CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Research's Object Description

The objects of this research are mining companies listed in Indonesian Stock Exchange and Bursa Malaysia in the period of 2018 as the samples. The samples consist of 43 companies in Indonesia and 32 companies in Malaysia. Those samples fulfill the criteria of purposive sampling. The selection of the sample in this research can be seen in Table 4.1 and Table 4.2.

Table 4.1
Sampling Process of Mining Companies in Indonesia

No	Description	Total
1	Mining companies listed in Indonesian Stock Exchange 2018	45
2	Mining companies with no complete data related to the variables	(2)
	Total Sample	**43**

Table 4.2
Sampling Process of Mining Companies in Malaysia

No	Description	Total
1	Mining companies listed in Bursa Malaysia 2018	32
2	Mining companies with no complete data related to the variables	(0)
	Total Sample	**32**

B. **Descriptive Statistics Test**

Descriptive statistics in this research provides the information of the total data, minimum value, maximum value, mean, and standard deviation from the variables. The result of descriptive statistics test can be seen in Table 4.3 and 4.4 below.

Table 4.3
Descriptive Statistics Test Result Indonesian Data

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Environmental Disclosures	43	.00	.50	.1321	.12276
Firm Value	43	.01	4.44	1.4277	1.16286
Proportion of Independent Commissioners on Board	43	.33	.67	.4027	.07899
Audit Committee	43	2.00	4.00	3.0930	.42617
Board Commissioners Size	43	2.00	8.00	4.3023	1.56654
Board Gender	43	.00	.50	.0841	.15169
Political Visibility	43	22.83	32.01	29.1267	1.89933
Foreign Ownership	43	.00	.88	.2577	.26200
Profitability	43	-3.17	1.10	.0376	.54643
Leverage	43	-.43	3.18	1.0412	.73174
Valid N (listwise)	43				

Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.4
Descriptive Statistics Test Result Malaysian Data

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Environmental Disclosures	32	.00	.29	.1259	.09537
Firm Value	32	.07	1.62	.6130	.45603
Proportion of Independent Commissioners on Board	32	.14	.75	.5006	.13125
Audit Committee	32	2.00	5.00	3.3125	.69270
Board Commissioners Size	32	4.00	9.00	6.8750	1.47561
Board Gender	32	.00	.40	.1547	.12937
Political Visibility	32	19.13	23.81	21.1644	1.01123
Foreign Ownership	32	.02	.58	.1789	.15606
Profitability	32	-1.43	1.20	-.0388	.41308
Leverage	32	-1.20	1.67	.5663	.72832
Valid N (listwise)	32				

Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.2 and 4.3 present the result of descriptive statistics test in Indonesia and Malaysia. This result will be explained in detail below:

1. **Environmental Disclosures**

Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 show that the Environmental Disclosures in Indonesian mining companies have a minimum value of 0.00 and the maximum value of 0.50. The average of the variable is 0.1321 with a standard deviation of 0.12276. Meanwhile Malaysian mining companies has a minimum value of 0.00 and the maximum value of 0.29. The average of the variable is 0.1259 with a standard deviation of 0.09537.

2. **Firm Value**

Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 show that the Firm Value in Indonesian mining companies has a minimum value of 0.01 and the maximum value of 4.44. The average of the variable is 1.4277 with a standard deviation of 1.16286. Meanwhile Malaysian mining companies has a minimum value of 0.07 and the maximum value of 1.62. The average of the variable is 0.6130 with a standard deviation of 0.45603.

3. **Proportion of Independent Commissioners on Boards**

Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 show that the Proportion of Independent Commissioners on Boards in Indonesian mining companies has a minimum value of 0.33 and the maximum value of 0.67. The average of the variable is 0.4027 with a standard deviation of 0.07899. Meanwhile Malaysian mining companies has a minimum value of 0.14 and the maximum value of 0.75. The average of the variable is 0.5006 with a standard deviation of 0.13125.

4. **Audit Committee**

Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 show that the Audit Committee in Indonesian mining companies has a minimum value of 2.00 and the maximum value of 4.00. The average of the variable is 3.0930 with a standard deviation of 0.42617. Meanwhile Malaysian mining companies has a minimum value of 2.00 and the maximum value of 5.00. The average of the variable is 3.3125 with a standard deviation of 0.69270.

5. **Board of Commissioners Size**

   Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 show that the Board of Commissioners Size in Indonesian mining companies has a minimum value of 2.00 and the maximum value of 8.00. The average of the variable is 4.3023 with a standard deviation of 1.56654. Meanwhile Malaysian mining companies has a minimum value of 4.00 and the maximum value of 9.00. The average of the variable is 6.8750 with a standard deviation of 1.47561.

6. **Board Gender (Percentage of Female Director)**

   Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 show that the Board Gender (Percentage of Female Directors) in Indonesian mining companies has a minimum value of 0.00 and the maximum value of 0.50. The average of the variable is 0.0841 with a standard deviation of 0.15169. Meanwhile Malaysian mining companies has a minimum value of 0.00 and the maximum value of 0.40. The average of the variable is 0.1547 with a standard deviation of 0.12937.

7. **Political Visibility**

   Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 show that the Political Visibility in Indonesian mining companies has a minimum value of 22.83 and the maximum value of 32.01. The average of the variable is 29.1267 with a standard deviation of 1.89933. Meanwhile Malaysian mining companies has a minimum value of 19.13 and the maximum value of 23.81. The average of the variable is 21.1644 with a standard deviation of 1.01123.

8. **Foreign Ownership**

    Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 show that the Foreign Ownership in Indonesian mining companies has a minimum value of 0.00 and the maximum value of 0.88. The average of the variable is 0.2577 with a standard deviation of 0.26200. Meanwhile Malaysian mining companies has a minimum value of 0.02 and the maximum value of 0.58. The average of the variable is 0.1789 with a standard deviation of 0.15606.

9. **Profitability**

    Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 show that the Profitability in Indonesian mining companies has a minimum value of -3.17 and the maximum value of 1.10. The average of the variable is 0.0376 with a standard deviation of 0.54643. Meanwhile Malaysian mining companies has a minimum value of -1.43 and the maximum value of 1.20. The average of the variable is -0.0388 with a standard deviation of 0.41308.

10. **Leverage**

    Table 4.3 and Table 4.4 show that the Leverage in Indonesian mining companies has a minimum value of -4.43 and the maximum value of 3.18. The average of the variable is 1.0412 with a standard deviation of 0.73174. Meanwhile Malaysian mining companies has a minimum value of -1.20 and the maximum value of 1.67. The average of the variable is 0.5663 with a standard deviation of 0.72832.

C. Classical Assumption Test

The data of this research will go through several tests; Normality Test, Autocorrelation Test, Heteroscedasticity Test, and Multicollinearity Test.

a. Normality Test

The data examined must be normally distributed. Normality test is used for determining whether the data is normally distributed or not. The normality test in this study uses the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. The results of the normality test using the Kolmogorov Smirnov can be seen in Table 4.5, Table 4.6, Table 4.7 and Table 4.8 below.

Table 4.5
Normality Test Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 1)

		Unstandardized Residual
N		43
	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	.08993303
	Absolute	.128
	Positive	.128
	Negative	-.077
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.842
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.478

Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.6
Normality Test Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 2)

		Unstandardized Residual
N		43
	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	1.02158385
	Absolute	.187
	Positive	.187
	Negative	-.126
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		1.229
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.098

Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.5 and Table 4.6 are the results of Normality Test for Research
Model 1 and Research Model 2 from Indonesian data. The results show
that the value of ASymp. Sig. (2-tailed) are 0.478 and 0.098. It means that
the data of Research Model 1 and Research Model 2 for Indonesian data
are normally distributed.

Table 4.7
Normality Test Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 1)

		Unstandardized Residual
N		32
	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	.07035069
	Absolute	.120
	Positive	.120
	Negative	-.093
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.680
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.744

Table 4.8
Normality Test Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 2)

		Unstandardized Residual
N		32
	Mean	.0000000
	Std. Deviation	.39668146
	Absolute	.145
	Positive	.145
	Negative	-.076
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Z		.821
Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)		.511

Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.7 and Table 4.8 are the results of Normality Test for Research Model 1 and Research Model 2 from Malaysian data. The results show that the value of ASymp. Sig. (2-tailed) are 0.744 and 0.511. It means that the data of Research Model 1 and Research Model 2 for Indonesian data are normally distributed.

b. Autocorrelation Test

Autocorrelation Test is used to know whether the data have correlation or not between variables in the prediction model and the changes of time. The result of Autocorrelation Test in this result can be seen in Table 4.9 and Table 4.10 below.

Table 4.9
Autocorrelation Test Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.681(a)	.463	.337	.09995	2.324

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Board Commissioner Size, Board
   Gender, Audit Committee, Profitability, Proportion of Independent
   Commissioner on Board, Foreign Ownership, Political Visibility
b Dependent Variable: Environmental Disclosures
Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.10
Autocorrelation Test Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.478(a)	.228	.169	1.06015	2.354

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Profitability, Environmental
    Disclosures
b Dependent Variable: Firm Value
Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.9 and 4.10 are the results from Auto Correlation Test from Research Model 1 and Research Model 2 from Indonesian data. The results show that the Durbin Watson value are 2.324 and 2.354. The value of DU for 43 samples with 6 independents variables is 1.8413. The value of DU for 32 samples with 6 independent variables is 1.9093. By looking at criterion DU<DW<4-DU, the Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia is 1.8413<2.324>2.1587. One of the Durbin Watson value in this test

cannot fulfill the criterion of Autocorrelation Test, thus this data have autocorrelation.

Table 4.11
Autocorrelation Test Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.675(a)	.456	.267	.08167	1.606

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Board Commissioner Size, Board Gender, Audit Committee, Profitability, Proportion of Independent Commissioner on Board, Foreign Ownership, Political Visibility
b Dependent Variable: Environmental Disclosures
Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.12
Autocorrelation Test Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.493(a)	.243	.162	.41739	2.232

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Profitability, Environmental Disclosures
b Dependent Variable: Firm Value
Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.11 and 4.12 are the results from Auto Correlation Test Research Model 1 and Research Model 2 from Malaysian data. The results show that the Durbin Watson value are 1.606 and 2.232. The value of DU for 43 samples with 6 independents variables is 1.8413. The value of DU for 32 samples with 6 independent variables is 1.9093. By looking at criterion DU<DW<4-DU, the Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia

is 1.8413>1.606<2.394. Those value did not fulfill the requirement of autocorrelation test. It means that the data has auto correlation. In this research the sample is only one year, so the data is automatically don't have the correlation with previous year. Thus, this autocorrelation test is not affect the result of research.

c. **Heteroscedasticity Test**

Heteroscedasticity test is used to test whether the regression model has inequality of variance from the residuals of one observation to another. The result of heteroscedasticity test can be seen in the Table 4.13, 4.14, 4.15 and 4.16 below.

Table 4.13
Heteroscedasticity Test Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	t	Sig.
(Constant)	-1.415	.166
Proportion of Independent Commissioner on Board	.318	.753
Audit Committee	1.173	.249
Board Commissioner Size	.415	.681
Board Gender	-.480	.635
Political Visibility	1.180	.246
Foreign Ownership	-.073	.942
Profitability	.129	.898
Leverage	-1.853	.073

a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES
Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.14
Heteroscedasticity Test Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	t	Sig.
(Constant)	3.715	.001
Environmental Disclosures	.904	.372
Profitability	.307	.760
Leverage	-.721	.475

a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.13 and Table 4.14 the results show that the significance value of each independent variable in Indonesian data in this study is greater than sig value 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that the data in this study did not experience heteroscedasticity.

Table 4.15
Heteroscedasticity Test Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	t	Sig.
(Constant)	.674	.507
Proportion of Independent Commissioner on Board	-1.262	.220
Audit Committee	.104	.918
Board Commissioner Size	-.735	.470
Board Gender	.051	.960
Political Visibility	.071	.944
Foreign Ownership	-.160	.875
Profitability	.922	.366
Leverage	-.896	.380

a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES
Source: SPSS' Output

Table 4.16
Heteroscedasticity Test Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	t	Sig.
(Constant)	3.851	.001
Environmental Disclosures	.365	.718
Profitability	.797	.432
Leverage	.946	.352

a. Dependent Variable: ABS_RES
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.7, Table 4.8, Table 4.9 and Table 4.10 the results show that the significance value of each independent variable in Indonesia and Malaysia in this study is greater than sig value 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that the data in this study did not experience heteroscedasticity.

d. **Multicollinearity Test**

Multicolinearity test aimed to examine whether there is a correlation between independent variables in the regression model. Multicollinearity can be seen from the value of Tolerance or Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). The result of Multicollinearity test I this study can be seen in Table 4.17, 4.18, 4.19 and 4.20.

Table 4.17
Multicolinearity Test Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	-.647	.279		
Proportion of Independent Commissioner on Board	-.228	.240	.661	1.514
Audit Committee	.027	.043	.706	1.417
Board Commissioner Size	.031	.013	.567	1.765
Board Gender	-.022	.113	.815	1.226
Political Visibility	.025	.010	.626	1.598
Foreign Ownership	-.069	.074	.636	1.572
Profitability	-.020	.032	.777	1.287
Leverage	-.040	.027	.631	1.585

a. Dependent Variable: Environmental Disclosures
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.17 show the results of Multicilinearity Test in Indonesian data Research Model 1. It is indicate that the tolerance value of all independent variables there are proportion of independent commissioner on board, audit committee, board commissioners size, board gender, political visibility, foreign ownership and control variables profitability and leverage in this study is greater than 0.10 and VIF value of all independent variables is smaller than 10. Thus, it can be concluded that this research is free from Multicilinearity.

Table 4.18
Multicolinearity Test Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	1.799	.358		
Environmental Disclosures	1.218	1.351	.974	1.027
Profitability	-.929	.311	.928	1.078
Leverage	-.478	.233	.920	1.086

a. Dependent Variable: Firm Value
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.18 show the results of Multicilinearity Test in Indonesian data Research Model 2. It is indicate that the tolerance value of all independent variables there are proportion of independent commissioner on board, audit committee, board commissioners size, board gender, political visibility, foreign ownership and control variables profitability and leverage in this study is greater than 0.10 and VIF value of all independent variables is smaller than 10. Thus, it can be concluded that this research is free from Multicilinearity.

Table 4.19
Multicolinearity Test Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	B	Std. Error
(Constant)	-.261	.344		
Proportion of Independent Commissioner on Board	-.189	.137	.666	1.502
Audit Committee	.106	.029	.517	1.933
Board Commissioner Size	-.029	.015	.458	2.182
Board Gender	.118	.136	.696	1.437
Political Visibility	.016	.017	.744	1.344
Foreign Ownership	-.112	.104	.815	1.227
Profitability	.043	.044	.653	1.531
Leverage	-.021	.026	.582	1.717

a. Dependent Variable: Environmental Disclosures
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.19 show the results of Multicilinearity Test in Malaysian data Research Model 1. It is indicate that the tolerance value of all independent variables there are proportion of independent commissioner on board, audit committee, board commissioners size, board gender, political visibility, foreign ownership and control variables profitability and leverage in this study is greater than 0.10 and VIF value of all independent variables is smaller than 10. Thus, it can be concluded that this research is free from Multicilinearity.

Table 4.20
Multicolinearity Test Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Tolerance	VIF
(Constant)	.422	.137		
Environmental Disclosures	1.045	.801	.962	1.039
Profitability	.304	.200	.826	1.211
Leverage	.126	.113	.823	1.215

a. Dependent Variable: Firm Value
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.20 show the results of Multicilinearity Test in Malaysian data Research Model 2. It is indicate that the tolerance value of all independent variables there are proportion of independent commissioner on board, audit committee, board commissioners size, board gender, political visibility, foreign ownership and control variables profitability and leverage in this study is greater than 0.10 and VIF value of all independent variables is smaller than 10. Thus, it can be concluded that this research is free from Multicilinearity.

D. HYPHOTESIS TESTING

a. Coefficient of Determination (Adjusted Square)

Coefficient of Determination test aimed to examine the ability of independent variables in explaining the variation of dependent variables. The results of this test can be seen in the Table 4.21, 4.22, 4.23 and 4.24 below.

Table 4.21
Coefficient of Determination Test Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.681(a)	.463	.337	.09995	2.324

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Board Commissioner Size, Board
   Gender, Audit Committee, Profitability, Proportion of Independent
   Commissioner on Board, Foreign Ownership, Political Visibility
b Dependent Variable: Environmental Disclosures
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.21 the result of Asjusted R square is 0.337. It means

that variables such as Proportion of Independent Board of

Commissioners, Audit Committee, Board Gender (Proportion of Female

Director), Political Visibility, and Foreign Ownership, Profitability and

Leverage can explain 33.7% of the dependent variable (Environmental

Disclosures). Meanwhile, the rest of the dependent variables 66.3% is

explained by the others factors that not include in this research.

Table 4.22
Coefficient of Determination Test Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.478(a)	.228	.169	1.06015	2.354

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Profitability, Environmental
   Disclosures
b Dependent Variable: Firm Value
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.22 the result of Asjusted R square is 0.169. It means that variables such as Environmental Disclosures, Profitability and Leverage can explain 16.9% of the dependent variable (Firm Value). Meanwhile, the rest of the dependent variables 83.1% is explained by the others factors that are not include in this research.

Table 4.23
Coefficient of Determination Test Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.675(a)	.456	.267	.08167	1.606

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Board Commissioner Size, Board
   Gender, Audit Committee, Profitability, Proportion of Independent
   Commissioner on Board, Foreign Ownership, Political Visibility
b Dependent Variable: Environmental Disclosures
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.23 the result of Asjusted R square is 0.267. It means variables such as Proportion of Independent Board of Commissioners, Audit Committee, Board Gender (Proportion of Female Director), Political Visibility, Foreign Ownership, Profitability and Leverage can explain 26.7% of the dependent variable (Environmental Disclosures). Meanwhile, the rest of the dependent variables 73.3% is explained by the others factors that not include in this research.

Table 4.24
Coefficient of Determination Test Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.493(a)	.243	.162	.41739	2.232

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Profitability, Environmental
   Disclosures
b Dependent Variable: Firm Value
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.24 the result of Asjusted R square is 0.162. It means

that variables such as Environmental Disclosures, Profitability and

Leverage can explain 16.2% of dependent variable (Firm Value).

Meanwhile, the rest of dependent variables 83.8% is explained by the

others factors that not include in this research.

b. Significant Simultaneous Test (F Test)

Significant Simultaneous Test is used to examine whether the

independent variable has a simultaneous effect on the dependent variable

in this research. F test is done by comparing the significant F with alpha

(α). The independent variables affect the dependent variable when the

significant value F < alpha (0.05). The result of this test can be seen in the

Tables 4.25, 4.26, 4.27 and 4.28 below.

Table 4.25
Simultaneous Effect Test (F Test) Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	.293	8	.037	3.669	.004(a)
Residual	.340	34	.010		
Total	.633	42			

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Board Commissioner Size, Board
   Gender, Audit Committee, Profitability, Proportion of Independent
   Commissioner on Board, Foreign Ownership, Political Visibility
b Dependent Variable: Environmental Disclosures
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on the Table 4.25 the significance value is 0.004 (0.004 <

0.05). It can be concluded that variables such as Proportion of

Independent Board of Commissioners, Audit Committee, Board Gender

(Proportion of Female Director), Political Visibility, Foreign Ownership,

Profitability and Leverage have simultaneous influence towards the

dependent variable (Environmental Disclosures) in Indonesia.

Table 4.26
Simultaneous Effect Test (F Test) Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	12.962	3	4.321	3.844	.017(a)
Residual	43.833	39	1.124		
Total	56.794	42			

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Profitability, Environmental
   Disclosures
b Dependent Variable: Firm Value
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on the Table 4.26 the significance value is 0.017 (0.017 < 0.05). It can be concluded that variables such as Environmental Disclosures, Profitability and Leverage have simultaneous influence towards dependent variable (Firm Value) in Indonesia.

Table 4.27
Simultaneous Effect Test (F Test) Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	.129	8	.016	2.409	.047(a)
Residual	.153	23	.007		
Total	.282	31			

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Board Commissioner Size, Board Gender, Audit Committee, Profitability, Proportion of Independent Commissioner on Board, Foreign Ownership, Political Visibility
b Dependent Variable: Environmental Disclosures
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on the Table 4.27 the significance value is 0.047 (0.047 < 0.05). It can be concluded that variables such as Proportion of Independent Board of Commissioners, Audit Committee, Board Gender (Proportion of Female Director), Political Visibility, Foreign Ownership, Profitability and Leverage have simultaneous influence towards dependent variable (Environmental Disclosures) in Malaysia.

Table 4.28
Simultaneous Effect Test (F Test) Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	1.569	3	.523	3.002	.047(a)
Residual	4.878	28	.174		
Total	6.447	31			

a Predictors: (Constant), Leverage, Profitability, Environmental
    Disclosures
b Dependent Variable: Firm Value
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on the Table 4.28 the significance value is 0.047 (0.017 <

0.05). It can be concluded that variables such as Environmental

Disclosures, Profitability and Leverage have simultaneous influence

towards dependent variable (Firm Value) in Malaysia.

c. **Partial Test (T-test)**

Partial test (t-test) is used to examine the influence of independent

variable towards dependent variable partially. The test is performed with

a degree of $\alpha = 0.05$. The independent variables affect the dependent

variable when the significant value of t < 0.05. The result of this test can

be seen in Table 4.29, 4.30, 4.31 and 4.32 below.

Table 4.29
Partial Test (T Test) Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error		
(Constant)	-.647	.279	-2.319	.027
Proportion of Independent Commissioner on Board	-.228	.240	-.951	.348
Audit Committee	.027	.043	.627	.535
Board Commissioner Size	.031	.013	2.358	.024
Board Gender	-.022	.113	-.197	.845
Political Visibility	.025	.010	2.396	.022
Foreign Ownership	-.069	.074	-.938	.355
Profitability	-.020	.032	-.630	.533
Leverage	-.040	.027	-1.502	.142

a Dependent Variable: Environmental Disclosures

Based on Table 4.29, the equation model of multiple regression analysis in this research can be seen as follow:

ED = -0,647 − 0.228(PIC) + 0.027(AC) + 0.031(BS) − 0.022(PBG) + 0.025(PV) − 0.069(FO) − 0.020(PFT) − 0.040(LEV) + e

The explanation of hypotheses testing are explained as follows:

a. **The Proportion of Independent Boards of Commissioners Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.29, it shows that the Proportion of Independent Boards of Commissioners has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.228, with the significance value of 0.348 > alpha

(0.05). It means that the Proportion of Independent Boards of Commissioners has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Indonesia. Thus, the hypotheses (H1a) is rejected.

b. **Audit Committee Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.29, it shows that the Audit Committee has a positive coefficient regression value of 0.027, with the significance value of $0.535 >$ alpha (0.05). It means that the Audit Committee has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Indonesia. Thus, the hypotheses (H2a) is rejected.

c. **Board of Commissioners Size Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.29, it shows that the Board of Commissioners Size has a positive coefficient regression value of 0.031, with the significance value of $0.024 <$ alpha (0.05). It means that the Audit Committee has a positive significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Indonesia. Thus, the hypotheses (H3a) is accepted.

d. **Board Gender (Percentage of Female Directors) Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.29, it shows that the Board Gender has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.022, with the significance value of $0.845 <$ alpha (0.05). It means that the Board Gender has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Indonesia. Thus, the hypotheses (H4a) is rejected.

e. **Political Visibility Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.29, it shows that the Political Visibility has a positive coefficient regression value of 0.025, with the significance value of $0.022 <$ alpha (0.05). It means that the Political Visibility has a positive significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Indonesia. Thus, the hypotheses (H5a) is accepted.

f. **Foreign Ownership Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.29, it shows that the Foreign Ownership has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.069, with the significance value of $0.355 >$ alpha (0.05). It means that the Foreign Ownership has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Indonesia. Thus, the hypotheses (H6a) is rejected.

The variables control are explained as follows:

g. **Profitability towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.29, it shows that the Profitability has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.020, with the significance value of $0.533 >$ alpha (0.05). It means that the Profitability has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Indonesia.

h. **Leverage towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.29, it shows that the Leverage has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.040, with the significance value of $0.142 >$ alpha (0.05). It means that the Leverage has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Indonesia.

Table 4.30
Partial Test (T Test) Result
Indonesian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
		Std.		
	B	Error		
(Constant)	1.799	.358	5.023	.000
Environmental Disclosures	1.218	1.351	.902	.372
Profitability	-.929	.311	-2.988	.005
Leverage	-.478	.233	-2.051	.047

a Dependent Variable: Firm Value
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.30, the equation model of multiple regression analysis in this research can been as follow:

PBV = 1.799 + 1.218 (EnD) – 0.929 (PFT) – 0.478 (LEV) + e

The explanation of hypotheses testing are explained as follows:

a. The Environmental Disclosures Level towards Firm Value

Based on the results from the Table 4.30, it shows that the Environmental Disclosures has a positive coefficient regression value of 1.218, with the significance value of 0.372 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Environmental Disclosures has no significant effects towards Firm Value in Indonesia. Thus, the hypotheses (H7a) is rejected.

The variables control are explained as follows:

b. **Profitability towards Firm Value**

Based on the results from the Table 4.29, it shows that the Profitability has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.929, with the significance value of 0.005 < alpha (0.05). It means that the Profitability has negative significant effects towards Firm Value in Indonesia.

c. **Leverage towards Firm Value**

Based on the results from the Table 4.29, it shows that the Leverage has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.478, with the significance value of 0.047 < alpha (0.05). It means that the Leverage has negative significant effects towards Firm Value in Indonesia.

Table 4.31
Hypotheses Testing Results Summary

Code	Hypotheses	Result
H_{1a}	The Proportion of Independent Commissioners on Boards has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia	Rejected
H_{2a}	The Audit Committee has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia	Rejected
H_{3a}	The Board of Commissioners Size has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia	Accepted
H_{4a}	The Board Gender (Percentage of Female Directors) has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia	Rejected
H_{5a}	The Political Visibility has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia	Accepted

Code	Hypotheses	Result
H_{6a}	The Foreign Ownership has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia	Rejected
H_{7a}	The Environmental Disclosures has a positive significant effect towards Firm Value in Indonesia	Rejected

Table 4.32
Partial Test (T Test) Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 1)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error		
(Constant)	-.261	.344	-.759	.456
Proportion of Independent Commissioner on Board	-.189	.137	-1.379	.181
Audit Committee	.106	.029	3.600	.002
Board Commissioner Size	-.029	.015	-2.004	.057
Board Gender	.118	.136	.870	.393
Political Visibility	.016	.017	.978	.338
Foreign Ownership	-.112	.104	-1.079	.292
Profitability	.043	.044	.978	.338
Leverage	-.021	.026	-.793	.436

a Dependent Variable: Environmental Disclosures

Based on Table 4.29, the equation model of multiple regression analysis in this research can be seen as follow:

ED = -0,261 − 0.189(PIC) + 0.106(AC) − 0.029(BS) + 0.118(PBG) + 0.016(PV) − 0.112(FO) + 0.043(PFT) − 0.021(LEV) + e

The explanation of hypotheses testing are explained as follows:

a. **The Proportion of Independent Boards of Commissioners Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.32, it shows that the Proportion of Independent Boards of Commissioners has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.189, with the significance value of 0.181 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Proportion of Independent Boards of Commissioners has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Malaysia. Thus, the hypotheses (H1b) is rejected.

b. **Audit Committee Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.32, it shows that the Audit Committee has a positive coefficient regression value of 0.106, with the significance value of 0.002 < alpha (0.05). It means that the Audit Committee has a positive significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Malaysia. Thus, the hypotheses (H2b) is accepted.

c. **Board of Commissioners Size Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.32, it shows that the Board of Commissioners Size has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.029, with the significance value of 0.057 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Audit Committee has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Malaysia. Thus, the hypotheses (H3b) is rejected.

d. **Board Gender (Percentage of Female Directors) Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.32, it shows that the Board Gender has a positive coefficient regression value of 0.118, with the significance value of 0.393 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Board Gender has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Malaysia. Thus, the hypotheses (H4b) is rejected.

e. **Political Visibility Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.32, it shows that the Political Visibility has a positive coefficient regression value of 0.016, with the significance value of 0.338 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Political Visibility has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Malaysia. Thus, the hypotheses (H5b) is rejected.

f. **Foreign Ownership Towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.32, it shows that the Foreign Ownership has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.112, with the significance value of 0.292 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Foreign Ownership has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Malaysia. Thus, the hypotheses (H6b) is rejected.

The variables control are explained as follows:

g. **Profitability towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results from the Table 4.32, it shows that the Profitability has a positive coefficient regression value of 0.043, with the

significance value of 0.338 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Profitability has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Malaysia.

h. Leverage towards Environmental Disclosures Level

Based on the results from the Table 4.32, it shows that the Leverage has a negative coefficient regression value of -0.021, with the significance value of 0.436 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Leverage has no significant effects towards Environmental Disclosures level in Malaysia.

Table 4.33
Partial Test (T Test) Result
Malaysian Data (Research Model 2)

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error		
(Constant)	.422	.137	3.070	.005
Environmental Disclosures	1.045	.801	1.304	.203
Profitability	.304	.200	1.524	.139
Leverage	.126	.113	1.112	.275

a Dependent Variable: Firm Value
Source: SPSS' Output

Based on Table 4.33, the equation model of multiple regression analysis in this research can been as follow:

PBV = 0.422 + 1.045 (EnD) – 0.304 (PFT) – 0.126 (LEV) + e

The explanation of hypotheses testing are explained as follows:

a. The Environmental Disclosures Level towards Firm Value

Based on the results from the Table 4.33 show that the Environmental Disclosures has a positive coefficient regression value

of 1.045, with the significance value of 0.203 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Environmental Disclosures has no significant effects towards Firm Value in Malaysia. Thus, the hypotheses (H7b) is rejected.

The variables control are explained as follows:

b. **Profitability towards Firm Value**

Based on the results from the Table 4.33 show that the Profitability has a positive coefficient regression value of 0.304, with the significance value of 0.139 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Profitability has no significant effects towards Firm Value in Malaysia.

c. **Leverage towards Firm Value**

Based on the results from the Table 4.33 show that the Leverage has a positive coefficient regression value of 0.126, with the significance value of 0.275 > alpha (0.05). It means that the Leverage has no significant effects towards Firm Value in Malaysia.

d. **Independent Sample T test**

Independent Sample T test is aimed to know the difference of the mean between two samples that are not related. In this research independent sample t test will be used to know the difference of mean in the form of Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia and Malaysia. The result can be seen in Table 4.34 below.

Table 4.34
Independent Sample T test Results

	COUNTRY	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Environmental Disclosures	INDONESIA	43	.1321	.12276	.01872
	MALAYSIA	32	.1259	.10051	.01777

Source: SPSS' Output

Based on the Table 4.34 the total of Mining Companies in Indonesia is 43 and Mining Companies Malaysia is 32. The mean of Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia is 0.1321 and Malaysia is 0.1259.

Table 4.35
Independent Sample T test Results

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower	Upper	Lower
ED	Equal variances assumed	.543	.463	.232	73	.817	.00616	.02658	-.04681	.05913
	Equal variances not assumed			.238	72.282	.812	.00616	.02581	-.04529	.05760

Source: SPSS' Output

Based on the Table 4.35 the significance value of Levene Test is 0.319 greater than sig. 0.05 (0.319 > 0.05). It means that there is no difference of mean in Environmental Disclosures Indonesia and Malaysia. Thus, The hypotheses (H_8) is rejected.

Table 4.36
Hypotheses Testing Results Summary

Code	Hypotheses	Result
H_{1b}	The Proportion of Independent Commissioners on Boards has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia	Rejected
H_{2b}	The Audit Committee has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia.	Accepted
H_{3b}	The Board of Commissioners Size has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia	Rejected
H_{4b}	The Board Gender (Percentage of Female Directors) has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia	Rejected
H_{5b}	The Political Visibility has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia	Rejected
H_{6b}	The Foreign Ownership has a positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia	Rejected
H_{7b}	The Environmental Disclosures has a positive significant effect towards Firm Value in Malaysia	Rejected
H_8	There is a difference between Environmental Disclosures level in Indonesia and The Malaysia	Rejected

E. DISCUSSION

1. The influence of Proportion of Independent Commissioners on Boards towards Environmental Disclosures Level

Based on the result the Proportion of Independent Commissioners on Boards has no significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia and Malaysia. Thus the hypotheses H_{1a} and hypotheses H_{1b} are rejected. This finding is in line with research conducted by Paramita and Marsono (2014); Sulistiyowati (2014); and Purba (2018). This findings is not accordance with the agency theory that stated more proportion of independent commissioners on Boards will tend to improve the management effectiveness. Moreover, the Independent Commissioners are elected by the minority shareholders, not by controlling shareholders at the General Meeting of Shareholders (FCGI, 2002), thus they do not have a significant effect on environmental disclosure in the annual report.

The Proportion of Independent Commissioners on Boards has task to supervise the board of directors in the company and gives advice or recommendations to directors regarding the business management. Thus, the Independent Commissioners on Boards has no relations with the decision making in the company. The other reason why this hypotheses is rejected is because there is a tendency that the board of independent commissioners owned by the company only complies with the regulations, the regulations stated that the company must have minimum

number of independent commissioners of 30% of all members on board of commissioners (KNKG, 2006). This result is not supported agency theory that stated the more proportion independent commissioner on board in company will increase the level of environmental disclosures.

2. **The influence of Audit Committee towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results, the Audit Committee in Indonesia has no significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures. Thus, the hypotheses H_{2a} is rejected. Meanwhile, the hypotheses H_{2b} is accepted because of the Audit Committee has positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia.

The result shows that H_{2a} is Rejected, this finding is in line with the research conducted by Suhardjanto (2010); Khasanah (2013); and Purba (2018). They found that there was no significant effect between Audit Committee and Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia. The Audit Committee size cannot resulting the effectiveness of supervising the management of the company. This finding is not support the agency theory. It explains that the number of audit committee will influence the environmental disclosures level. In Indonesia almost all of the audit committee members in companies are 3 person. It can be assumed that they just fulfilled the requirement from POJK Number 55/POJK.04/2015 regarding the audit committee.

In contrast with finding in Indonesian data, the Audit Committee has positive significance effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia, thus H_{2b} is accepted. According to Pratama and Rahardja (2013) stated that the existence of an audit committee in the company was expected to improve the quality of corporate governance, thus the company could improve the performance. This result supported agency theory that states the bigger Audit Committee size in company tend to encourage manager to disclose more about environmental information. This finding is in line with Rahmi (2014); Sulistiyowati (2014); and Sari *et al.* (2019). They find that Audit Committee has significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures. In Malaysia the number of Audit Committee has significant influence towards Environmental Disclosures. The more Audit Committee are in Malaysia, the more Environmental Disclosures information are. The author assumed that in Malaysia the Audit Committee run their responsibility to controlling and supervise that the company's performance well.

3. **The influence of Board of Commissioners Size towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results, the hypotheses H_{3a} is accepted that there is positive significant effects between Board of Commissioners Size and Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia. Meanwhile, the H_{3b} is rejected, thus Board of Commissioners Size has no effect between Board of Commissioners Size and Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia.

The result of H_{3a} is Accepted, this finding is in line with the research conducted by Sulistiyowati (2014); Okky (2016); Rao and Tilt (2016); and Fashikhah *et al.* (2018).   They found that the Board of Commissioners Size has positive significance effect towards Environmental Disclosures. It can be concluded that the larger size of the board of commissioners can improve the control of management in company, thus the management will be more passionate to disclose the environmental information. Other than that, the larger of Boards of Commissioner will increase the idea and communication between management and commissioner. Thus, the larger Board of Commissioners can encourage management in disclosing the environmental information. This findings in line with legitimacy theory about social contract with the society. If the company would like to get legitimacy from the society they must practice the environmental disclosures.

In contrast with finding in Indonesian data, the Board of Commissioners has no significance effect towards Environmental Disclosures. This finding is in line with the research conducted by Haniffa and Cooke (2002) and Fashikhah *et al.* (2018). The author can concluded that the number of Board of Commissioners in Malaysia will not influence the Environmental Disclosures level in Malaysia. The Board Commissioners Size in Malaysia did not have interest with the Environmental Practices in Malaysia. The number of Board

Commissioners in Malaysia is quite high within 6 until 9 person. The whole companies did not have specific Board Commissioners that focus on the environmental aspects. Furthermore, the much number of Board Commissioners Size will causes less effectiveness of management because too much ideas each Commissioners members.

4. **The influence of Board Gender (Percentage of Female Directors) towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results, Hypotheses H_{4a} and $H_{4b\ are}$ rejected. The Board Gender (Percentage of Female Directors) has no significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures neither in Indonesia nor Malaysia. This finding is in line with the research conducted by Nalikka (2009); Sudiartana (2011); and Pajaria *et al.* (2016). They found that the Board Gender has no significant effect towards voluntary disclosures.

Hofstede (1991) explains that there are four dimensions that influence social values in society, one of them is Power Distance Index (PDI). PDI describes how far society can accept inequality. In Asia, Indonesia occupy the second level after Malaysia for FDI score. It means that the society in Indonesia and Malaysia can accept inequality. Furthermore, this findings not support the feminist ethical theory that stated the presence of women directors will influence the company decision making.

Based on Nurture Theory, the diversity of female and male is the result from culture construction and empirical experience of each

individual, is not affected by genetic. Results of this research justify this theory. Along with the development of the globalization era as it is today whereby modernization not only happens physically, but happens in every individual. This theory is in contrast with Nature Theory (Prasista, 2016).

The author can conclude the number of female directors in accompany has no significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures. Nowadays, the decision making in company is taken by the discussion of all directors. Thus, the numbers of female directors not affect the decision making in company including the decision to disclose the environmental information.

5. **The influence of Political Visibility towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results, hypotheses H_{5a} is accepted that Political Visibility has positive significant effect towards Environmental Disclosure in Indonesia. Meanwhile, the hypotheses H_{5b} is rejected, there is no significant effect between Political Visibility and Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia.

The result of hypotheses H_{5a} is accepted, this result is in line with the research conducted by Pajaria *et al.* (2016) and Herman and Saleh (2018). They found that Political visibility (Firm Size) has positive significance effect towards Environmental Disclosures level in Indonesia. This finding is supported by agency theory that states that the

larger the size in companies, the larger the information disclosure is. The larger size of the companies will greatly affect the company's operation activities in the society. They tend to do social and environmental activities programs, because of the society intention. In addition, this finding in line with legitimacy theory that stated the more size of the company the more legitimacy from the society will be.

In contrast with finding in Indonesian data, H_{5b} is rejected that there is no significant influence between Political Visibility (Firm Size) and Environmental Disclosures in Malaysia. This finding is in line with the result conducted by Anggraini (2006) and Fashikhah *et al.* (2018). They found that the Environmental Disclosures did not affected by Firm size. The author can conclude that larger of company not exactly tend to disclose more about environmental disclosure, because the company will focus more in how to get more profit. Moreover, the Environmental Disclosure is activities in company is that is still voluntary.

6. **The influence of Foreign Ownership towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

Based on the results, hypotheses H_{6a} and H_{6b} are rejected that Foreign Ownership has no significant effect towards Environmental Disclosures. This finding is in line with the research conducted by Maulidra (2015); Rohmah (2015); Kusumawardani (2017); and Wulandari and Sudana (2018). They found that there was no significant effect between Foreign Ownership and Environmental Disclosures Level.

Wulandari and Sudana (2018) argue that mining companies are industries that are included in high profile. The companies that are included in high profile have high sensitivity of environmental, social politic, and completion among others company. The number of the percentage of Foreign Ownership in company does not influence the level of Environmental Disclosures. This result not supported signaling theory that state the environmental disclosures will give positive signal to foreign investors in term of investment. In fact the foreign investors tend to invest in company that will give more return or the company that has high profit and dividend. They are not focusing in companies that disclose more about social and environment information.

7. **The influence of Control Variables towards Environmental Disclosures Level**

In this research the author used two control variables; Profitability and Leverage. Based on the result, in Indonesia and Malaysia the Profitability has no significance effect towards environmental disclosures. This finding is in line with Oktalia (2014) and Wulandari and Sudana (2018). The company that has high profitability tend to focus in another way to gain more profit. It means that the high profitability will attract more investors rather than doing a disclosures about environmental.

Based on result show that Leverage has no significance effect towards Environmental Disclosures in Indonesia and Malaysia. In line

with agency theory that stated the management of companies that has high leverage level tend to reduce the environmental disclosures to reduce the debtholders intention. Higher leverage tend to reduce cost including the disclosure of environment. This finding is consistent with previous researcher's finding that is Herman and Saleh (2018).

8. **The influence of Environmental Disclosures towards Firm Value**

Based on the results, hypotheses H_{7a} and H_{7b} are rejected. It means that there is no significance effect between Environmental Disclosures and Firm Value. This finding is in line with research conducted by Lastanti and Salim (2019); Kusuma and Priantinah (2018). The author assumed that the environmental disclosures is just to attract the investors to invest in their company not to increase the firm value. The disclosure of environmental information in mining companies in Indonesia and Malaysia is low. Thus, the hypotheses are rejected.

In addition, environmental disclosures is one of the CSR aspects, the companies tend to disclose more in social activities rather than environmental activities. Other than that, the proxy of Environmental Disclosures in this research used GRI Standards that were effectively used in July 2018. The standards are available in detail, but the companies disclose the environmental information in general. There is a gap between regulators of GRI Standards and management in companies. Thus, there is no significant effect between Environmental Disclosure and Firm Value.

9. **The influence of Control Variables towards Firm Value**

Based on the result profitability in Indonesia has negative direction and has significance effect towards firm value. Meanwhile, In Malaysia profitability has no significant influence towards firm value. In Indonesia, the smaller profitability ratio tends to disclose more about environmental information. This is in line with Mahendra *et al.* (*2012*) that state that the companies with high profit tend to share higher dividends. In contrast with profitability in Indonesia, the profitability in Malaysia has no significant effect towards firm value. The number of the percentage of profitability in a companies has no significant effect to firm value. The author, assumed that in Malaysia profitability is one of factors that not influence the firm value.

Based on results in Indonesia Leverage has negative and significant effect towards Firm Value. It could happen because if debt in companies increase it will make the cost of operational increase also, thus it makes make the Firm Value (PBV) decreases. In line with the research conducted by Timbuleng *et al.* (2015). Meanwhile, in Malaysia Leverage has no significant effect towards Firm Value. It means that the number of the percentage of Leverage has no impact to Firm Value. The other reason is the number of debt is used will not affect the stock price and Firm Value because the used of debt tend to make the equity cost increase. This finding is in line with the research conducted by Nuraeni *et al.* (2016).

10. **The differences of Environmental Disclosures Level in Indonesia and Malaysia**

Based on the result from Independent sample T-test show that the disclosures level in Indonesia and Malaysia is same. It means that there is no differences of environmental disclosures level in Indonesia and The Malaysia. Thus Hypotheses H_8 is rejected. This finding is consistent with research conducted by Prasista (2016) .

Indonesia and Malaysia are countries that join ASEAN organization. The economic condition of both countries are almost the same and both are include in developing countries. In Fact the disclosures of environmental information of both countries are low. That can happen because almost all the mining companies prefer to focus on something that will gain more profitability rather than making the disclosure. Those fact causes the disclosing of environmental disclosure not to be prioritize.

In addition, Malaysia and Indonesia used GRI Standards in disclosing the environmental. This Standard is effectively used in July 2018. GRI Standards that used is GRI 300 (Environmental) that consists of 8 sub topics; materials, energy, water, biodiversity, emissions, effluents and waste, environmental compliance and supplier environmental assessment. These standards are still new but have been effectively used. The author assumed that the use of GRI Standards is

one of the factors that cause the environmental disclosures level in Indonesia and Malaysia has no difference.