September 1, 2021).
- Semuel, H., Hatane, S. E., Fransisca, C., Tarigan, J., & Dautrey, J. M. (2019). A Comparative Study on Financial Performance of the Participants in Indonesia Sustainability Reporting Awards. *Indonesian Journal of Sustainability Accounting and Management*, 3(1), 95–108. <https://doi.org/10.28992/ijSAM.v3i1.84>
- She, C., & Michelon, G. (2019). Managing Stakeholder Perceptions: Organized Hypocrisy in CSR Disclosures on Facebook. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 61(C), 54–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2018.09.004>
- Shen, X., Ho, K. C., Yang, L., & Wang, L. F. S. (2021). Corporate social responsibility, market reaction and accounting conservatism. *Kybernetes*, 50(6), 1837–1872. <https://doi.org/10.1108/K-01-2020-0043>

- Solimar International. (2014). *Climate change and tourism*. Available at: <https://www.solimarinternational.com/what-we-do/destination-management/climate-change-and-tourism/> (accessed September 7, 2021).
- Thao, L. H. N., Doan Ngoc, P. A., & Velencei, J. (2019). Measuring Corporate Social Performance. *Serbian Journal of Management*, 14(1), 193–204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5937/sjm14-18009>
- Theodoulidis, B., Diaz, D., Crotto, F., & Rancati, E. (2017). Exploring Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance through Stakeholder Theory in the Tourism Industries. *Tourism Management*, 62, 173–188. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2017.03.018>
- Toyota, T. (2018). *Sustainability is Now Mission Critical for Businesses. Here's why*. World Economic Forum. available at: <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/09/sustainability-is-now-mission-critical-for-businesses-heres-why/>
- Trianaputri, A. R., & Djakman, C. D. (2019). Quality of Sustainability Disclosure among the Asean-5 Countries and the Role of Stakeholders. *Jurnal Akuntansi Dan Keuangan Indonesia*, 16(2), 180–205. <https://doi.org/10.21002/jaki.2019.10>
- UNWTO. (2021). *Transforming Tourism for Climate Action*. Available at: <https://www.unwto.org/sustainable-development/climate-action> (accessed September 7, 2021).
- Zahidy, A. A., Sorooshian, S., & Hamid, Z. A. (2019). Critical Success Factors for Corporate Social Responsibility Adoption in the Construction Industry in Malaysia. *Sustainability*, 11(22), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11226411>
- Zeppel, H., & Beaumont, N. (2012). Climate Change and Tourism Futures: Responses by Australian Tourism Agencies. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 12(2), 73–88. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1467358412444807>