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ABSTRACT

This study aims to examine the disclosure of corporate social responsibility in manufacturing companies in Indonesia as influenced by the diversity of the company’s board of directors and board of commissioners. A total of 142 manufacturing companies listed on theIDX from 2017-2021 became the population of this study. Purposive sampling was used in sample selection, resulting in a research sample of 42 companies. During the 5 (five) years of observation, 210 observations were obtained. The results showed that gender diversity characterized by the presence of women on the company’s board had a negative effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure, age diversity characterized by the presence of a young board on the company’s board had no effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure, and the diversity of the company’s board education background with management and business education had a positive effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure.
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INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is one of the countries with the maximum implementation of corporate social responsibility (Djufri, Wilestari & Molina, 2022). This happens because companies lack awareness of their social obligations. The negative impact of the company's lack of awareness regarding corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure has been felt, especially in terms of damage caused to the environment and nature around the company. Operational activities carried out by companies can cause various environmental damage, such as air pollution, noise pollution, as well as ecosystem and environmental pollution (Nanda & Rismayani, 2019).

In 2017 there was a case of environmental pollution in which PT Unilever was accused of polluting the environment because it did not have adequate waste disposal facilities. The company disposes of the remaining production waste. In the same year, cases of environmental pollution also occurred caused by PT Mayora. Waste from PT Mayora's Tapioca factory produces waste that pollutes irrigation water channels. According to a resident, the irrigation water has become unpleasant, slimy, and brownish due to factory waste. Based on the environmental issue phenomenon mentioned previously, it can be concluded that companies have not fully complied with regulations regarding CSR.

CSR is a form of company accountability for its commercial operations in the form of social and environmental activities (Hartono, 2018). In Indonesia, the implementation of CSR is specifically regulated in several laws, including the provisions of Article 74 of Law No. 40 of 2007 concerning Limited Liability Companies and Government Regulation Number 47 of 2012 concerning the Social and Environmental Responsibility of Limited Liability Companies. This legislation is intended to provide benefits to companies and society by improving the environment and quality of life around which the company operates.

The company's reputation or image will be good in the view of stakeholders if corporate social responsibility is implemented well. According to stakeholder theory, firms have to responsibility to stakeholders because the company's sustainability depends on how satisfied its stakeholders are (Misutari & Ariyanto, 2021). A business can continue to operate if stakeholders support it. Therefore, the company's operations must consider the consent of all parties that it affects and that are impacted by its existence (Damayanti & Hardiningsih, 2021). One strategy for building relationships with stakeholders is to disclose CSR.

Companies that do social activities related to CSR disclosure
must have solid corporate governance. Corporate governance includes diversity on a company's board of directors and commissioners. Diversity is a general word for individual differences in social, cultural, physical, and environmental factors that influence how people think and behave. The diversity of the board of directors is considered to increase the influence of corporate social responsibility disclosures because it will enrich discussions with people from different backgrounds (Naveed et al., 2021). In line with the upper echelon theory proposed by Hambrick & Mason (1982), it states that the choice of organizational strategy is determined by people who have a large role in the organization, namely managers or leaders.

Mixed findings emerge from research on board diversity and CSR disclosure. Research has shown that gender-based board diversity significantly increases CSR disclosure (Hadya & Susanto, 2018; Khan et al., 2019; Yaseen et al., 2019). Contrary to what was found by Ahmad et al. (2018) and Matitaputty & Davianti (2020) a limited percentage of female directors has no meaningful impact on CSR disclosure. Research on age diversity has produced a variety of findings. Research findings by Katmon et al. (2019) and Khan et al. (2019) indicate that board age diversity does not have as much influence as other aspects. However, research by Beji et al. (2021) and Ibrahim & Hanefah (2016) shows that a company's CSR disclosure is influenced by the age of directors.

Research on the influence of directors' educational background on CSR disclosure has also produced conflicting findings. Education and CSR disclosure are interrelated (Rahindayati et al., 2015). This opinion is confirmed by Azam et al. (2019) and Hadya & Susanto (2018). Additional research findings show that the board of directors' educational background has no impact on the company's CSR disclosure (Ahmad et al., 2018; Khan et al., 2019).

Due to various variations among previous research findings, researchers are motivated to conduct research on corporate board diversity on CSR disclosure. This research tries to identify the diversity (gender diversity, educational diversity, and age diversity) of company boards of directors and commissioners regarding CSR disclosure in Indonesian manufacturing companies.

This research population consists of 142 manufacturing companies registered on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) between 2017 and 2021. Manufacturing companies were chosen as research subjects because these companies are categorized as high-profile companies and always
have direct contact with nature or the surrounding environment in carrying out their operations (Burgwal & Vieira, 2014). Companies that fall into the high-profile company category have criteria such as having a large workforce and the production process that is carried out produces residue, for example, waste and pollution (Aulia & Hadinata, 2019).

Based on the context that was explained, this research entitled "The Effect of Board Diversity on Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure in Indonesian Manufacturing Companies. This research aims to examine the effect of gender, age, and educational diversity of the board on corporate social responsibility disclosure in Indonesian companies.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses quantitative methodologies. The variables investigated in this research are gender diversity, age, and board educational background on CSR disclosure. This research make use of secondary data in the form of corporate annual reports gathered from the Indonesia Stock Exchange (www.idx.co.id) and the official websites of each company.

The manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) between 2017 and 2021 constitute the population of this research. The manufacturing industry was chosen as a research subject because this industry is involved in activities that directly impact the environment, so it is closely related to CSR and concern for the environment. A total of 142 companies are part of the total population of this study.

The sample selection used a purposive sampling technique, namely by using special criteria so that it was suitable to be used as a sample because not all samples met the research criteria. The criteria used in sampling this research are:

2. Manufacturing companies that publish annual reports through the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) or the company's official website from 2017 to 2021 respectively.
3. Manufacturing companies that provide data and information according to the variable components required in the research.

Of the 142 manufacturing companies, only 42 companies were sampled using purposive sampling techniques. This is because as many as 100 companies did not meet the requirements set for estimating the sample size in this study. Thus, 210 observations were obtained that met the criteria for 5 (five) years of observation time. The sample
selection is presented in the following table:

Table 1. Sample Selection Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Sample Selection Criteria</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Manufacturing companies listed on the Indonesian Stock Exchange (BEI) from 2017 to 2021</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Manufacturing companies that did not publish annual reports through the Indonesia Stock Exchange (IDX) or through the company’s official website in 2017-2021 respectively.</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Manufacturing companies that do not provide data or information in accordance with the variable criteria required in the 2017-2021 research.</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Samples</th>
<th>42</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observation Year</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2017-2021)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Data processed, 2023

Diversity describes variations in personality traits between men and women (Katmon et al., 2019). Gender diversity is determined by calculating the number of female board members in a corporation divided by the percentage of directors and commissioners (Wulan et al., 2022). The formula for calculating gender diversity is as follows:

\[ \text{GEND} = \frac{\text{Number of female on board}}{\text{Number of Board Directors and Commissioner}} \]

A diverse board can provide beliefs and viewpoints that are diverse, distinctive, and based on experience (Khan et al., 2019). Age diversity is measured by calculating the number of board members under 40 years old divided by the percentage of directors and commissioners (Wulan et al., 2022). The formula for calculating age diversity is as follows:

\[ \text{AGE} = \frac{\text{Number of Board with age< 40 years}}{\text{Number of Board Directors and Commissioner}} \]

Diversity in educational background shows that there are individual differences in terms of attitudes, intelligence, and cognitive bases that can influence future decision-making (Azam et al., 2019).

Background diversity is measured by calculating the number of board members with management and business education divided by the total company board of directors and commissioners (Hadya & Susanto, 2018). The formula for calculating diversity of educational background is as follows:

\[ \text{EDU} = \frac{\text{Number of board with business and management education}}{\text{Number of Board Directors and Commissioner}} \]

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) is an aspect of corporate responsibility for its economic activities in the form of social and environmental activities (Hartono, 2018). In this research, CSR disclosure (CSRD) is measured using an index based on the Global
Reporting Initiatives (GRI) G4 indicator which includes 91 disclosure elements.

The measurement of CSR disclosure is conducted in the following manner: each social responsibility item in the company's annual report is assigned a value of 1 (one) if it is reported, and a value of 0 (zero) if it is not published. The total for each company is then calculated by adding the values of each item (Misutari & Ariyanto, 2021). The formula for CSR disclosure is as follows:

\[ \text{CSR}_{ij} = \frac{\sum x_{ij}}{N_j} \]

Information:
- \( \text{CSR}_{ij} \): CSR disclosure index
- \( \sum x_{ij} \): 1 = if the item is disclosed; 0 = if the item is not disclosed
- \( N_j \): The number of CSR disclosure items is 91 items

The research used multiple linear regression analysis (Multiple Regression Analysis) utilizing IBM SPSS Statistics 26 software. The multiple linear regression model in this research is as follows:

\[ \text{CSR Disclosure} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{GEND} + \beta_2 \text{AGE} + \beta_3 \text{EDU} + e \]

Information:
- \( \alpha \): Constant
- \( \beta \): Regression Coefficient
- \( \text{CSR Disclosure} \): CSR Disclosure
- \( \text{GEND} \): Gender Diversity
- \( \text{AGE} \): Age Diversity
- \( \text{EDU} \): Educational Diversity
- \( e \): Error coefficient

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

Descriptive statistics presents data in a clearer and more concise format. The output of descriptive statistical analysis used in this research includes the mean value, minimum value, and standard deviation for each variable examined. The result of descriptive statistics is presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Results of Descriptive Statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEND</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: CSR = Corporate social responsibility disclosure; GEND = Gender diversity; AGE = Age Diversity; EDU = Educational background diversity

Source: Data processed (2023)

Table 2 presents the results of descriptive statistical analysis. The results of the analysis above show that the number of data (N) for each valid variable is 210. The dependent variable, CSR disclosure measured using the CSR disclosure index, has a minimum value of 0.09 and a maximum value of 0.86. The average value (mean) is 0.474 and the standard deviation is 0.170. This output means that in the 210 observation data, the lowest value for CSR disclosure is 0.09 which is owned by PT Argo Pantes Tbk. (ARGO) for 2019 data and the highest value for CSR disclosure is 0.86 owned by PT Indofarma (Persero) Tbk. (INAF) for 2019 data. The average value (mean) is...
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higher than the standard deviation value \(0.474 > 0.170\), so the distribution of the CSR disclosure variable in manufacturing sector companies is classified as good.

Gender diversity (GEND) as an independent variable is measured by calculating the number of female board of directors and commissioners in a corporation by the total number of the company's board. It has a minimum value of 0.00, a maximum value of 0.44, an average value (mean) of 0.1085, and a standard deviation of 0.10748. This output means that in the 210 observation data, the lowest value for gender diversity (GEND) is 0.00 which is owned by 24 companies, one of which is PT Indocement Tunggal Prakarsa Tbk. (INTP) for data from 2017 to 2021. This happens because there are still many companies whose boards of directors and commissioners are dominated by men.

The highest score for gender diversity (GEND) is 0.44 owned by PT Unilever Indonesia Tbk. (UNVR) for data for 2020 and 2021. The average value (mean) is higher than the standard deviation value \(0.1085 > 0.10748\), so the distribution of the gender diversity variable (GEND) in manufacturing sector companies is classified as good.

Age diversity (AGE) as an independent variable is measured by calculating the number of female board of directors and commissioners in a company divided by the total number of the company's board. It has a minimum value of 0.00, and a maximum value of 0.55, with an average value (mean) of 0.124 and a standard deviation of 0.143. This output means that in the 210 observation data, the lowest value for age diversity (AGE) is 0.00 which is owned by 26 companies, one of which is PT FKS Food Sejahtera Tbk. (AISA) for data from 2017 to 2021. This happens because there are still many companies whose boards of directors and commissioners are dominated by older board members.

The highest value for age diversity (AGE) is 0.55 owned by PT Kino Indonesia Tbk. (KINO) for 2018 data. The average value (mean) is lower than the standard deviation value \(0.1242 < 0.14357\), so the distribution of the age diversity variable (AGE) in manufacturing sector companies is classified as not good.

Educational background diversity (EDU) as an independent variable is measured by calculating the number of board of directors and commissioners with educational backgrounds in management and business divided by the total number of company boards having a minimum value of 0.11, a maximum value of 0.83, with an average value is 0.489 and the standard deviation is 0.149. This output means that in the 210 observation data, the lowest value
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for educational background diversity (EDU) is 0.11 which is owned by PT. Toba Pulp Lestari Tbk. (INRU) for data from 2019 to 2021 and the highest value for educational background diversity (EDU) is 0.83 owned by PT Argo Pantes Tbk. (ARGO) for data for 2020 and 2021. The average value is higher than the standard deviation value (0.489 > 0.14998), so the distribution of the educational background diversity (EDU) variable in manufacturing sector companies is classified as good.

The normality test, multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test, and autocorrelation test are the classic assumption tests used in this research. The classical assumption test results are displayed in the Table 3 below:

**Table 3. Classic Assumption Test Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th>Glej. Test</th>
<th>DW Test</th>
<th>KS Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tol.</td>
<td>VIF</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEND</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>1.024</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>1.032</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>0.992</td>
<td>1.050</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW Test</td>
<td>2.069</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: CSR = Corporate social responsibility disclosure; GEND = Gender diversity; AGE = Age Diversity; EDU = Educational background diversity

Source: Processed data (2023)

The test of normality examines if the residuals are normally distributed. A regression model that has a normal distribution of residual is considered good. The One-Sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test is used in this study to determine the regression model’s normality. The condition for normal residual distribution in this test is if the value of Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) above 0.05 and vice versa.

Based on the results of the research on the value of Asymp.Sig. (2-tailed) in Table 3 above is 0.060 > 0.05. This means that the residual is distributed normally. So the regression model of this research can be said to be good and can continue to the next classical assumption test.

The multicollinearity seeks to determine whether the regression model is viable or not by examining whether or not there is a relationship between independent variables. A regression model is considered feasible if it does not contain multicollinearity. The tolerance and VIF values can be used to determine whether or not there is multicollinearity. If the tolerance value is greater than 0.100 and the VIF is less than 10.000, it is possible to conclude that there are no symptoms of multicollinearity and vice versa.

Based on Table 3 on the collinearity statistics, it is known that all the variables have a tolerance value (Tol.) > 0.1 and VIF value < 10. It shows that the variables in the regression model, namely gender diversity, age diversity, and diversity of educational backgrounds of directors and commissioners of the
company, do not have a multicollinearity relationship. Thus, this study’s regression model can be regarded to be viable and can continue to the other classical assumption tests.

The heteroscedasticity test is a test that determines whether the variance of the residuals is not the same across all observations in the regression model. The *Glejser* test was chosen for the heteroscedasticity test in this study. Research has no signs of heteroscedasticity if the significance results show more than 0.05, and vice versa.

The *Glejser* test (Glej.) in Table 3 shows that the sig. value for gender diversity (GEND), age diversity (AGE), and educational background diversity (EDU) are 0.096, 0.126, and 0.622 respectively. This indicates that each variable has a significance value > 0.05. As a result, the heteroscedasticity test via the Glejser test is met, implying that there is no evidence of heteroscedasticity in the research’s regression.

The autocorrelation test determines whether or not there is a connection between independent and dependent variables in the regression model. If there is no autocorrelation between the independent and dependent variables, the regression model is considered viable. In testing the autocorrelation of the regression model, this study uses Durbin-Watson (DW).

The autocorrelation test (DV) in Table 3 shows the results for the Durbin-Watson (DW) value of 2.069. Where the total number of observations in this study is 210 (N=210) and variables other than the dependent variable are 3 (K=3), so the dU obtained from the DW table is 1,750 (4-dU = 2,250) and dL is 1,711 (4-dL = 2.29). Thus it can be concluded that the dw value of 2.069 is more than dU and less than 4 – dU, namely 1.750 < 2.069 < 2.250 or in other words the regression model is free from autocorrelation.

The test of multiple linear regression continued with the f-test and t-test. The f-test shows the goodness of fit of the regression model meanwhile the t-test shows the effect of each independent variable on the dependent variable. The result of multiple linear regression is presented in Table 4 below.

**Table 4. The Results of Multiple Linear Regression**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t-stat.</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GEND</td>
<td>-2.183</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>-0.719</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDU</td>
<td>3.929</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. R-Square</td>
<td>0.068 (6.8%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f-statistic</td>
<td>6.077 (0.001)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: CSR = Corporate social responsibility disclosure; GEND = Gender diversity; AGE = Age Diversity; EDU = Educational background diversity

Source: Data processed (2023)

*The adjusted R Square* value shown in Table 4 is 0.068. This means
that gender diversity (GEND), age diversity (AGE), and educational background diversity (EDU) of the company's board of directors and commissioners explain 6.8% of the CSR disclosure. Meanwhile, the other 93.2% were influenced by factors outside the scope of this research.

The significance value for the F test shown in Table 4 is 0.001 with the f-statistic of 6.077, which means the significance level is < 0.05. This shows that the regression model in this research is fit and can be used to explain the influence of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

Table 4 shows that gender diversity (GEND) has a sig. value 0.030 < 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that gender diversity has a negative effect on the CSR disclosure variable (H1 is not supported). The sig. value of age diversity (AGE) is 0.473 > 0.05. Thus, it can be concluded that age diversity has no effect on the CSR disclosure (H2 is not supported). Meanwhile, the educational background diversity (EDU) has a sig. value of 0.000 < 0.05. It can be concluded that educational background diversity (EDU) has a positive influence on the CSR disclosure variable (H3 is supported).

**Discussion**

According to the results of testing the first hypothesis, board gender diversity had a negative influence on CSR disclosure in manufacturing companies between 2017 and 2021 (H1 is not supported). This finding is not in line with upper echelon theory which argues that the characteristics of a company's board can influence company decision making. The existence of a female board that has a level of concern for environmental and social issues is not able to encourage companies to build good relationships with interested parties. This finding is also not in line with stakeholder theory.

The unsupported first hypothesis shows that the presence of women on the board of directors and commissioners in the company cannot increase CSR disclosure even though the values and characteristics of female board members are more in line with CSR issues, the presence of women on the company's board is not a key factor in the decisions and policies taken by the company. This is possible because the number of women who hold positions on the board of directors and commissioners in manufacturing companies in Indonesia is still small, as evidenced by the characteristics of the data shown by the results of descriptive statistics where the average value (mean) of gender diversity is 0.1085 which means that the percentage of the female board of directors and commissioners in manufacturing companies in Indonesia is only
around 10.8% and the rest is dominated by men.

Other from the result of descriptive statistical analysis, it was discovered from the result of data tabulation with a total of 210 research observations, indicating that the number of female board of directors and commissioners in this study was only 225 members out of a total of 2127 board of directors and commissioners in manufacturing companies from 2017 to 2021. This proves that the presence of women on the boards of manufacturing companies in Indonesia is still relatively small (minority). This causes the role of women on the board to not have a majority of voting rights in decision-making, especially in matters of CSR disclosure.

The results of this research support Prastiwi & Wiratno (2021) and Pajaria et al. (2016) who found that gender diversity has a negative effect on CSR disclosure. Prastiwi and Wiratno (2021) revealed that women on the board of directors play less of a role in decision-making on CSR activities due to cultural factors in Indonesia, namely the perception that control over decision-making is determined by men.

Pajaria et al. (2016) said that the minority of women in companies resulted in the small influence of female boards of directors and commissioners in determining decisions regarding CSR disclosure. Ahmad et al. (2018) and Matitaputty & Davianti (2020) also have the same research results which is the presence of a female director on CSR disclosure does not have a significant effect. However, this finding contradicts the results of research from Hadya & Susanto (2018), Khan et al. (2019), and Yaseen et al. (2019) that gender-based board diversity significantly increases CSR disclosure.

According to the results of testing the second hypothesis, board age diversity had no effect on CSR disclosure in manufacturing companies between 2017 and 2021 (H2 is not supported). The unsupported second hypothesis shows that the presence of a young board of directors cannot increase CSR disclosure even though it is said that young directors are more innovative and have new ideas that can provide a different perspective to the company. These findings are not in line with upper echelon theory, which argues that the quality of the board of directors influences decision-making due to the presence of age diversity characteristics which can influence the choice to report CSR.

The second hypothesis not being supported could also be possible because most of the manufacturing company board members who serve as board directors and commissioners are
dominated by old board members and the representation of young directors is very limited. This statement is proven by the characteristics of the data shown by the results of descriptive statistics where the average value of age diversity is 0.1242, which means that the percentage of the board of directors and commissioners who are young (less than 40 years old) in manufacturing companies is only around 12% and the rest is dominated by board members who are not young.

This research result supports the previous study (Katmon et al., 2019; Khan et al., 2019). Katmon et al. (2017) explained that younger directors, who have less experience, tend to take more risks in disclosing the company's CSR activities, while senior directors, who have more experience, tend to be more cautious and hesitate to do it. However, according to Beji et al. (2020) and Ibrahim & Hanefah (2016), the age of directors influences the company's CSR disclosure.

This research shows that the diversity of board educational backgrounds has a significant positive influence on CSR disclosure in manufacturing companies between 2017 and 2021. These findings support the third hypothesis in this research (H3 is supported).

This is in line with upper-echelon theory, which argues that the educational background of the board of directors can have an impact on how the organization makes decisions. The business education background has an impact on future decisions to make assessments and policies. Someone with an educational background in business management tends to be risk-averse and will adopt sound business strategies. So it can be said that boards of directors and commissioners who have relevant backgrounds such as management and business are considered to be more competent in making decisions regarding CSR disclosure and disclose more and broader information to show accountability, improve the company's image, and increase management credibility.

Based on previous research by Beji et al. (2020) and Damanik & Dewayanto (2021), the educational background of the board of directors has an influence on corporate social responsibility disclosure. This opinion is confirmed by Azam et al. (2019), Rahindayati et al. (2015), and Hadya & Susanto (2018) who state that educational background significantly influences corporate social responsibility disclosure.

CONCLUSION
This research aims to examine the effect of board diversity (gender, age, and educational background) on the CSR disclosure. Based on the
result of this research, there are some conclusion that can be drawn. First, gender diversity has a negative effect on CSR disclosure in manufacturing companies between 2017 and 2021. Second, age diversity does not affect disclosure in manufacturing companies between 2017 and 2021. Third, educational background diversity has a positive effect on CSR disclosure in manufacturing companies between 2017 and 2021.

This study has several limitations that should be accommodated in future research. First, there is subjectivity in assessing CSR disclosures using GRI-G4. Therefore, it is hoped that further research will carry out or compare the results of CSR disclosures with other researchers to reduce subjectivity regarding CSR disclosures. Second, the adjusted R Square value is 0.068. This means that the three variables used (gender diversity, age diversity, and educational background diversity) only contribute 6.8% to the CSR disclosure variable. Meanwhile, the other 93.2% were influenced by other factors outside the scope of this research. Therefore, further research may add other variables that are thought to influence CSR disclosure.
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