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Abstract
This paper intends to extend prior developed market-based researches on the value relevance of non-financial information, which is reflected in Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) disclosure, by examining the association between companies’ financial performances and their non-financial performances. We use 281 firm-year observations of 34 public-listed firms in Indonesia during the period of 2012 - 2018. As the majority of prior studies have focused on the use of price model, we employ regression of both price and return models to assess the value relevance. We also analyze the value relevance of ESG disclosure on both aggregate and singular aspects. We employ sensitivity analysis to assess any differences in the value relevance of both models. The findings show that environmental, social, and ESG disclosure have significant impacts on share prices and stock returns, therefore they have value relevance in both price model and return model. Only governance disclosure has no effect on both share prices and stock returns. Our paper addresses an additional approach in assessing the value relevance of non-financial information. By incorporating two models, we provide a better understanding of the value relevance of ESG information. Our empirical evidence supports the process of developing sustainability reporting regulation in Indonesia regarding the value relevance of non-financial information.
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INTRODUCTION
Value relevance is the main aspect of the qualitative characteristics of financial statements. Accounting numbers are said to have value relevance if they have a significant influence on the market values [1]. Accounting information that has no value relevance is not relevant to be used in decision making processes by users of financial statements. Financial statements should have the value relevance, including Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) reports. Value relevance research also includes the relevance of non-financial information.

The importance of sustainability performance has become a concern for researchers and practitioners in the last two decades. In Indonesia, companies’ obligation to carry out social and environmental responsibilities is regulated by the government through Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 concerning Limited Corporate Social and Environmental Responsibility. Many countries have begun to emphasize sustainability reporting obligations, including Indonesia. The implementation of mandatory sustainability reporting is regulated by Indonesia’s Financial Services Authority (OJK), namely OJK Regulation (POJK) No. 51 of 2017 concerning the Implementation of Sustainable Finance for Financial Services Institutions, Issuers, and Public Companies, which will begin in 2019 and is targeted for completion in 2024. The issuance of regulations requiring companies to report sustainability reporting shows that issues related to social responsibility are valuable information that will be valued by investors.

Empirical evidence shows a decrease in the value relevance of accounting information from year to year [2–4]. The decline in the value relevance is also found in CSR information [5–7]. The declining value relevance is a signal of declining quality of accounting information [3]. Declining quality of accounting information can cause distortions in decision making processes, resulting in a loss of the usability of accounting information.

Previous studies on the value relevance of CSR information have shown inconclusive findings. Some scholars have found a positive effect of CSR information on share prices [8–10]. Other scholars, meanwhile, have secured evidence that CSR information has a negative effect on market values [11–13]. The inconclusiveness on the research findings is caused by the varied research methods and measurements of CSR information [12,14]. The differences in the assessment of the value relevance of CSR information are also caused by differences in assumptions regarding CSR information, which are either seen as economic benefits or as costs that can reduce future earnings predictions [11,15]. Some studies have only used a small portion of environmental information components, such as information on water and air waste emissions [13], sulfur dioxide (SO2) emissions [16] and carbon emissions [17]. Some researchers have also only focused on the negative aspects of CSR performances such as: environmental pollution [18,19], court claims for corporate violations of government regulations [20] and public complaints [5]. Meanwhile, other researchers have focused on the positive aspects of the company CSR performances, such as: allowances for reducing pollutant gas emissions [16] and environmental management programs [14]. Market participants will react negatively to CSR information that has a negative content and will respond positively to CSR information that shows good companies’ performances in carrying out their social responsibilities [5].

The concept of corporate sustainability is measured through three aspects also known as the “Triple Bottom Line” [21]. Most researches on the relevance of CSR information have focused on a single aspect, namely the environmental aspect alone, which belongs to the “planet” from the triple bottom line aspect [8,22]. The lack of comprehensive reporting of information causes difficulties for investors to classify future economic benefits and costs related to the companies’ environmental performances [23]. Subsequent researches then began to consider the aspects of “people” from the triple bottom line, that are reflected in social information and corporate governance information [24–27].

Bloomberg ESG information has combined people and planetary aspects from the triple bottom line component. Bloomberg measures ESG disclosure’s scores by considering “hard” and “soft” items of each type of information. Bloomberg also gives higher scores for information items that are revealed more than other information items. Thus, Bloomberg also considers the quality of ESG information disclosure [25]. Bloomberg ESG score includes all types of CSR information disclosure, both negative (such as: levels of pollutant gas emissions) and positive (such as: the use of renewable energy).
Most early studies seem to have a similar focus on the aggregate analysis of ESG factors to examine the effect of ESG information on companies' financial performances. ESG information contains various types of information that are put together in a proxy. The influence of each type of information for investors can vary. ESG analysis at the aggregate level can cover the effect of each component of information on financial performance, hence the results obtained can be inaccurate [28–30]. Individual analysis is important to decide the determinant factors of each type of information.

This study aims to assess the value relevance of ESG information by using the Bloomberg measurement proxy. We use pricing models and return models to assess the value relevance. Most researches on the value relevance of CSR disclosure have used a price model that is based on Olson’s Model [31]. Price models give a higher R² (measure of value relevance) than return models [32]. However, price models have more serious problems than return models [33]. The use of single price models to test the value relevance of accounting information will lead to biased interpretation due to serious econometric problems, especially heteroscedasticity. Hence, the use of return models is recommended [34].

The rest of this paper is structured as follows. Section 2 discusses literature review and hypotheses development. In section third, we describe our research method, including research design. Section 4 discusses research findings. Overall conclusion is presented in the last section (section 5).

LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

The effect of environmental information disclosure on share price

Information, which is freely available, is used by individuals to make decisions [35]. Lack of access to public information will lead to information asymmetry as asymmetry occurs when people who hold certain information are able to make better decisions [35], hence they earn abnormal return because they have better understanding about a firm’s performance. Signal effectiveness can be improved by disclosing information that is relevant and needed by the receivers, hence the receivers are able to attain a comprehensive picture of the company and make accurate decisions.

Disclosure of information related to corporate environmental responsibility delivers a positive signal for investors. Good environmental performance can be a competitive advantage for companies, as competitors with lower environmental performances would have difficulties imitating them [36]. Such an advantage can have an impact on the long-term sustainability of the companies in generating profits for investors.

Companies committing to carrying out environmental responsibilities and disclosing information to the public will be valued more highly by market participants, which is reflected by the rise in their stock prices [17]. Environmental disclosure is a tool which helps investors assess future financial prediction and reduction in cost of capital [36]. High level of disclosure enhances market liquidity, consequently reducing the cost of capital through a reduction of transaction cost and an increase in the company's securities demand [37].

Johnston [16] has conducted research on the value relevance of greenhouse gases information (GHG). GHG information is measured by the amount of greenhouse gas emissions. Information on the amount of greenhouse gas emissions allows investors to predict the increase in the companies’ stock prices. According to Johnston [16], investors considered information on SO2 gas emission as a corporate strategy for managing companies’ risks associated with GHG gas emissions. Johnston [16] concluded that SO2 gas emission information had significant impact and was considered informative by market participants.

Neglecting environmental aspects can be a negative signal for investors on companies’ performances and can lead to financial losses. Disclosure of environmental aspects, such as greenhouse gas emissions, waste installations and the use of renewable energy, has proven to be able to increase companies’ superiority [38,39]. Disclosure of new information will be responded with various forms of responses. If the information has content, the reaction of investors can be examined through the rise of share prices.

Theoretical and empirical researches support the following hypothesis:

H₁: Disclosure of environmental information has a positive effect on the company’s share price.

The effect of social information disclosure on share price

Social information describes a company’s achievements on social aspects within a certain period of time. Social aspects such as employee welfare, customer satisfaction, work accident rates, and customer complaint levels are other indicators besides financial indicators that can be sensitive information for stakeholders. Information asymmetry can be reduced through the disclosure of relevant information [30].

Along with the changing public perception of the existence of a company, the company’s activities are no longer focused on financial performance measures to maximize profit. Greater disclosure of sustainability activities can decrease confusion of firm value, hence can increase the level of investors’ confidence [40]. Therefore, market participants are expected to give higher values on companies which disclose information more highly.

Companies have a responsibility in the social and environmental aspects. Good corporate social performance can be reacted as a positive signal by investors because it is related to the long-term sustainability of the companies’ operations and can increase investors’ awareness of the importance in considering social factors as an indication of potential risks in the future [30]. Disclosure of social information is said to have value relevance when used by investors as a basis for decision making.

Qiu et al. [25] have conducted a research on the value relevance of environmental and social disclosure in the UK. They found that only social disclosure had value relevance and mattered to investors. Environmental disclosure has no significant effect on market value. Higher market value earned by companies that disclose social information highly is driven by greater prediction of growth rate in their future cash flow [25].

The importance of social aspects as a signal of potential future risk and return among investors has raised attention on the disclosure of social information [30].

Based on the previous literature and empirical researches, the second hypothesis is proposed as follows:

H₂: Disclosure of social information has a positive effect on the company’s share price.

The effect of governance information disclosure on share price

Corporate governance information is information about the mechanism within the company to balance the interests of the company and those of the stakeholders, which is intended to create long-term shareholder value [41]. Good corporate governance structure is an important requirement for companies to carry out social responsibility and achieve sustainable development. Good corporate governance also assures the rights of stakeholders and ensures good corporate social responsibility [42].

Corporate governance plays an important role in protecting shareholders’ interests. About good governance structures is a positive signal for investors. Investors believe that the company can prevent potential fraudulent behaviors and maintain shareholders’ value. Disclosure of governance information helps ensure investors that corporate social responsibility activities are running well. Disclosure of corporate governance information is indicated to be able to attract more investors [43].

Previous studies have examined the effect of corporate governance in improving companies’ financial performances. Governance information is considered to have a positive impact on firm value [43,44]. Empirical evidence has proved that effective corporate governance can increase corporate investors’ confidence. Investors are ensured that the company
Disclosure of governance information has a positive effect on the company’s share price. Based on the argument, hypothesis three is proposed as follows:

H₃ : Disclosure of ESG information has a positive effect on the company’s share price.

The effect of ESG information disclosure on share price

ESG disclosure is information about environmental, social, and governance that is integrated, making it possible to provide a more comprehensive picture of companies’ non-financial performances. The ESG disclosure policy helps companies ensure investors that the company has made a commitment to improving its operations [39]. Therefore, information is a positive signal for investors. ESG information can reflect companies’ sustainability performances. Disclosure of ESG information is considered relevant by investors if the information can be used in decision making processes. ESG information can affect companies’ financial performances in a several ways [30]. First, ESG reporting can enhance companies’ reputation, and thus it will increase investors’ confidence. Second, ESG information related to efficient use of resources allows the company to have a competitive advantage, hence they have a better ability to compete with competitors. Third, ESG policy leads to more motivated employees, increasing their productivity and innovation, which then allows companies to gain new market shares [30]. Quiros [27] have conducted a research on the effect of ESG disclosure on firm value. They use a sample from public-listed companies in Brazil within the period of 2011-2015. They found that market participants positively valued ESG disclosure. Similar finding is provided by [30,40,45]. Based on literature reviews and empirical evidence, ESG disclosure is expected to have a positive impact on market values. Therefore, the fourth hypothesis is proposed as follows:

H₄ : Disclosure of ESG information has a positive effect on the company’s share price.

The effect of environmental information disclosure on stock return

Environmental disclosure contains information about companies’ environmental performances. Awareness on environmental aspects such as the level of pollutant gas emissions, prevention of waste and recycled waste, and the use of renewable energy is important to assess the feasibility of the companies’ operations. Disclosure of information about environmental performances can reduce investment risks [26], which can be perceived as a positive signal by shareholders.

Dutta et al. [46] have examined the effect of environmental disclosure on stock returns. In this case, the environmental disclosure was measured by CO₂ emission. They used a large sample of public-listed companies in the European Emission Allowances (BUSA) market between 2009 and 2017. The empirical result showed that environmental disclosure was positively associated with stock returns. This finding is supported by previous studies [47,48].

Based on the argument, environmental disclosure is expected to have a positive impact on stock returns. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis is proposed as follows:

H₅ : Disclosure of environmental information has a positive effect on the company’s stock return.

The effect of social information disclosure on stock return

Companies are a part of a broad social system and have the responsibility to contribute to the social welfare of the community [49]. Disclosure of social responsibility information acts as a positive signal for investors. Investors believe that the companies have the commitment to dealing with social and environmental issues [50]. Cormier [36] states that disclosure of social responsibility information will improve corporate social performances, which in turn will increase company visibility and credibility. Good corporate credibility will make the companies have a good brand image and reputation, which have an impact on financial benefits in the form of premium market values, superior financial performances and low capital costs [51].

Lagore, Mahoney and Thorne [50] have examined the impact of corporate social responsibility disclosure on stock returns. They use 122 public-listed firms in the United States of America (USA). They found that firms which disclosed standalone CSR reports had a positive association on stock returns. Investors rely on CSR reports because it will encourage companies to disclose higher quality information. The consequence of improving the quality of information disclosure is an increase in the companies’ reputation, delivering a positive signal for investors.

Koernadi, Krishnamurti and Rad [56] have examined the impact of corporate governance on stock returns. They used 88 firms in New Zealand between 2004 and 2008. They found that well-governed firms had higher levels of stock returns due to lower levels of risks. Disclosure on governance information can assure investors that firms have a commitment to maintaining shareholders’ values. Governance is associated with low levels of risk. This empirical result is supported by Rostami et al [57] and Khan et al [43].

Based on prior empirical studies, it can be drawn that governance disclosure is positively related to stock returns. Therefore, hypothesis regarding this can be proposed as follows:

H₆ : Disclosure of social information has a positive effect on the company stock return.

The effect of ESG information disclosure on stock return

ESG disclosure is information about the mechanisms, relationships and processes regarding companies’ management and control [41]. According to Mouselli [55], information about governance is a major determinant in company valuation, capital costs and market liquidity. Implementation of effective governance mechanisms will encourage companies to disclose higher quality information. Therefore, the fifth hypothesis is proposed as follows:

H₇ : Disclosure of ESG information has a positive effect on the company stock return.

The effect of ESG information disclosure on stock return

Integration of environmental, social, and governance information into a singular proxy provides a more comprehensive picture regarding companies’ non-financial performances. Disclosure of ESG information on aggregate level helps investors in comprehensively assessing the firms’ non-financial performances [30]. Bernardi [58] has found an empirical evidence that integrated reporting had an impact on the accuracy of earning prediction. Disclosure of relevant ESG information can be a positive signal for investors. Peiris and Evan [58] have examined the relationship between ESG aspects on stock return. The research was conducted based on 250 stocks in Domini Social Index (DSI) in the USA between 1991 and 1996. The empirical result showed that ESG disclosure had a significant positive effect on stock returns. According to Peiris and Evan [58], higher levels of ESG disclosure implied higher capabilities in generating profit. This empirical evidence is supported by other scholars [47,59].

Based on previous literature and empirical researches, it can be presumed that ESG disclosure has a positive effect on stock returns. Therefore, hypothesis eight is proposed as follows:

H₈ : Disclosure of ESG information has a positive effect on the company’s stock return.

METHODOLOGY
Sample Selection
The population of this study consists of 467 public-listed companies forming 3,789 firm-year observations in Indonesia.
within the period of 2012–2018. The number of the companies vary from year to year based on the number of companies listing. We then use the purposive sampling method to select a sample for the study. The criteria to select the sample is based on the availability of data, hence companies that do not disclose ESG information are not selected as samples. After excluding 397 companies which do not have ESG disclosure, the sample is reduced to 70 companies and leaves a pooled sample of 532 firm-year observations. As our study focuses on mining, agriculture and manufacturing sectors, we further select companies which hold ESG disclosure on the three sectors. We choose the three mentioned sectors as our focus due to their sensitivity on environmental issues. The final sample consists of 34 companies and forms 281 firm-year observations.

Research Model

We use price model and return model to assess the value relevance of ESG disclosure. Both models are derived from Olson’s model [31]. Adopting Zuraida [30], we use four regression models to test the value relevance of ESG in price model. Model one to three are used to assess the value relevance of the singular aspect of ESG disclosure. Model four is used to analyze the value relevance of ESG disclosure in aggregate. We do not put all the models into single regression due to serious multicollinearity as argued by Zuraida [30]. The price models are written as follows:

\[ P_{it+1} = \alpha + \beta_{ENVI}it + \beta_{BVit}it + \beta_{EPSit}it + \beta_{SIZEit}it + \varepsilon_{it}(1) \]

\[ P_{it+1} = \alpha + \beta_{SOCit}it + \beta_{BVit}it + \beta_{EPSit}it + \beta_{SIZEit}it + \varepsilon_{it}(2) \]

\[ P_{it+1} = \alpha + \beta_{GOVit}it + \beta_{BVit}it + \beta_{EPSit}it + \beta_{SIZEit}it + \varepsilon_{it}(3) \]

\[ P_{it+1} = \alpha + \beta_{ESGi}it + \beta_{BVit}it + \beta_{EPSit}it + \beta_{SIZEit}it + \varepsilon_{it}(4) \]

For return model, we use a model modified by Ota [32]. We also employ four regression models in return model. All the variables in return model are deflated by \( P_{it-1} \). ESG disclosure is not deflated by \( P_{it} \) as the information is assumed to be independent and not affected by the scale of the company [11]. The return models are written as follows:

\[ R_{it} = \alpha + \beta_{ENVI}it + \beta_{EPSit}it + \beta_{SIZEit}it + \varepsilon_{it}(5) \]

\[ R_{it} = \alpha + \beta_{SOCit}it + \beta_{EPSit}it + \beta_{SIZEit}it + \varepsilon_{it}(6) \]

\[ R_{it} = \alpha + \beta_{GOVit}it + \beta_{EPSit}it + \beta_{SIZEit}it + \varepsilon_{it}(7) \]

\[ R_{it} = \alpha + \beta_{ESGi}it + \beta_{EPSit}it + \beta_{SIZEit}it + \varepsilon_{it}(8) \]

Where:

- \( P_{it-1} \) : share price of company i at year \( t-1 \)
- \( P_{it} \) : share price of company i at year \( t \)
- \( R_{it} \) : stock return of company i at year \( t \)
- \( ENVI \) : environmental disclosure of company i at year \( t \)
- \( SOC \) : social disclosure of company i at year \( t \)
- \( GOV \) : governance disclosure of company i at year \( t \)
- \( ESG \) : ESG disclosure of company i at year \( t \)
- \( BV \) : book value per share
- \( EPS \) : earnings per share
- \( SIZE \) : control variable of company size
- \( \Delta EPS \) : control variable of changes in earning per share

Share prices are measured by companies’ closing prices as of April 30 and April 30 and are then deflated by closing prices at the end of the fiscal year (December 31). Both share price and stock return are taken quite shortly after the submission deadline of annual report, which is aimed to reduce the effect of other information.

ESG disclosure is measured by Bloomberg scores. Bloomberg ESG scores range from 0 to 100. The figures reflect the percentage of company disclosure that can be achieved in a year. As the scores are provided in percentage, they allow for comparison among companies. According to Qiu [25], Bloomberg measures the scores based on points gathered through annual reports, sustainability reports, and company websites. Bloomberg has 120 different points (60 points for environmental disclosure, 26 points for social disclosure and the rest is for governance disclosure). Among the disclosure points, 80% are considered as “hard” items that can be quantified, such as carbon emissions and the use of renewable energy, while the remaining 20% are considered as “soft” items, such as energy efficiency policy and waste reduction policy [25, 58]. By considering both “hard” and “soft” items, Bloomberg scores represent not only the quantity of the disclosure, but also its quality [25, 58]. The scoring or weighting system used by Bloomberg to obtain overall scores cannot be disclosed due to copyright concerns.

Several control variables are used to improve goodness of fit of the model. Book value per share is measured by deflating book value of equity by the number of outstanding common stock. Current book value can be a determinant factor of future earning, thus it can be used to predict market value of the companies [31]. Earning per share is measured by dividing earning after interest and tax by the number of outstanding common share. Earnings contain useful information to assess firms market value [31]. Company size is measured by the natural logarithm of the number of total asset. According to Cooper and Owen [12], who argued that company size can influence the value relevance of environmental information. Therefore, company size is used as a control variable in this study.

RESEARCH FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics of 281 firm-year observations are presented in Table 1. On average, the environmental disclosure score of all companies is at 11.40%, with a minimum score of 0% and a maximum score of 56%. It indicates that environmental disclosure among the companies is low. Social disclosure is at a mean of 21.13%, with a minimum score of 0% and a maximum score of 63%, which indicates that social disclosure among the companies is low. The average of governance disclosure and ESG disclosure are at 48.15% and 22.62%, respectively. Governance disclosure has a minimum score of 23% and a maximum score of 75%, while ESG disclosure recorded a minimum and a maximum score of 6% and 54% respectively. Governance disclosure among the companies is considered as high. On the other hand, ESG information has a low level of disclosure.

The average of share price is Rp8,413.35, with a minimum of Rp50 and a maximum of Rp98,400. Stock return has an average of Rp6.54, with a minimum and a maximum return at Rp(48) and Rp523 respectively. The data shows a wide range of sample distribution.

| Table 1. Descriptive Statistics |
|---------------------------------|
| Variables | Mean | Min | Max | SD |
| ENV | 11.40 | 0 | 56 | 14.02 |
| SOC | 21.13 | 0 | 63 | 19.58 |
| GOV | 48.15 | 23 | 75 | 8.42 |
| ESG | 22.62 | 6 | 54 | 13.11 |
| P | 8,413.35 | 50 | 98,400 | 13,246.19 |
| R | 6.54 | -48 | 523 | 33.87 |

Notes : ENV : environmental disclosure, SOC : social disclosure, GOV : governance disclosure, ESG : ESG disclosure, P : share price, R : stock price
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The coefficient of ESG disclosure in price model is the same as that of environmental disclosure (0.016). It can be interpreted that investors value environmental disclosure as high as ESG in aggregate level. On the other hand, the coefficient of ESG in return model (0.024) is the highest among its singular components. Social disclosure has the lowest coefficients both in price model (0.010) and return model (0.015). Investors consider ESG in aggregate as the most value relevant. As Baboukardos [15] stated that information with comprehensive disclosure can assist investors in evaluating firm performance better than standalone disclosure. The overall coefficients in return model are higher than those of price model. However, return model has lower explanatory power (R²) meaning that the value relevance of return model is lower than that of price model. Comparing the explanatory power of price model and return model, the empirical test shows that price model (model 1 to 4) has a higher explanatory power than return model (model 5 to 8). The explanatory power of price model is around 20% to 22%, while return model is around 3% to 4%. The wide explanatory power gap between price model and return model supports Kothari and Zimmerman’s [33] argument. Return model has a lower level of R squared than price model.

Our empirical result provides a strong support for hypothesis 1 (0.016, p<0.05). We have found a positive and significant effect of environmental disclosure on share price. The result indicates that environmental information has value relevance.
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according to price model. As stated by Lang and Lundholm [61] and Cormier and Magnan [22], disclosure of quality environmental information can decrease the level of cost of capital. Environmental disclosure matters to investors in assessing firms’ risks [36]. Environmental disclosure acts as a positive signal to investors and helps investors predict future companies’ performances. The response of investors to the issuance of environmental information is reflected on market values. Hypothesis 2 is strongly supported by the result of empirical test (0.010, p<0.05). We have proven that social disclosure is positively associated with share price and considered as value relevant information. Disclosure of social information such as wage and salary policies, employee welfare and work safety procedures can help companies get quality employees [38], which in turn can increase employees’ loyalty and productivity [25]. According to Qi et al. [25] employees’ productivity can reduce conflicts within companies while simultaneously becoming an implicit cost that can reduce the cost of capital. Disclosure of social information is a form of corporate commitment to social responsibility to all stakeholders. Companies are committed to protecting the interests of its stakeholders, especially those of the shareholders. Social disclosure can enhance the level of confidence of prospective investors about the companies’ sustainability performances in the future. Social disclosure sends a positive signal for investors’ expectations of future performance. Investors also have the expectation that the companies will be able to create long-term values for them. Thus, disclosure of quality social information can be directly responded by investors through the companies’ stock prices.

Hypothesis 3 cannot be supported by the empirical test (p=0.05). Governance disclosure has no effect on share price. The absence of influence of governance information on stock prices does not mean to indicate that governance information has no value relevance. According to Ball and Brown [62], the absence of investors’ reaction to disclosure of accounting information is not due to the ineffective. Governance disclosure can help investors evaluate the companies’ performance to assess the quality of their management [64]. High ESG performance is also related to fulfilling the rights of stakeholders in a wider scope and not only limited to shareholders. By fulfilling the rights of stakeholders, the companies are able to maintain its sustainability. Corporate sustainability is an important aspect in creating long-term values for shareholders. Investors are willing to pay a premium price for companies that have higher ESG performances compared to those with lower performances [64]. Thus, the disclosure of ESG information has a positive impact on companies’ stock returns.

A number of control variables is significant at the level of 5% significance. However, they are not identical for the eight models. Book value per share and earning per share are significant in overall price models (model 1 to 4), while company size is significant only in model 2 and 4. Changes in earning per share are significant in overall return models (model 5 to 8), while earning per price deflated by share price and company size has no significance in overall return models.

Sensitivity Analysis
We employ an additional analysis to obtain evidence on whether price model and return model explain the value relevance of ESG disclosure differently. To examine that, we employ a sign test. The result of the sign test is provided in table 3.

Table 3. Sign Test of Price Model and Return Model

| Frequencies | N | Negative Differencesa | Positive Differencesb | Tiesc |
|-------------|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|------|
|             |   |                       |                       | 0    |
|             |   | 0                     | 4                     | 0    |

Journal of critical reviews 55
The empirical test shows that all of the coefficients of return model are higher than those of price model. However, both models are not different statistically in providing a measurement of the value relevance (p<0.05). Kothari and Zimmerman [33] argued that the low explanatory power of return model led scholars to derive incorrect conclusions. It can be caused by noises in earning or reflection of investors’ irrationality[33].

Consistent results of the value relevance of ESG disclosure show that both models can explain the value relevance in a similar way. Environmental, social and ESG disclosure have value relevance in both price model and return model, while governance disclosure has no value relevance in both models. The use of both models in value relevance studies is fully recommended in order to get a more convincing evidence.

CONCLUSION

Confirming the content of information on sustainability report is an important aspect for sustainability practitioners. A significant relationship between accounting numbers and share price or stock return indicates information content. We investigate whether ESG disclosure is considered as value-relevant. By using two models, we are capable of obtaining better evidence on the value relevance of ESG disclosure. Overall, our empirical test leads us to infer that environmental, social and ESG information has been reacted positively by investors in both price model and return model. Governance information is not reacted by investors in both price model and return model. The absence of reaction of investors on governance disclosure does not mean that it has no value relevance. Governance disclosure has been anticipated by investors, hence there was no more reaction in the issuance of ESG information. ESG information has the highest coefficient among its singular components, proving that investors focus more on aggregate ESG information. Among environmental and social information, investors pay higher attention to environmental information. Thus, environmental information has a more valuable impact for investors among the three types of ESG information. Sensitivity analysis is applied to examine whether the value relevance in both models is different. The result suggests that there is no difference on the measurement of the value relevance in both models. The price and the return regression indicate a consistent result in explaining the value relevance of ESG disclosure.

Our study has several limitations. First, disclosure of voluntary information such as ESG can be influenced by company size [25]. Large-scale companies have greater resources to make disclosures that are better in quality and quantity than small-scale companies. This study only uses firm size as a control variable, but does not see the impact of each size on the value relevance. The limitations of the sample are the reason for not analyzing the impact of company size. Second, ESG measurement used in this study is the Bloomberg score. Bloomberg uses a scoring method that might be different from other database providers. Using ESG data from other providers with different valuation methods might produce stronger evidence related to the relevance of ESG value. We leave it to forthcoming studies to further validate such measures and the related association with voluntary sustainability disclosures. Finally, our empirical evidence supports the process of developing sustainability reporting regulation in Indonesia regarding the value relevance of non-financial information. This study also offers an implication for capital market practitioners to integrate ESG information into investment valuation models.
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