Journal of Accounting and Financial Management E-ISSN 2504-8856 P-ISSN 2695-2211
Vol 9. No. 12 2023 www.iiardjournals.org

Influence of Monitoring Mechanisms on Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure of Listed Consumer Goods Companies in Nigeria

Bamidele M. M (Ph.D.)
Department of Accountancy,
Osun State College of Technology, Esa oke

ADINOGE Zuliat Osinimu
Department of Accountancy,
Federal Polytechnic, Ede, Osun State, Nigeria

DOI: 10.56201/jafm.v9.no12.2023.pg151.166

Abstract

This study investigated the effect of firm monitoring on corporate social responsibility disclosure among listed consumer goods companies in Nigeria. To achieve the above objectives, longitudinal research design was used while purposive sampling technique was used to select sample size of fourteen (14) quoted consumer goods companies out of study's population of 20 quoted firms. Secondary data was extracted from annual reports of sampled 14 firms. The study used panel estimation regression methods to analysed the data.

The results indicated that board size had positive and significant effect on CRSD with (t-stat= -5.1337, p<0.05), implies diverse board with more expertise, qualities and core competence will render adequate monitoring and supervision improve the quality of their corporate social responsibility. Board independence had an inverse and significant effect on CSRD with (t-stat= -2.4532, p<0.05), by implication, more independent board significantly increases the extent of corporate social responsibility disclosure in sample listed firm. This study concluded monitoring mechanisms serve as a veritable mechanism to promote corporate social responsibility disclosure among listed consumer goods firm in Nigeria. This study recommended among others that consumer goods companies should put in place a larger board structure that encompasses people of different backgrounds of skills and experience in order to help the companies move forward during the difficult times

Introduction

Consumer goods companies in Nigeria play a major role in transforming the economy towards sustainable development through massive contribution to production and consumption patterns that meet consumers' satisfaction sustainably. However, the term disclosure encompasses the reporting of information that are of financial and non-financial, that are associated with directors and executives, or those involved management consultations, analyses as well as forward looking information (Ahid et al., 2016). To meet the needs of international stock market and the accounting standards, there is a need for corporations to increase their levels of disclosing information from mandatory level to the voluntary disclosure level to support the

decision making procedures (Al-Janadi et al., 2012;García-et al, 2017).The rapid collapse of economic barriers and the globalization of business leads to uncountable debate on the role of corporate social responsibility in an international and national ground (Ararat et al., 2018). Corporate social responsibility is an indispensable management instrument for the companies to make values and popularity within their customers in their areas of operations (Ali & Isa, 2018). It is documented as an essential theme for international business communities and has even become their tool for determining where to invest as well as an expected actions (García-Sánchez & Martínez- Ferrero, 2017). Corporate social responsibility is not limited to only assistance to the host community of company's operations (Muktar et al. 2016), but a tool for promoting businesses status as well as reducing the company tax (Agyei-Mensah, 2017). The responsiveness of companies towards corporate social responsibility activities has enhanced businesses status and reputations in the communities they are operating, because the benefits of corporate social responsibility activities is not for the community along but companies itself (Jomo et al 2017).

The development of corporate social responsibility expressively, coupled with the notion that companies have responsibilities to the society beyond that of making profit (Gamerschlag et al, 2010). There are lots of challenges facing businesses in Nigeria within today's complex and competitive environment are products of economic and non-economic related forces. Thus, the survival and prosperity within the business environment has not been met with a reputable notch, businesses failed to plan their activities in such a way that strike can venture in terms of a balance bet ween the firm attributes and social aspects to their operations. The consumer goods sector of the Nigerian economy is not an exception as it equally needs to reconcile the conflicting interests of its various stakeholders such as shareholders, government, creditors, and the host communities. In Nigeria corporate social responsibility started late Adegbite et al. (2013) and not all companies are willing to implement corporate social responsibility in their business activity due to their shareholders traditional thinking (Amaeshi et al 2016; Opusunju & Ajayi, 2016) that corporate social responsibility implementation is decreasing their profits (Emmanuel et al, 2018). Despite the clear benefits of benefits that companies might gain from engaging in corporate social responsibility activities or not can be influenced by a lot of firm attributes such as firm performance mechanisms, firm monitoring mechanism and firm structural mechanism

Firm monitoring mechanisms such as board size, board independence and managerial ownership are the attributes that influence structures and processes that firms put in place which are required to strengthen and promote a culture of regulatory compliance (Ja'afar, & Hassan, 2020).Monitoring mechanisms can be seen as a tools employed by firms to effectively reduce the proportion of privileges that management can extract at the detriment of shareholders' value. Emphasis is on providing a sustainable conducive environment for the human and corporate organisation to operate efficiently. Any monitoring mechanisms that are neglected to be functional in corporate social responsibility disclosure of an organization, this may invariable affecting the company's reputation. The harsh economic situation in the country and uncertainty that followed the recent pandemic emphasized the need to regain the confidence of users of financial information. Consequently, firms across the globe need to provide information on social performance. This is in response to the calls for firms to supplement regulatory efforts to lessen information asymmetry between monitoring mechanisms and outside investors by disclosing relevant information in order to improve stakeholders' reporting (Bananuka et al, 2019). Thus, criticism of traditional reporting framework created opportunities for new reporting models and institutional innovations, causing growing numbers of

organizations to disclose information on how their entities interact with local communities, employee and other stakeholders.'(Emeka-Nwokej et al., 2021).

In addition several studies such as (Emeka-Nwokeji et al 2021; Egbunike & Efionayi,2021; Chintrakarn et al., 2021; Marrone, 2020; García-Meca & Martínez-Ferrero, 2020; Ballester et al., 2020; Yahaya & Bilyaminu, 2020; Mohammed, 2018; Ode-Ichakpa et al., 2020) have examined the impact of CSRD on financial and non-financial performance in Nigeria, leading to conflicting findings and conclusions. However, most of the above studies did not pay attention on how monitoring mechanisms influence the corporate social responsibility of listed consumer goods. It is against this background that this study filled the gap by examine the influence of monitoring mechanisms on corporate social responsibility disclosure of listed consumer goods companies in Nigeria. This study also ascertain level at which selected consumer goods firms in Nigeria disclose corporate social responsibility
This study provides an up-to-date analysis of corporate social responsibility disclosures in the annual reports of selected of consumer goods companies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

There are many different concepts and practical methods created under the umbrella of CSR studies. They include corporate social performance, corporate social responsiveness, corporate citizenship, corporate social entrepreneurship and other synonymous terms. CSR could be defined as a conjoint set of obligations, legal and ethical commitments to stakeholders, which stem from the impact that organizations generate through their activities (García, & Rodríguez, 2017). Corporate responsibility refers to as the ethical, economic, environmental and social impacts issues. The aim of each of these concepts is an attempt to broaden the obligation of organisations to include more than financial considerations (Parmar et al., 2010). CSR is a commitment to improve community well-being through discretionary business practices and contributions of corporate resources. In this context, a business goes out of its way voluntarily to provide help in kind or make direct financial contributions to make life better in society (Babura, 2020). CSR is a company organization's ongoing commitment to act ethically and contribute to economic progress while enhancing the quality of life of its employees and their families, as well as the local community and society at large.
CSR is the concept that an enterprise is responsible or accountable for its impact on all relevant shareholders. It is the continuing commitment by business to behave fairly and responsibly and contribute to economic development while improving the quality of life of the workforce and their families, as well as of the local community and society at large
The CSR objective usually conflicts with the profit maximisation purpose of the firm. This conflict is no surprise since part of the ideas that gave birth to CSR stated that managers need to do more than the expected profit maximisation. In other word, corporate social responsibility refers to a company voluntary contribution to sustainable development which goes beyond legal requirements (Barakat et al, 2015).Major corporate ethical disaster impacting on the environment, human resources and the community have heightened the demand for firms to engaged in corporate social responsibility events and corresponding disclosure of this activities . Coffie et al.(2018) defined corporate social responsibility disclosure as the means by which organizations inform and convince the society that they are meeting their social and environmental expectations.
Corporate social responsibility disclosure can be used as a device by companies to communicate accountability, by showing their vision for the future and account for the past

performance. If companies are able to communicate social and environmental works, they can receive advantages attached to a good reputation and build a relationship, based on trust, with the society in which they operate (El-Bassiouny & El- Bassiouny, 2018).

Board Size: Board size is the number of members in a company's board of directors. It refers to the total number of directors (executive and non-executive) sitting on the board. Ntim et al. (2013) opined that the size of a board has a higher propensity of improving the voluntary information including environmental disclosure, agency theorist are of the opinion that a more diverse board would possess more expertise, qualities and core competence needed to ensure adequate monitoring and supervisory of management (Uwigbe et al 2011) . Empirical studies such as (Al Fadli, 2020; Majumder et al., 2017) shows that size of board related with CSR positively. Coffie et al. (2018) observed that the board of directors had a favourable association with CSRD in 33 listed companies in developing countries between 2008 and 2013. Larger boards, therefore, promote the CSRD level.

Board independence : This is a crucial monitoring mechanisms that determines an organization extent of social environmental reporting (Khan et al., 2014). The board usually consists of both dependent directors and independent directors. Independent directors are the minority interest group (shareholders), because they do not engage in the daily activities of the boards, they are mere ally with their executive position (Rouf, 2011), the dependent directors who have a larger involvement with the firm's activities. Sharif and Rashid (2014) asserted that a higher percentage of non-dependent executives' present would create a balance of interest and ensure that company's policies and programs capture the interest of shareholders, stakeholders and the environment at large. Independent boards better represent the concerns of stakeholders and enable firms to meet their social goals. According to several studies such as (Al Fadli, et al, 2020; Muttakin & Subramaniam, 2015) shows that board independence is positively associated with CSRD. Furthermore, Alhassan and Basariah (2016) averred that enlightened independent directors would improve environmental reporting.

Managerial Ownership: Managerial ownership of shares can be seen as a means of reducing conflicts of interest between managers' and shareholders. Ba (2017) opined that mangers might be given equity shares in order to increase their stake in the company which help in reducing conflict of interest between the managers and the stakeholders. The relationship that exists between managerial ownership and CSRD can be found in the work of (Chang & Zhang, 2015). The study argued that mangers are likely to behave in conflicting ways when allowed to have significant numbers of shares in an organisation. On one hand, Chang and Zhang (2015) contended that when management owned significant numbers of shares in an organisation, they are likely to make decisions on corporate matters that will maximize shareholders value.

Firm Age: Firm age is controlling variable and is a concept that is looking at the years of existence of a corporate organization. It is thought that years of operation by a firm has something to do with the degree of its corporate social responsibility and disclosure as well. Obiora et al, (2021) opined that on the bases of age, older companies disclose more social responsibility information than newer companies, therefore. Sequel to this, (Obiora et al, 2021 and Siriwatpatara 2018) found that, firm age has no significant effect on the corporate social responsibility among consumer goods companies in Nigeria.

Theoretical Framework

The stakeholder theory which underpins the study proposes that corporate entities provide a balance between the interests of its diverse stakeholders in order to ensure that each party's interest receives some degree of satisfaction. The stakeholder theory developed from the work of Freeman (1984) which defines a stakeholder as any group, individual or entity that can influence and equally be affected by the achievement of a firm's objectives e.g. investors, employees, the environment, suppliers, the public etc.. The stakeholder theory criticizes the failure of shareholder wealth maximization in benefitting the society and that a broader concern for stakeholders ultimately is in the interest of shareholders. This is buttressed by the works of Mitchell et al. (1997) premised on stakeholder theory, which suggest positive relationships between corporate social responsibility and profitability. Ingley et al. (2010) view the implication of CSR as the proper social, environmental and economic actions that a firm must incorporate to satisfy the concerns of stakeholders and the financial requirements of shareholders. It is expected that high investment in CSR activities improves a firm's competitive advantage and consequently, profitability in addressing interests of various constituents in a rational manner.

Empirical Review

Tiamiyu et al (2021) studied the company attributes and sustainability reporting of quoted manufacturing companies in Nigeria. Authors used panel regression to revealed that board size and board independence have a negative effect on the sustainability reporting of the quoted manufacturing firms in Nigeria, while firm growth has a positive influence on sustainability reporting. The study found no statistical association between firm size and sustainability reporting.

Emeka-Nwokeji et al (2021) studied the monitoring mechanism and social sustainability disclosure practices among firms in Nigeria. Descriptive and inferential statistics were used as tool of analysis. Results of the analysis revealed that the extent of social sustainability disclosure among sampled firms on the average is about 36%. Board shareholding and firm size has a significant positive effect on social sustainability disclosure practice, while board size, board independence, board gender diversity, board meeting and CEO nationality has no significant effect on social sustainability disclosure practice among firms in Nigeria.

Yahaya and Apochi (2021) investigated the effect of board on corporate social responsibility reporting of quoted 47 firms over 7 years in Nigeria (2013-2019). Panel regression method was used to revealed that board size, diligence and independence failed to show significant effects. However, board gender diversity, firm size and leverage show significant effect.

Abubakar and Moses (2020) examined the effect of corporate governance attributes on environment disclosure using data collected from 20 quoted manufacturing companies in Nigeria covering 2012 to 2018. Regression result revealed that board independence has a significant positive effect while diversity in terms of nationality and expertise has no significant effect on environment disclosure of the sampled company.

Kilincarslan et al. (2020) empirically examined the impact of governance structure on environmental disclosure using data of 121 publicly listed firms from 11 Middle East Africa countries from 2010 to 2017. Empirical result shows that that board size and board gender diversity has significant positive impact on environmental disclosure while board independence has significant negative relationship with environmental disclosure.

Rabi (2019) conducted a study on the relationship between board characteristic and environmental disclosure in Jordan using Agency theory to back the study. A sample of 63 listed industrial companies was study and panel data were obtained from their annual report from 2014 to 2017. The regression result revealed that board size significantly and positively affects environmental disclosure. Board independence on the other hand has insignificant effect on the level of environmental disclosure in Jordan.

Ofoegbu et al (2018) examined the influence of board characteristic on environmental disclosure quantity using data collected via annual reports of 213 South Africa and 90 Nigeria environmentally sensitive firms for the year 2015. The study was grounded base on legitimacy and stakeholder theory. The result shows that board size and board independence significantly influence extent of environmental disclosure. However, the study has some deficiencies as cross-sectional data was used and time effect was not considered.

Naseer and Rashid (2018) studied the impact of corporate governance on environment reporting in using content analysis on 50 non-financial firms quoted in Pakistan from 2014 to 2015. Agency and Stakeholder theory was used to underpin the study. Multiple regression analysis result showed that board independence and board size have a significant positive influence on the level of environmental reporting. While female directorship has an insignificant relationship with the level of environmental reporting.

Emmanuel et al (2018) examined the impact of corporate diversity on corporate social environmental disclosure of registered 17 manufacturing firms in Nigeria spanning the period 2012–2016. Findings from the study revealed that board size, foreign directors and gender had a significant positive influence on the extent of corporate social environmental disclosure of the selected firms. On the other hand, the presence of an independent director and non-executive director had an insignificant positive influence on corporate social environmental disclosure

Ali and Isa (2018) examined the impact of board attributes on corporate social responsibility performance of Listed Cement Companies in Nigeria from 2004 to 2014. Generalized Least Square (GLS) regression method was use to found that board attributes have significant impact on corporate social responsibility performance in the listed cement companies in Nigeria. Thus, Board size has significant positive impact and managerial ownership has significant negative impact, and board composition have insignificant positive impact on the corporate social responsibility performance.

Eneh and Amakor (2018) investigated the board structure and corporate social responsibility performance in 45 listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria from 2010 to 2019. The authors found that effect of board structure variables (BDIND, BDS and BGD) on CSR disclosure and hence board size is not significant in the first hurdle in determining CSR disclosure decision of firms in the sample. The results indicating that board independence and board gender diversity is significant in determining the extent of disclosure.

Trireksani and Djajadikerta (2016) empirically examined the relationship between board independence and environment disclosure practice. The study used samples of 38 listed mining companies on Indonesia stock Exchange for the individual year 2012. The regression result revealed that board size has a significant positive effect while board independence and gender diversity have no significant effect on the level of environmental disclosure

Similarly, Fortunella and Hadiprajitno (2015) also found that board independence and board size have a significant positive influence on environmental disclosure in Indonesia. However, board gender has in insignificant influence on environmental disclosure. However, both studies could be improved upon by increasing the number of periods covered.

METHODOLOGY

This study employed longitudinal research design. The population of the study consisted of twenty (20) listed consumer-goods. Purposive sampling method was used to select 20 firms out of fourteen (14) companies. Secondary data were extracted from the published annual financial reports and accounts of the 14 elected consumers–goods firms for the period of 11 years from 2011-2021.Descriptive statistics and panel estimation techniques of multiple regressions as well as relevant diagnostic tests were used in this study.

Summary of Variables

Variables	**Type of Variable**	**Variable Labels**	**Measurement**	**Expected Sign**
Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure	Independent	CSRD	This is measured as the total Corporate Social Responsibility reporting score of firm computed. It is proxy by Corporate Social Responsibility Index	
Board size	Independent	BOS	This is the total number of directors on a board	±
Board independence	Independent	BOI	the percentage of non-executive directors to total number of directors on a board	±
Managerial Ownership	Independent	MOW	Proportion of shares held by the directors and management of firms	±
Firm Age	Control	FAGE	Number. of years since the firm is incorporated	±

Source: Author's Compilation (2023)

Corporate Social Responsibility Measurement

Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure in this study emerged as dependent variable. Well-matched with (Muktar et al, 2016, Kasbun et al, 2019) a scoring system of an item scores '1' if reported and Zero '0' if not reported to analyse corporate social responsibility disclosure among the sampled companies. The methods involved in the scoring system are through categorization of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure into eight items as showed in the table below.

Table1. Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure Index Checklist

items	Social
1	Diversity and equal opportunity
2	Labour and industrial relations
3	Occupational health and safety
4	Training and education
5	Human rights
6	Community involvement
7	Product responsibility
8	Philanthropy

Source: Author's Compilation (2023)

The formula for calculating the un-weighted reporting scores using the corporate social responsibility is expressed as:

$$CSRDI = \sum_{i=1}^{8} d_1/_d \quad \ldots\ldots\ldots\ldots(.1)$$

Where:

CSRDI is corporate social responsibility disclosure index

di = 1 if item 'di' is reported or 0 if item 'di' is not reported

d = maximum number of items for each (i.e. 8)

Model specification

A model adapted from work of (Obiora et al, 2021) was used as specified in functional and stochastic form

$$CSRD = f(BOS, BOI, MOW, FAGE) \quad (1)$$

$$CSRD_{it} = \delta_0 + \delta_1 BOS_{it} + \delta_2 BOI_{it} + \delta_3 MOW_{it} + \delta_4 FAGE_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \quad (2)$$

Where:

CSRD = Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure
BOS = Board size, BOI = Board independence, MOW =Managerial ownership
FAGE=Firm Age , ε_{it} = Error term , $\boldsymbol{\delta}_{0,}$ = Constant term
$\boldsymbol{\delta}_1 \ldots \boldsymbol{\delta}_4$ = Regression Coefficients
Note the subscription index "it" i = company; t = time

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Descriptive Statistics

Table 4.1: Summary of Descriptive Statistics

	CRSD	BOS	BOI	MOW	FAGE
Mean	0.1152	10.6948	66.0861	4.4308	33.006
Median	0.0000	10.000	70.0000	0.4387	37.0000
Maximum	0.7500	18.000	93.3333	55.651	56.0000
Minimum	0.0000	6.0000	0.00000	0.0061	2.00000
Std. Dev.	0.2136	2.8129	18.6270	9.7854	12.9713

Skewness	2.0041	0.4783	-1.0443	3.4030	-0.81192
Kurtosis	5.9048	2.3675	4.4939	16.0632	2.7699
Jarque-Bera	157.234	8.4400	42.312	1392.228	17.2596
Probability	0.0000	0.0146	0.0000	0.0000	0.00017
Sum	17.7500	1647.000	10177.27	682.3462	5083.000
Sum Sq.Dev.	6.9853	1210.656	53085.77	14650.38	25742.
Observations	154	154	154	154	154

Source: Author'sComputation,2023

Table 4.1 showed that the average CRSD value of 0.115, this implies that the selected consumer goods firms performed below average in CRS disclosure and maximum value is 0.75 and minimum value is 0. By implication, the extent of CRS disclosure of the sampled Nigerian consumer goods firm is 11.5 percent suggesting that the CRS disclosure information among Nigerian consumer goods firm is at low level and standard deviation is 0.21 indicating that there is no widely spread around the average estimated value. Table 4.1 also show that the average board size of selected companies over the period of study is found to be 10.6948, implies that sampled firms satisfied the minimum number of board of director, maximum number was 18.00 and maximum number was 6.00 with a standard deviation of 2.8129. Board independence has a mean value of 66.086, implies that some selected companies have 66 % of board independent in board of directors, the maximum and minimum value are 93.33% and 0% with standard deviation of 18.627, indicating that there is widely spread around the average estimated value. Managerial ownership has a mean value of 4.431, implies that the percentage of ownership among sampled companies was low, the maximum and minimum values are 55.651 and 0.0061 with standard deviation of 9.785. The age of firm has a mean value of 33.006, the maximum value was 56 years and minimum value was 2 years respectively. The probability of Jarque-Bera of CRSD, BOS, BOI, MOW, FAGE are less than a 0.05 level of significance which indicates that the data were normally distributed.

4.2 Correlation Analysis

Table 4.2 Correlation Matrix and VIF

	CRS	BOS	BOI	MOW	FAGE	VIF
CRS	1.0000					NA
BOS	0.3606	1.0000				1.0868
BOI	-0.0736	0.1446	1.0000			1.0288
MOW	-0.0606	0.1949	-0.0470	1.0000		1.2215
AGE	0.4610	0.0627	0.0699	-0.3619	1.0000	1.1771

Source: Author's Computation,2023

Table 4.2 shows the results of the correlation among the variables. The results show that board size had positive association with CRSD, indicating that board do proactive to issues of corporate social responsibility while board independence had negative and weak association with CRSD with correlation coefficients of -0.0736 but positively related to BOS. Managerial

ownership had a negative and weak correlation with CRSD with coefficient -0.0606. Other regressors have relatively weak relationship since their correlation coefficients are not up to 0.5. Hence, problem of multicolinearity did not occur. Since VIF of variables below threshold of 10, the full model of the study is free from the problem of multicollinearity.

Table 4.3 The regression result of firm monitoring mechanisms and CRSD

Variables		**Pooled OLS**	**Fixed Effect**	**Random Effect**
C	Coef.	-0.3039	-0.2824	-0.2951
	t-Stat	-3.9381	-3.5563	-3.7646
	p-val	0.0001	0.0005	0.0002
BOS	Coef.	0.0264	0.0268	0.0266
	t-Stat	5.0457	5.1384	5.1337
	p-val	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
BOI	Coef.	0.0017	-0.0021	-0.0019
	t-Stat	-2.3066	-2.5988	-2.4532
	p-val	0.0225	0.0104	0.0153
MOW	Coef.	0.0006	0.0003	0.0005
	t-Stat	0.4267	0.2072	0.3317
	p-val	0.6702	0.8362	0.7406
FAGE	Coef.	0.0075	0.0075	0.0076
	t-Stat	6.4265	6.1381	6.3586
	p-val	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
R^2		0.347724	0.4101	0.3537
F –stat		19.8577	6.9047	20.3864
P-val		0.0000	0.0000	0.0000
Breusch Pagan				15.5008
P-val				0.0018
Hausman Test				10.775
P-val				0.6883
Wald Test				78.59171
P-val				0.0000

Source: Author's Computation (2023)

Table 4.3 shows the P-value of the Hausman Test of (0.6883) which implies that Random effect is most preferred. The probability value of <0.05 and F-stat. 15.50 show that the model is fit and significant at 5% level of significance and the variables were properly selected and combined. This implies that the firm monitoring variables have a favourable influence on the corporate social responsibility disclosure of sampled Nigerian consumer goods firms. The R^2 of 35 % of the total variation of CSRD is explained by the explanatory variables and the remainder of 65% is not explained which is accounted for by the random error term. Wald Tests x^2 shows p-value 0.000 <0.005 this implies that the explanatory variables were taken as a part of factors that determined the CSRD. As depicted in Table 4.3, Board size had positive

and significant effect on CRSD with (t-stat= 5.1337, p<0.05). By implication, the addition of a director on the board would improve corporate social responsibility disclosure, which also buttresses the claim that a more diverse board would possess more expertise, qualities and core competence needed to ensure adequate monitoring and supervision of management that would improve the quality of their corporate social responsibility information to its stakeholders. This finding similar to the work of Ozordi et al. (2018). Board independence had an inverse and significant effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure with (t-stat= -2.4532, p<0.05). By implication, more independent board significantly increases the extent of corporate social responsibility disclosure in sample listed firms. This finding is in line with (Eneh and Amakor, 2022) but in contrary with findings of Emeka-Nwokeji, et al., 2021). Managerial ownership found a positive and insignificant relationship with CSRD at (t-stat= 0.3317, p>0.05), This implies that the insignificant negative impact of managerial ownership and CSRD implies that, the more equity shares owned by managers the less CSRD. This study is consistent with the study of Sadiq and Mohammed (2017) and Egbunike and Efionayi, 2021. On the side of control variable, firm age had positive and significant influence on CSRD (t-stat= 6.3586, p<0.05), this implies that older companies disclose more social responsibility information than newer companies. This outcome contradicts with finding Siriwatpatara 2018) found that, firm age has no significant effect on the corporate social responsibility among consumer goods companies in Nigeria.

Discussion of Findings

The outcome revealed that board size had positive and significant effect on CRSD. This indicates that director on the board would improve corporate social responsibility disclosure, which also buttresses the claim that a more diverse board would possess more expertise, qualities and core competence needed to ensure adequate monitoring and supervision of management that would improve the quality of their corporate social responsibility information to its stakeholders. This finding corroborated the study of Abdulkadir and Alifiah, (2019) and Emmanuel et al (2018) discovered that board size had positive and significant effect on CRSD, this mean that the higher the number of people in the board, the higher the corporate social responsibility disclosure by listed companies in Nigeria. Similar findings also discover from work of Ozordi et al. (2018), but in contrary to the study of (Emeka-Nwokeji et al., 2021) who found that board size has no significant effect on CSRD. Board independence had an inverse and significant effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. This indicates that more independent board significantly increases the extent of corporate social responsibility disclosure in sample listed firms. This finding is consistent with study of (Eneh and Amakor,2022; Abubakar and Moses (2020) who indicated that board independence is significant in determining the extent of disclosure but in contrary with findings of (Emeka-Nwokeji et al., 2021). Managerial ownership found a positive and insignificant relationship with CSRD. The implication of insignificant negative impact of managerial ownership on CSRD implies that, the more equity shares owned by managers the less CSRD. This study is consistent with the study of Sadiq and Mohammed (2017) and (Egbunike and Efionayi, 2021) both found that the ownership structure has no significant effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure. On the control variable, firm age had positive and significant influence on CSRD, this implies that older companies disclose more social responsibility information than newer companies. This outcome contradicts with finding Siriwatpatara (2018) found that firm age has no significant effect on the corporate social responsibility among consumer goods companies in Nigeria.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

From the data analysis and discussion of findings, the study shown that level of CRS disclosure among sampled consumer goods firm not up to 30% which is still low. The study also shown that monitoring mechanisms such as board size and board independence have significant effect on corporate social responsibility disclosure among the sampled consumer goods firms in Nigeria. This is because the board independence members are free from managerial influence and capable of monitoring and controlling the exuberance of the executive directors, thereby protecting and defending the interests of the shareholders and other stakeholders. It is concluded that the firm monitoring mechanism had influence on CRSD.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this research; the following recommendations made are as follows:

i. Consumer goods companies should put in place a larger board structure that encompasses people of different backgrounds of skills and experience in order to help the companies move forward during the difficult times
ii. Listed consumer goods companies should encourage a good board structure that makes provision for the presence of independent directors should be maintained to checkmate the management so that all the decisions taken by them will be the ones to attain the company's ultimate goal.

REFERENCES

Adegbite, E., Amaeshi, K., & Nakajima, C. (2013). Multiple influences on corporate governance practice in Nigeria: Agents, strategies and implications. *International Business Review,* 22(3),524–538.

Agyei-Mensah, B. K. (2017). The relationship between corporate governance, corruption and forward-looking information disclosure: a comparative study. *Corporate Governance (Bingley)*, 17(2), 284–304.

Al Fadli, A., Sands, J., Jones, G., Beattie, C., & Pensiero, D. (2020). Board independence and CSR reporting: Pre and post analysis of JCGC 2009. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 62(2), 117–138.

Al-Janadi, Y., Rahman, R. A., & Omar, N. H. (2012). The level of voluntary disclosure practices among public listed companies in Saudi Arabia and the UAE: Using a modified voluntary disclosure index. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance*, 9(2), 181–201.

Ali, S. M., & Isa, M. A. (2018). Firms attributes and corporate social responsibility disclosure: A Literature Review. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 8(4), 312–325.

Alsaadi, A. (2021). Family ownership and corporate social responsibility disclosure. Spanish Journal of Finance and Accounting, 1- 23.

Alsayegh, M. F., Abdul Rahman, R., & Homayoun, S. (2020). Corporate economic, environmental, and social sustainability performance transformation through ESG disclosure. *Sustainability,* 12(9), 1-20.

Amaeshi, K., Adegbite, E., & Rajwani, T. (2016). Corporate social responsibility in challenging and non-enabling institutional contexts: Do Institutional Voids matter? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 134(1), 135–153.

Ba, M. (2017). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: The role of corporate governance. Evidence from the Netherlands. (Master thesis). University of Twente, Enschede, Netherlands.

Babura, J. E. (2020). A framework for managing corporate governance, CRS and stakeholder relationship. *Leadership, Security and National Development*, 874.

Ballester, L., González-Urteaga, A., & Martínez, B. (2020). The role of internal corporate governance mechanisms on default risk: A systematic review for different institutional settings. *Research in International Business and Finance*, 54, 101293, 1-27.

Bananuka, J., Tumwebaze, Z., & Orobia, L. (2019). The adoption of integrated reporting: a developing country perspective. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*. 17(1), 2-23.

Barakat, F. Q, López Pérez, M., V.& Rodríguez A., L. (2015). Corporate social responsibility disclosure (csrd) determinants of listed companies in palestine (pxe) and Jordan (ASE). *Biomass Chem Eng,* 49(23–6).

Coffie, W., Aboagye-Otchere, F., & Musah, A. (2018). Corporate social responsibility disclosures (CSRD), corporate governance and the degree of multinational activities Evidence. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, 8(1), 106–123.

Efuntade, A. O., & Akinola, A.O (2020). Firm characteristics and financial performance in quoted manufacturing companies in Nigeria. *International Journal Business Finance. Management. Research*, 7, 25-32

Egbunike, A. P., & Efionayi, D. O (2021) ownership structure and corporate social responsibility disclosure of listed banks in Nigeria. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Accounting* (JOCIA) .(1), 117-128

El-Bassiouny, D., & El-Bassiouny, N. (2018). Diversity, corporate governance and CSR reporting: A comparative analysis between top-listed firms in Egypt, Germany and the USA. Management of Environmental Quality: *An International Journal*.

Emmanuel, O., Uwuigbe, U., Teddy, O., Tolulope, I., & Eyitomi, G. A. (2018). Corporate diversity and corporate social environmental disclosure of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 16(3), 229–244.

Eneh, O. M. & Amakor, I. C. (2022) board structure and corporate social responsibility performance in listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *Research Journal of Management Practice.* 2, (2) 17-28

Emeka-Nwokeji, N. A., Nangih, E, Chiedu, C.O., Chendo, N.A, & Eboatu, I (2021) Monitoring mechanism and social sustainability disclosure practices among firms in Nigeria: cross sectional analysis of 2018 corporate governance reform. *European Journal of Business, Economics and Accountancy* 9 (2), 68-101

Emmanuel, O., Uwuigbe, U., Teddy, O., Tolulope, I., & Eyitomi, G. A. (2018). Corporate diversity and corporate social environmental disclosure of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 16(3), 229–244

Freeman, R. (1983). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach‘, *Advances in strategic management,* 1, (1), 31–60

Friedman,M.(1970). The social responsibility of business is to increase its profit. New York Times Magazine.

Gamerschlag, R., Möller, K., & Verbeeten, F. (2010). Determinants of voluntary CSR disclosure: Empirical evidence from Germany. *Review of Managerial Science*, 5(2), 233–262.

García-Meca, E., & Sánchez-Ballesta, J.P. (2010). The association of board independence and ownership concentration with voluntary disclosure: a meta-Analysis. *European Accounting Review*, 19, 603- 627.

García-Sánchez, I. M., & Martínez-Ferrero, J. (2017). Independent Directors and CSR Disclosures: The moderating effects of proprietary costs. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management,* 24(1), 28–43

Jomo, S., Lindberg, D. L., & Nowland, J. (2017). Are board governance characteristics associated with ethical corporate social responsibility disclosures? The Case of the Mandatory Conflict Minerals Reporting Requirement. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 14(3), 101–116.

Kang, H., Cheng, M., & Gray, S. (2007). “Corporate governance and board composition: diversity and independence of Australian boards”. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 15(2), 194–207.

Kilincarslan, E., Elmagrhi, M. H., & Li, Z. (2020). Impact of governance structures on environmental disclosures in the Middle East and Africa. *Corporate Governance (Bingley),* 20(4), 739–763.

Mohammed, S. D. (2018). Mandatory social and environmental disclosure: A performance evaluation of listed Nigerian oil and gas companies pre-and-post-mandatory disclosure requirements. *Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 6(2), 56-68.

Marrone, A. (2020). Corporate governance variables and integrated reporting. International *Journal of Business and Management*, 15(5), 26-36.

Miras-Rodríguez, M., Martínez-Martínez, D., Escobar-Pérez, B., Miras-Rodríguez, M. del M., Martínez-Martínez, D., & Escobar- Pérez, B. (2018). Which corporate governance

mechanisms drive csr disclosure practices in emerging countries? S*ustainability,* 11(1), 61-75

Mitchell, R., Agle, B. R., & Wood, D.J. (1997). Toward a theory of stakeholder identification and salience: Defining the principle of who and what really counts. *Academy of Management Review,* 22(4), 853–886.

Muktar J., Bahammam S., Jibrin, R. S, & S. M. (2016). The effect of corporate governance on corporate social responsibility disclosure. *Journal of Economic*, 7(8), 2215–2218.

Muttakin, M. B., & Khan, A. (2014). Determinants of corporate social disclosure: Empirical evidence from Bangladesh. *Advances in Accounting*, 30(1), 168–175.

Naser, K., Al-Hussaini, A., Al-Kwari, B., & Nuseibeh, R. (2006). Determinants of corporate social disclosure in developing countries: The case of Qatar, Advances in International Accounting, 1.

Obiora, F.C, Ofor,N.T, & Ikenna E(2021) Firms attributes and corporate social responsibility disclosure in Nigerian. *JETMASE* 3(1): 211 – 221

Ode-Ichakpa, I., Cleeve, E., Amadi, C., &Osemeke, G. (2020). A business case argument for corporate social responsibility disclosure in Nigeria. *Africa Journal of Management*, 6(4),407 -418

Ofoegbu, G. N., Odoemelam, N., & Okafor, R. G. (2018). Corporate board characteristics and environmental disclosure quantity: Evidence from South Africa (integrated reporting) and Nigeria (traditional reporting). *Cogent Business & Management,* 5(1), 1–27.

Opusunju, M. I., & Ajayi, M. I. (2016). Impact of corporate governance of corporate social responsibility of Dangote group of companies in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business Quantitative Economics and Applied Management Research*, 2(10), 32–48.

Rouf, A. (2001). The corporate social responsibility disclosure: A study of listed companies in Bangladesh. *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 16(5), 274–289.

Siriwatpatara, R. (2018). The effects of firm characteristics on corporate social responsibility activities in industry sector in Eastern of Thailand. Proceedings of 124th ISERD International Conference, Osaka, Japan, 27th -28th July 2018, pg 1- 6.

Tiamiyu, M.A., Oyedokun, G.E., & Adeyemo, A. (2021). Firm characteristics and sustainability reporting of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria. *AFAR Multidisciplinary Journal of Management Sciences,* 3(1), 1-18.

Trireksani, T., & Djajadikerta, H. G. (2016). Corporate governance and environmental disclosure in the Indonesian Mining Industry, 10(1).

Uwuigbe, U., Uwuigbe, O. &Ajayi, A. O. (2011). Corporate social reasonability disclosures by environmentally visible corporation: A study of selected firms in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management*. 3(9).

Yahaya, O. A., & Bilyaminu, T. (2020). Internal corporate governance and intellectual capital of listed oil and gas firms in Nigeria. *Euro. J. of Acc., Aud. & Fin. Research*, 8(9), 98-109