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ABSTRACT

This study aims to determine the effect of ownership structure and ISO 14001 certification on firm value with CSR as a moderating variable. The population of this study includes all mining companies listed on the IDX for the 2019-2021 period. The sampling technique used was purposive sampling. The research population data were 49 companies and a sample of 18 companies was obtained. The analysis technique used is to use Moderated Regression Analysis. The results showed that managerial ownership has no effect on firm value. Institutional ownership affects firm value. ISO 14001 certification affects firm value. CSR cannot moderate the relationship between managerial ownership and firm value. CSR can moderate the relationship between institutional ownership and firm value. CSR cannot moderate the relationship between ISO 14001 certification and firm value.
INTRODUCTION

Disclosure of corporate social responsibility is increasingly expanding in various countries, including Indonesia (Kartini, Maiyarni, and Tiswiyanti, 2019). Corporate practices that are responsible and beneficial to local communities and society at large are at the core of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Disclosure refers to the act of providing important amounts of information necessary for the efficient functioning of capital markets (Putra et al., 2022).

The value of a company serves as a measure to evaluate its standing in the global market, and a higher value indicates increased welfare for its shareholders. An increase in firm value has the potential to attract investors' attention and encourage investment. Maximizing shareholder wealth is another name for maximizing corporate value, a concept that can be seen as optimizing the value of society as a whole (Sudarsono and Harahap, 2022).

The phenomenon that occurs, CNBCIndonesia (2023) weakening global demand has an impact on coal demand. This has an impact on coal prices decreasing. The decline in coal prices also causes the share prices of coal mining companies to fall, potentially having an impact on the overall value of these companies. Therefore, it is very important for an organization to optimize its firm value while achieving its main goals. The concept of enterprise value relates to the monetary value that investors are ready to give to a company. A large share price indicates increasing firm value. The importance of firm value lies in its ability to reflect the performance of a company, which can influence market value.

A number of empirical studies have been conducted to analyze what aspects of firm value are most important. The company ownership structure is one of the factors studied. The two main categories of corporate ownership that have received significant scholarly attention are institutional ownership and managerial ownership. The agency perspective argues that management ownership structures function as a mechanism to mitigate agency conflicts within organizations. The agency perspective argues that the management ownership structure functions as a mechanism for disclosing information within the organization, thereby reducing information asymmetry between internal and external stakeholders (Sudarsono and Harahap, 2022). Research Ridwan and Olimsar (2020) according to the author, there is a favorable correlation between managerial ownership and firm value. Meanwhile, the findings of Pratama et al., (2021) and Tambalean et al., (2018) argue that there is no evidence that managerial ownership increases firm value.

Non-bank financial institutions, legal institutions, foundations, and other foreign institutions that own shares at the end of the year are known as institutional ownership (Rizki et al., 2019). Annual financial report registration shows institutional ownership. Consolidated financial statements show the economics of entities that operate separately but have common control. The ownership structure of an organization shows how the owner seeks to maintain the company (Tiswiyanti, Wiralestari, and Fitriyani, 2012). Research Br Purba and Effendi (2019), and Ridwan and Olimsar (2020) based on the literature, it is
argued that there is a positive correlation between institutional ownership and the value of a company. In the field of scientific research, Arianti and Putra (2018), and Dewi and Abundanti (2019) has conducted research which states that there is no impact of institutional ownership on firm value.

Factors of global environmental degradation in the last few decades, environmental management has become a top priority both nationally and organizationally to achieve sustainability. More and more organizations are starting to employ Environmental Management Systems (EMS) to improve environmental performance and comply with stakeholder pressure. EMS is a systematic process used in organizations to implement environmental policies and goals. This includes changing operating practices, monitoring environmental performance, and related compliance audits (Liu et al., 2020).

The ISO 14001 standard is a globally recognized environmental management system certification, which helps companies identify, prioritize and manage environmental hazards in their daily activities. Organizations that obtain ISO 14001 accreditation are required to demonstrate that companies with ISO 14001 accreditation carry out greater social responsibility actions than non-accredited companies. This shows that organizations that have obtained ISO 14001 certification already have greater social responsibility (Hayati, Cahyaningsih, and Pratama, 2021). Research Hotria and Afriyenti (2018), and Yusuf et al., (2022) concluded that ISO 14001 certification in a company positively influences CSR disclosure. Meanwhile research Dianawati (2018), and Hayati et al., (2021) which concludes that ISO 14001 certification has no influence on Corporate Social Responsibility.

Based on the background above, the aim of this research is to prove empirically that firm value is partially influenced by managerial ownership, institutional ownership, and ISO 14001 certification; and to prove empirically that CSR can moderate the relationship between managerial ownership and firm value; between institutional ownership and firm value; between ISO 14001 certification and firm value.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Agency Theory

The goal of the firm from a financial management perspective is to maximize shareholder wealth. To achieve this goal, the responsibility of managing the firm is usually left to professionals, as capital owners have limitations. These professionals are called managers or agents. Managers are empowered by business owners to manage and make decisions regarding company objectives, one of which is to maximize shareholder wealth (Anggraini, 2019).

Legitimacy Theory

Legitimacy theory is a theory used to explain the disclosure of corporate social and environmental behavior. Organizational legitimacy is sought by companies from society. Legitimacy has advantages in supporting the survival of a company. Legitimacy is seen as equalizing the perception that the actions
taken by an entity are desirable, appropriate, or consistent with a socially developed system of norms, values, beliefs, and definitions. Legitimacy is considered important for companies because it is a strategic factor for the company's future development (Arianti and Putra, 2018).

Ownership Structure

1. Managerial Ownership
   Managerial ownership is a condition in which the manager owns the company's shares or the manager is also a shareholder of the company. Managerial ownership can equalize the interests of the agent and principal so that management is expected to improve its performance (Tambelean, Manossoh, and Runtu, 2018).

2. Institutional Ownership
   Institutional ownership is share ownership by non-banking financial institutions, legal institutions, foundations, foreign institutions, and other institutions at the end of the year. Institutional ownership data can be seen in the notes to the financial statements each year (Artika, 2020).

ISO 14001 Certification
ISO 14001 certification is an international environmental management certification standard, designed to help organizations around the world improve the effectiveness of their environmental management activities. Companies wishing to obtain ISO 14001 certification must be evaluated in the form of an audit to see if the company meets the 14001 standard. In this case, the company must conduct an annual internal audit to ensure compliance with the ISO 14001 standard and renew it every 3 years (Mauliddina, 2018).

Firm Value
Rudangga and Sudiarta (2016) Increasing firm value is an achievement that is in line with the wishes of stakeholders. Firm value is the perception that investors have of a company. Firm value can be said to be a certain condition that has been achieved by the company as an illustration of public trust in the company after going through a process for several periods from the time the company was founded until this condition is achieved (Yuliusman et al., 2022).

Corporate Social Responsibility
Although it has become a global issue, to date there is no single globally accepted definition of CSR. Etymologically, CSR can be interpreted as corporate or corporate social responsibility. CSR can simply be defined as how a company manages its business processes to produce a positive impact on society (Yuliusman and Kusuma, 2020).
RESEARCH MODEL

Figure 1. Research Model

Hypothesis

Hypothesis can be interpreted as a statement that will be researched as a temporary answer to a problem. Based on the existing problems and objectives to be achieved, the hypothesis proposed in this study can be formulated as follows:

H1: Managerial Ownership affects Firm Value.
H2: Institutional Ownership affects Firm Value.
H3: ISO 14001 Certification affects Firm Value.
H4: CSR can moderate the relationship between Managerial Ownership and Firm Value.
H5: CSR can moderate the relationship between Institutional Ownership and Firm Value.
H6: CSR can moderate the relationship between ISO 14001 Certification and Firm Value.

METHODOLOGY

This research is quantitative descriptive research. The population in the study were all mining companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange for the 2019-2021 period which amounted to 49 companies. Sampling using purposive sampling and obtained 18 companies so that the total sample was 54. The data analysis tool method uses SPSS 25.

RESULTS

Descriptive Analysis

Table 1. Descriptive Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>36.0049</td>
<td>4.446585</td>
<td>9.7730486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>11.0580</td>
<td>97.7303</td>
<td>61.693758</td>
<td>23.2598036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 14001</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.277778</td>
<td>.4521090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PBV</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.2651</td>
<td>6.7224</td>
<td>1.508957</td>
<td>1.3441699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.0382</td>
<td>.7643</td>
<td>.474639</td>
<td>.0996168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Valid N (listwise) 54

Source: Results of data processing with SPSS

a. Independent Variable

The statistical analysis presented in table 1 shows that the independent variable (X) in this study was assessed using Managerial Ownership,
Institutional Ownership, and ISO 14001 Certification, with a sample size (N) of 54. Disclosure of managerial ownership ranges from a minimum value of 0.0000 to a high value of 36.0049. The average (mean) value of managerial ownership is 4.446585 with a standard deviation of 9.7730486. The smallest value of institutional ownership is 11.0580, while the maximum value is 97.7303. The average value of institutional ownership is 61.693758 with a standard deviation of 23.2598036. ISO 14001 certification shows a range between 0.0000 to 1.0000, with a mean value of 0.277778 and a standard deviation of 0.4521090.

b. Dependent Variable

Statistical analysis in table 1 shows that the dependent variable (Y) in this study was assessed using the PBV ratio calculation method to estimate firm value. The sample size (N) of this study was 54, with the smallest value recorded at 0.0000 and the maximum value observed at 6.7224. The calculated mean PBV value is 1.508957, with a standard deviation of 1.3441699.

c. Moderating Variables

The statistical analysis presented in table 1 shows that the moderating variable (Z) in this study was assessed using Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a measuring tool. The sample size (N) consists of 54 observations, with the lowest value recorded being 0.0382 and the highest value achieved being 0.7643. The calculated average (mean) value is 0.474639, while the calculated standard deviation is 0.0996168.

Classic Assumption Test

The findings of this research include conventional assumption tests including normality tests, multicollinearity tests, heteroscedasticity and autocorrelation as presented in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classic Assumption Test</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Normality</td>
<td>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</td>
<td>0.414</td>
<td>Sig&gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Normally distributed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multicollinearity</td>
<td>VIF and Tolerance Managerial Ownership (KM) Institutional Ownership (KI) ISO 14001 Firm value (PBV)</td>
<td>2.821 and 0.355 2.604 and 0.384 1.831 and 0.546 1.388 and 0.720</td>
<td>VIF &lt; 10 Tolerance&gt; 0.10</td>
<td>Multicollinearity does not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heteroscedasticity</td>
<td>Glejser test Managerial Ownership (KM) Institutional Ownership (KI) ISO 14001 Firm value (PBV)</td>
<td>0.616 0.096 0.073 0.912</td>
<td>Sig&gt; 0.05</td>
<td>Heteroscedasticity does not occur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocorrelation</td>
<td>Durbin Watson</td>
<td>2.019</td>
<td>dU&lt;DW&lt;(4-dU)</td>
<td>No Autocorrelation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Results of data processing with SPSS
The normality test is carried out to assess the normal distribution of the regression model and other variables used in the research. The table above shows that the data used in this research is normally distributed, judging from the normality test, the significance level (Sig) is 0.414.

To determine whether or not a set of research variables exists in a regression model, a multicollinearity test can be carried out. If the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) is less than 10 and the tolerance value is greater than 0.10, then the variable is free from multicollinearity. Based on the table provided, the findings show that the data above does not show evidence of multicollinearity.

The heteroscedasticity test is carried out to assess the presence of heteroscedasticity in the residuals of the regression model which indicates potential differences in variance between observations. A variable is declared free from heteroscedasticity if the value of \( t_{\text{count}} < t_{\text{table}} \). Based on the table above, the results show that the data is free from heteroscedasticity.

The autocorrelation test is carried out in a linear regression model to find out whether there is a relationship between the residual in period t and the error in period t-1. Data does not show autocorrelation if the Durbin-Watson statistic is in the range \( d_U < DW < (4-d_U) \). Based on the available table, the findings obtained indicate that the data has been successfully freed from autocorrelation. This conclusion is drawn from the Durbin-Watson statistical value of 2.019 which exceeds the upper limit (\( d_U \)) and is in the range of 1.7234 and 2.2766 (1.7234 < 2.019 < 2.2766).

### Hypothesis test

**Moderate Regression Test (Moderate Regression Analysis-MRA)**

Table 3. MRA Regression Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2,657</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>-.654</td>
<td>6,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.675</td>
<td>-1,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-3,862</td>
<td>-3,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 14001</td>
<td>-1,900</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>-6,39</td>
<td>-2,035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1Z</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>1,159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2Z</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>2,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3Z</td>
<td>2,383</td>
<td>1,706</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>1,397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: PBV  
Source: Results of data processing with SPSS

The regression equation obtained from the test results above is:

\[
Y = a_1 + b_1X_1 + b_2X_2 + b_3X_3 + b_4X_1Z + b_5X_2 + b_6X_3 + e
\]

or

\[
\text{Firm Value} = 2.657 - 0.093 \times X_1 - 0.031 \times X_2 - 1.900
\]

or

\[
\text{Firm Value} = 2.657 - 0.093 \times (\text{KM}) - 0.031 \times (\text{KI}) - 1.900 \times (\text{ISO14001}) + 0.223 \times (\text{KM and CSR interaction}) + 0.030 \times (\text{KI and CSR interaction}) + 2.383 \times (\text{ISO 14001 and CSR interaction}) + e
\]

Information:

1. A fixed value of 2.657 indicates that the variables included in this research are proportionally distributed in managerial ownership (KM), institutional...
ownership (KI), ISO 14001 certification, interaction of KM and CSR (X1Z),
interaction of KI and CSR (X2Z), and interaction of ISO 14001 and CSR
(X3Z). If the constant considered is 0, then the firm value of the sample
company is 2.657.

2. Regression analysis produces a coefficient value of -0.093 for the
management ownership variable. These findings indicate that an increase
in managerial ownership by one scale or one unit is associated with a loss
of firm value of 0.093, while all other independent factors are held
constant.

3. Regression analysis produces a coefficient value of -0.031 for the
institutional ownership variable. These results can be interpreted as
meaning that if institutional ownership increases by one scale or one unit,
the firm value will decrease by 0.031 assuming that all other independent
variables are constant.

4. The coefficient value of the ISO 14001 certification variable based on the
results of the regression analysis produced is -1.900. These results can be
interpreted as meaning that if ISO 14001 certification increases by one
scale or one unit, the firm value will decrease by 1,900 assuming that all
other independent variables are constant.

5. The coefficient value of the interaction variable between managerial
ownership and CSR based on the results of the regression analysis
produced is 0.223. These results can be interpreted as meaning that if the
interaction between managerial ownership and CSR increases by one scale
or one unit, then the firm value will increase by 0.223 assuming that all
other independent variables are constant.

6. The coefficient value of the interaction variable between institutional
ownership and CSR in the regression analysis produces a value of 0.030.
These results can be interpreted as meaning that if the interaction of
institutional ownership and CSR increases by one scale or one unit, then
the firm value will increase by 0.030 assuming that all other independent
variables are constant.

7. The coefficient value of the interaction variable ISO 14001 certification and
CSR based on the results of the regression analysis produced is 2.383.
These results can be interpreted as meaning that if the interaction between
ISO 14001 certification and CSR increases by one scale or one unit, then the
firm value will increase by 2.383 assuming that all other independent
variables are constant.
Partial Significant Test (t Test)

Table 4. Statistical Test Results t Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.657</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>6.542</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>-.675</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KI</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>-.531</td>
<td>-.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISO 14001</td>
<td>-1.900</td>
<td>.934</td>
<td>-.639</td>
<td>-.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X1Z</td>
<td>.223</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.762</td>
<td>1.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X2Z</td>
<td>.030</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.275</td>
<td>2.144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X3Z</td>
<td>2.383</td>
<td>1.706</td>
<td>.457</td>
<td>1.397</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: PBV

Based on the results of the t test, it can be concluded that:

1. The managerial ownership variable (X1) shows a negative $t_{count}$ of -1.024 and is statistically significant. The value of 0.307 exceeds the predetermined significance level of 0.05 (5%). These findings indicate that the relationship between managerial ownership and firm value does not have empirical evidence to support a positive and statistically significant impact. Therefore, the initial hypothesis (H1) which states that management ownership has an impact on firm value is refuted.

2. The institutional ownership variable (X2) has a negative $t_{count}$ of -3.862 and has a Sig level of 0.000 is smaller than the significance level of 0.05 (5%). This shows that research has shown that the institutional ownership variable has a big impact on company valuation which can be formulated as follows: which states that institutional ownership has an effect on the company's accepted value.

3. The ISO 14001 certification variable (X3) has a negative $t_{count}$ of -2.035 and has a Sig level of 0.046 is smaller than the significance level of 0.05 (5%). This shows that ISO 14001 certification has proven to have a significant effect on firm value. Thus, the third hypothesis (H3) which states that ISO 14001 certification has an effect on firm value is accepted.

4. The interaction variable KM and CSR (X1Z), which is the interaction between KM and CSR, has a positive $t_{count}$ of 1.159 and has a Sig level of 0.248 which is greater than the significance level of 0.05 (5%). This shows that the interaction variable KM and CSR (X1Z) is proven to have no effect on firm value. Based on the KM t test (X1) and the interaction of KM and CSR (X1Z), it can be concluded that the CSR variable cannot moderate the relationship between managerial ownership variables and firm value. Thus, the fourth hypothesis (H4) which states that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) can moderate the relationship between managerial ownership and firm value is rejected.

5. The interaction variable between KI and CSR (X2Z), which is the interaction between KI and CSR, has a positive $t_{count}$ of 2.144 and has a Sig level of 0.033, which is smaller than the significance level of 0.05 (5%). This shows that the empirical analysis shows a statistically significant relationship between the interaction term KI and CSR (X2Z) and its impact
on firm value. Based on the \( KI \) t test (X2) and the interaction between \( KI \) and CSR (X2Z), it can be concluded that the CSR variable can moderate the relationship between institutional ownership variables and firm value. Thus, the fifth hypothesis (H5) which states that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) can moderate the relationship between institutional ownership and firm value is accepted.

6. The interaction variable \( KI \) and CSR (X3Z), which is the interaction between ISO 14001 and CSR, has a positive t count of 1.397 and has a Sig level of 0.164 which is greater than the significance level of 0.05 (5%). This shows that the interaction variable ISO 14001 and CSR (X3Z) is proven to have no impact on the assessment of a corporation. Based on statistical analysis carried out using the ISO 14001 t test (X3) and testing the interaction between ISO 14001 and CSR (X3Z), it can be concluded that the corporate social responsibility (CSR) variable does not have the ability to moderate the relationship between the ISO 14001 certification variable and firm value. Therefore, the sixth hypothesis (H6) which states that Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) has the potential to mitigate the relationship between ISO 14001 certification and firm value is considered not supported.

### Coefficient of Determination (Adjusted R2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.439a</td>
<td>.193</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>1.2123274</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), ISO 14001*CSR, KI, KM*CSR, KI*CSR, ISO 14001, KM

Source: Results of data processing with SPSS

The Adjusted R-Squared (R2) number is 0.174. This figure means that the influence of the variables managerial ownership (KM), institutional ownership (KI), ISO 14001 certification, interaction of KM and CSR (X1Z), interaction of KI and CSR (X2Z), and interaction of ISO 14001 and CSR (X3Z) on value company simultaneously is 17.4%.

### DISCUSSION

**The Effect of Managerial Ownership on Firm Value**

The findings of this research indicate that there is no significant influence of managerial ownership (KM) on firm value, thus causing the first hypothesis to be rejected. Therefore, the findings of this study contradict the principles of agency theory, which states that managerial ownership variables can effectively mitigate agency conflicts.

The results of this research support previous research conducted by Abdullah, Ali, and Haron (2018), Noviyanti (2020), Nuryono, Wijayanti, and Samroton (2019), Pratama, Mukhzarufda, and Yudi (2021), and Tambalean, Manossoh, and Runtu (2018) this theory states that the correlation between management ownership and the value of a company is weak or does not exist at all. Managers have put their own interests before the interests of the company in the interests of growing firm value due to the lack of management who do not own shares in the company. Managerial ownership has little influence on
firm value because managers do not receive the expected profits as one of the company owners due to their small ownership proportion, and because managers do not improve their performance as expected because of this. Research Aini (2019), Anita and Yulianto (2016), Dewi and Abundanti (2019), Ridwan and Olimsar (2020), Widianingsih (2018), and Yuliusman and Kusuma (2022) among other things, found that managerial ownership has a significant effect on firm value. However, the conclusions of this study contradict these findings.

The Effect of Institutional Ownership on Firm Value

The findings of this research indicate that institutional ownership (KI) has a significant influence on firm value, thus supporting the acceptance of the second hypothesis. Therefore, the findings of this study are in line with and provide support for agency theory, which states that institutional ownership plays an important role in mitigating agency conflicts.

The findings of this research are in line with research conducted by Br Purba and Effendi (2019), Noviyanti (2020), Nuryono, Wijayanti, and Samrotun (2019), and Ridwan and Olimsar (2020) shows that institutional ownership has a significant effect on firm value. In other words, institutional ownership functions as an intermediary responsible for overseeing how management carries out its duties in managing the business. The more institutional ownership, the more efficiently a company uses its assets. As a result, this leads to an increase in the overall value of the organization. Increasing institutional ownership has placed increased emphasis on curbing CEO behavior that deviates from shareholder preferences. The findings of this study contradict research conducted by Aini (2019), Dewi and Abundanti (2019), Ermanda and Puspa (2022), Israel, Mangantar, and Saerang (2018), and Pratama, Mukhzarufda, and Yudi (2021) which states that institutional ownership has no effect on firm value.

The Effect of ISO 14001 Certification on Firm Value

The findings of this research indicate that ISO 14001 certification has a real impact on firm value, thus leading to the acceptance of the third hypothesis. Therefore, the results of this research are in line with and provide support for agency theory, which states that organizations that obtain ISO 14001 certification have an effective environmental management system, which leads to improved corporate environmental performance. In addition, the results of this study are in line with and provide support for legitimacy theory, which states that organizations that demonstrate strong environmental performance tend to disclose their environmental practices because doing so can improve their overall performance.

The findings of this research confirm previous research conducted by Yusuf (2021) which states that obtaining ISO 14001 certification has an influence on company assessment. An environmental management system is needed for companies to maintain the company's sustainability. By adopting the ISO 14001 environmental management mechanism, corporations are
expected to generate greater profits for their owners. Apart from that, the firm value will also increase. The findings of this study contradict research conducted by Aprilasani et al., (2017), Arumsari (2020), Ferrarini (2021), Hasanah et al., (2022), and Mauliddina (2018) which concluded that ISO 14001 certification did not have a significant impact on company performance. In addition, the findings of this study provide a contrasting perspective to research conducted by Nuranisa (2020), which states that ISO 14001 certification does not have any impact on an organization's environmental disclosure practices.

The Effect of Managerial Ownership on Firm Value with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a Moderating Variable

The findings of this research indicate that corporate social responsibility (CSR) does not have the ability to moderate the impact of managerial ownership on firm value. As a result, the fourth hypothesis is not supported. Therefore, the findings of this study show a contradiction with the principles of agency theory, which states that when managerial ownership increases, managers will demonstrate commitment to the long-term value of the organization by expressing corporate social responsibility (CSR) practices. Nevertheless, this research provides evidence that corporate social responsibility (CSR) does not have the capacity to regulate the relationship between managerial ownership and firm value.

The findings of this study also fail to provide support for the legitimacy hypothesis, which states that organizations should demonstrate social responsibility as a means of demonstrating their involvement in social activities for the benefit of local communities. According to the opinion mentioned above, organizations will strive to gain societal legitimacy through involvement in social initiatives in their respective environments. There is hope that increased legitimacy can have a positive impact on an organization's reputation.

The findings of this research are in line with previous research conducted by Br Purba and Effendi (2019), Malino and Wirawati (2017), Rahmatia (2015), and Trisnadewi and Amlayasa (2020) which states that corporate social responsibility (CSR) has no effect on moderating the relationship between managerial ownership and firm value because it is mandatory for the company. The ability of managers who are also shareholders to increase firm value only through disclosure of corporate social responsibility (CSR) is still limited. The findings of this study contradict research conducted by Ratih and Damayanti (2016), Vidarani and Budiasih (2019), and Widianingsih (2018) which states that corporate social responsibility (CSR) can act as a moderating factor in this relationship between management ownership and firm value.

The Effect of Institutional Ownership on Firm Value with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a Moderating Variable

The findings of this research indicate that corporate social responsibility (CSR) has the potential to weaken the impact of institutional ownership on firm value, thus supporting the acceptance of the fifth hypothesis. Therefore, the
findings of this research are in line with and support agency theory, which explains that institutional ownership can reduce agency costs, thereby making better socially responsible decisions and increasing firm value.

The findings of this research are consistent and provide empirical support for legitimacy theory, which states that disclosure of corporate social responsibility (CSR) can function as a means to attract investors, because investors tend to show a preference for environmentally conscious companies. If corporations have a significant level of ownership, they will be more motivated to increase their value. Therefore, CSR disclosure can help moderate the relationship between institutional ownership and firm value.

The findings of this research are in line with previous research conducted by Widianingsih (2018) which stated that corporate social responsibility (CSR) has the potential to change the relationship between institutional ownership and firm value. Strong and comprehensive corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure has the potential to increase shareholder value, while recognizing the interests of other stakeholders. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is seen as a strategic approach used by companies to ensure long-term sustainability and improve operational performance by generating beneficial impacts. In addition, incorporating CSR disclosure information into investment evaluation practices has the potential to increase investor confidence, as seen from the significant increase in share volume. The findings of this study contradict research conducted by Agustina (2021), Fadhillah, Idawati, and Praptiningsih (2021), Jamil, NR, and Afriyenti (2019), Putra and Budiasih (2017) which states that corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities do not have the capacity to moderate the relationship between institutional ownership and firm value.

The Effect of ISO 14001 Certification on Firm Value with Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as a Moderating Variable

The findings of this research indicate that corporate social responsibility (CSR) does not have the ability to mitigate the impact of ISO 14001 certification on firm value. As a result, the sixth hypothesis is not supported. Therefore, the results of this study contradict the principles of agency theory which states that aligning the interests of managers and shareholders will be assisted by increased transparency and disclosure. Disclosure of company environmental information is carried out so that principals can monitor the company's environmental performance and provide trust to agents to avoid agency conflicts.

The results of this research also contradict legitimacy theory which says that organizations will always act in accordance with organizational boundaries and values. This theory also encourages companies to ensure that their actions and performance are acceptable to society.

The findings of this research are in line with previous research conducted by Dianawati (2018), and Hayati, Cahyaningsih, and Pratama (2021) which concluded that ISO 14001 certification does not have a significant impact on corporate social responsibility. The absence of differences in corporate social
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings and analysis presented in this study, several conclusions can be drawn. First, managerial ownership does not have a significant influence on firm value. Second, institutional ownership shows a significant and positive influence on firm value. Third, obtaining ISO 14001 certification has been proven to have a significant positive influence on firm value. Additionally, corporate social responsibility (CSR) was determined not to act as a moderator in the relationship between managerial ownership and firm value. However, CSR moderates the relationship between institutional ownership and firm value. Finally, it was found that CSR does not moderate the relationship between ISO 14001 certification and firm value.

ADVANCED RESEARCH

This research still has limitations, so further research needs to be carried out regarding the topic "Determinants of Firm Value: With Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as Moderation" to improve information for readers.
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