



**CORPORATE BOARD SIZE AND CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY
DISCLOSURE AMONG LISTED INDUSTRIAL GOODS COMPANIES IN NIGERIA**

¹Jimoh IBRAHIM *, ²Emmanuel Taiwo AINA and ³Olubukola Olajumoke AKANJI

¹Department of Accounting, Osun State University, Nigeria

²Bursary Department, Igbajo Polytechnic, Osun State, Nigeria

³Department of Accountancy, Federal Polytechnic, Ede, Osun state, Nigeria

² ainaemman@gmail.com

³ bukkybabalola76@gmail.com

*Corresponding email: jimohibrahim889@gmail.com: +2348038532583

Abstract

The failure of the board of directors to effectively manage a company's disclosure of CSR can significantly damage its reputation. Therefore, this study examines the influence of board size on corporate social responsibility disclosure (CSR D) among listed industrial goods companies in Nigeria. *Ex post facto* research design was used. Purposive sampling technique was used to select sample size of eleven (11) quoted industrial goods companies out of study's population of 13 quoted firms. Secondary data were extracted from annual accounts of sampled 11 companies from 2011-2021. The study utilized panel estimation regression methods to analyze the data. The results indicated that board size had a positive and significant effect on CSR disclosure (coeff.= 0.0154, p-v =0.0260), suggesting that a diverse board with more expertise, qualities, and core competence can enhance monitoring and supervision, thereby improving the quality of CSR. The study's concluded that corporate boards can effectively encourage listed industrial products companies in Nigeria to disclose their CSR practices. The study also recommends that industrial products companies should maintain an effective board size to oversee management and ensure that all actions align with the company's objectives.

Keywords: Corporate board size, CSR D, industrial goods companies

JEL Classification Code: G34, M14.

INTRODUCTION

The term "corporate social responsibility" has become a cornerstone of modern business ethics since its introduction by Harlem Brundtland, the former Prime Minister of Norway, in her pivotal 1987 United Nations report. Brundtland emphasized that CSR represents a vital development, one that meets the needs of our generation while ensuring that future generations can also fulfill their own aspirations (Brundtland, 1987). In response to significant public scrutiny, companies within the chemical industry led the charge by releasing their inaugural environmental reports in the late 1980s. This proactive approach paved the way for a subsequent wave of passionate small and medium-sized enterprises that adopted advanced environmental management systems. Over the past two decades, the commitment to corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure has not only gained traction but has also proven essential for companies aiming to build trust and credibility in an increasingly conscientious global market. The key drivers of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure (CSR D) are primarily based on the guidelines set forth by the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI). However, 2014 KPMG survey reported by Chinedu and Ogochukwu (2020) reveals a striking disparity: Nigeria accounts for a mere 2 percent of GRI-based reports, while South Africa dominates the

landscape with approximately 96 percent. The remaining 4 percent of reports are dispersed across the rest of the continent. This highlights a significant opportunity for growth and improvement in CSR reporting across Nigeria and the broader African region.

Adegbite et al. (2013) highlighted that corporate social responsibility was introduced late in Nigeria, leading to reluctance among some businesses to incorporate CSR into their operations due to long-held beliefs of shareholders. Therefore, corporate board is an important internal corporate governance mechanism as it not only provides the policy direction for the organisation, it also involves in monitoring and supervision of the works of the corporate managers (Kajola et al., 2023). The size of the board therefore is very important for any business. Having a larger or smaller board has been a topical issue in corporate governance for a very long time. Proponents of a larger board (Emmanuel et al., 2018; Osemene and Fagbemi, 2019) suggested that these diverse members will use their wealth of experience to direct the affairs of the business and enable effective monitoring of the activities of the management to be achieved. A broader board can enhance the public visibility of a company's entire operations, including its commitment to social responsibility. However, proponents of a smaller board (Tarus, 2020) argue that it leads to reduced board administration costs, improved communication among members, and more effective management of the organization. Consequently, it is expected that a company with a smaller board will deliver more effective CSR information to its various stakeholders (Kajola et al., 2023).

Hasanah et al. (2017) assert that the board can be seen as a collection of safeguards that stakeholders can utilize to protect themselves against any cunning actions by company managers. Therefore, the functional corporate board plays a crucial role in facilitating the successful implementation of corporate social responsibility. Despite the evident benefits of CSR initiatives, corporate board members wield significant influence over business participation. Emeka-Nwokej et al. (2021) found that board size influences the systems and procedures implemented by businesses to promote a culture of regulatory compliance. In emerging nations, board size is often more skewed due to directors serving as non-executive directors of multiple companies. Increasing the size of boards can be an effective way for companies to limit management privileges at the expense of shareholder value, and to create a sustainable and favorable environment for efficient human and corporate operations. The primary goal of the Board is to ensure proper management of the organization. According to the SEC code of CG (2011), the Board is responsible for monitoring the efficient performance of the management in order to safeguard and enhance shareholder value, as well as fulfill the company's duties to its stakeholders, including its employees.

The failure of the board of directors to effectively manage a company's disclosure of CSR can significantly damage its reputation. Given the challenging economic conditions and unpredictability brought about by recent epidemics, rebuilding trust among users of financial information has become crucial. In response, businesses are increasingly expected to provide data on their social performance to enhance regulatory efforts, meet stakeholder reporting needs, and reduce information asymmetry between the board of directors and outside investors (Bananuka et al., 2019). A growing number of organizations are disclosing information about how their entities engage with local communities, employees, and other stakeholders because of criticism of the traditional reporting framework, which opened up opportunities for new reporting models and institutional innovations (Emeka-Nwokej et al., 2021).

Extensive research has delved into the connection between company board characteristics and corporate social responsibility (CSR) activities and disclosures, particularly in developed

economies. However, one major critique of previous studies is their inconsistent and often contradictory findings. This confusion largely stems from the lack of a universally accepted theory that clearly articulates the reasons business organizations pursue social responsibility initiatives and opt for voluntary disclosures in their annual reports. Moreover, the variety of proxies used to measure CSR reporting (Tarus, 2020) adds another layer of complexity. Additionally, the inconsistency can be attributed to the differences in study periods and sample sizes. Lastly, a significant oversight has been the failure to account for the varying institutional frameworks that exist between industrialized and developing nations. Addressing these gaps is crucial for advancing our understanding of CSR in different contexts

The primary motivation for this study stems from the significant lack of empirical research conducted in developing countries, particularly Nigeria. Most existing studies focused on specific sectors, such as Etoko (2024), which examined eight oil and gas companies between 2012 and 2021, and Osemene and Fagbemi (2019), who sourced data exclusively from consumer goods companies. Only a limited number of studies have investigated the oil and gas sector, concentrating on a mere ten companies during the 2011–2020 period. Moreover, several studies on corporate social responsibility disclosure (CSR/D) have been conducted, yet they have produced varying and sometimes conflicting results. These include research by Emeka-Nwokeji et al. (2021), Egbunike & Efonayi (2021), García-Meca & Martínez-Ferrero (2020), Ballester et al. (2020), Yahaya & Bilyaminu (2020), Eneh and Amakor (2022), and Nnubia et al. (2023). Addressing these gaps in the literature is crucial for fostering a more comprehensive understanding of CSR practices in the Nigerian context.

Nevertheless, the majority of the aforementioned research neglected to consider the impact of board size on corporate social responsibility among industrial goods companies. The relationship between board size and CSR and its impact on social aspects remains unclear, indicating a knowledge gap. The following question aims to address the aforementioned issues. What is the influence of board size on CSR disclosure of listed industrial goods companies in Nigeria? The broad objective of this study is to examine the influence of board size on CSR disclosure of listed industrial goods companies in Nigeria. This study would provide an insight into how board of director size influence the management in term of CSR in Nigeria.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Conceptual Review

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR)

CSR studies encompass a wide range of theoretical frameworks and techniques, including corporate social entrepreneurship, corporate citizenship, corporate social performance, and corporate social responsiveness. According to García and Rodríguez (2017), CSR entails legal and ethical duties to stakeholders and obligations arising from the impact of organizations on society. The term "corporate responsibility" addresses social, environmental, economic, and ethical issues, expanding an organization's responsibility beyond financial concerns. CSR reflects the commitment to utilizing corporate resources and discretionary business practices to improve community well-being. In this context, a company provides direct financial support or in-kind assistance to the community to make a positive impact on lives (Babura, 2020). CSR involves a company's ongoing commitment to upholding moral standards, driving economic progress, and enhancing the well-being of its employees, their families, the local community, and society at large. The company's goal to maximize profits often clashes with the CSR objective, as some concepts behind CSR suggest that managers should prioritize more than just profit maximization. Businesses are increasingly recognizing CSR as a commercial objective,

focusing on long-term sustainability and proactive adherence to legal, moral, and international standards (Babura, 2020).

CSR revolves around holding businesses accountable for their decisions and promoting the interests of all stakeholders, with shareholders as the primary stakeholders and others equally important. Ensuring all stakeholders feel valued and significant is a key goal of CSR, which can lead to favorable responses and bolster the company's reputation. Over the last decade, CSR has evolved from focusing solely on workplace health and safety to encompassing global responsibility. The increasing focus on CSR is driven by a heightened organizational effort to enhance company value. According to Coffie et al. (2018), CSR disclosure is a strategic approach employed by businesses to inform and persuade the public that they are adhering to social and environmental standards.

Board Size

The size of a company's board of directors is a critical factor in its success. The total number of directors, both executive and non-executive, seated on the board is referred to. Determining the ideal size of an organization's board of directors is a topic of fierce debate among experts. When the board is excessively large, individual directors may feel less engaged in decision-making and lack a sense of personal responsibility. Conversely, a lack of diversity on the board can hinder the ability to make compelling decisions and may lead to challenges in meeting deadlines (Ali & Isa, 2018). While various firm-specific factors can impact board size, Eneh and Amakor (2022) suggest that structuring a board is primarily about ensuring adequate human resources for effective strategic direction (Al-Qahtani & Elgharbawy, 2020). Smaller boards are often viewed as more effective in overseeing management due to better communication, coordination, and accountability among members (Eneh & Amakor, 2022), ultimately contributing to enhanced governance and organizational performance. The board of directors shares responsibilities in managing the business.

As noted by Hasanah et al. (2017), their main roles are to guide management and ensure long-term company viability. Effective performance by the board is crucial for strong corporate governance (Jarboui et al., 2023). Legitimacy theory asserts that companies should report their social and environmental performance in addition to financial results (Al-Qudah & Houcine, 2023). This perspective highlights accountability to all stakeholders impacted by business decisions. Therefore, when the board issues a sustainability report, it can secure long-term support from stakeholders (Fuente, 2017). The board of directors acts as a representative for shareholders and stakeholders, pressuring management to release the company's sustainability report to enhance public credibility and present a positive image. Research by Jamil et al. (2021), Jiang et al. (2023), Al-Qudah & Houcine (2023), Arayssi et al. (2020), Jarboui, et al. (2023), Aladwey et al. (2022), Maughan & O'Dochartaigh (2023), Alshhadat (2023), and Bai et al. (2023) highlights the significant role the board plays in disclosing sustainability reports.

Theoretical Framework

The study is based on stakeholder theory, which suggests that corporate entities balance the interests of various stakeholders to ensure each party's satisfaction. Stakeholders include groups, individuals, or entities that can influence and be affected by a firm's objectives. The theory criticizes the inefficiency of shareholder wealth maximization in advancing shareholder interests (Freeman 1984). Freeman (1984) stated that the idea that CSR involves incorporating social, environmental, and economic actions to satisfy stakeholders' concerns and shareholders' financial requirements. They suggest that high investment in CSR activities can enhance a

firm's competitive advantage and profitability by addressing various constituents' interests. Mitchell et al. (1997), based on stakeholder theory, also propose positive relationships between CSR and profitability. This theory has limitations, such as the challenge of satisfying all stakeholders simultaneously and the tendency for businesses to prioritize shareholders over customers and employees. Consistent implementation of the theory in organizations leads to the best outcomes (Mitchell et al., 1997). The significance of the stakeholder theory lies in its emphasis on fulfilling the legitimate interests of all linked constituents of a corporation, including employees, customers, suppliers, the local community, and shareholders, potentially contributing to the long-term success of the firm.

Empirical Review

In 2021, Emeka-Nwokeji et al. investigated social sustainability disclosure in Nigerian enterprises. The findings revealed an average disclosure level of 36%, lower than in comparable economies. Board size had no impact, but board shareholding and firm size positively influenced disclosure practices. In their 2021 study, Yahaya and Apochi examined the impact of the board on CSR reporting in Nigerian public firms. Analyzing panel data from 47 companies over a 7-year period (2013-2019), comprising 329 observations, the study found that board size did not have a significant impact. However, business size, leverage, and gender diversity on the board showed noticeable effects. The study also revealed that the CSR disclosure model is inferior to the social disclosure index.

Between 2014 and 2018, Obiora et al. (2021) studied how firm attributes influence corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure in Nigeria's consumer products industry. The research considered firm size, age, leverage, and profitability as indicators of these attributes. Their correlation and regression analysis revealed that while age, leverage, and profitability did not significantly impact CSR disclosure, firm size had a negative effect on CSR disclosure. Eneh and Amakor (2022) examined the relationship between board structure and corporate social responsibility (CSR) performance in 14 listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria using a twofold hurdle approach. Covering fiscal years 2010 to 2019, their longitudinal study employed simple random sampling and analyzed data using the Dual-Hurdle model. Findings indicated that board independence and gender diversity significantly affect CSR disclosure, while board size shows no impact.

Kajola et al. (2023) evaluated the impact of board characteristics on corporate social responsibility performance (CSR) in 10 Nigerian oil and gas companies from 2011 to 2020. Their analysis, using generalized least squares with random effects, revealed that both board size and composition have a positive and significant effect on CSR. Nnubia et al. (2023) examined the relationship between board characteristics and corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure in 40 manufacturing firms from South Africa and Nigeria using a judgmental sampling approach. Covering the years 2010 to 2019 (30 firms in Nigeria and 10 in South Africa), they employed OLS regression and the Pearson Correlation Method for analysis. The findings revealed that board independence negatively correlates with CSR disclosure, while board size has a positive correlation, leading to the conclusion that board size significantly impacts CSR disclosure in both countries.

From 2012 to 2021, Etoko (2024) examined the link between corporate social responsibility (CSR) performance and business attributes in eight publicly traded oil and gas marketing companies in Nigeria. Using current year donations (CYD) as a CSR measure and prior year profit (PYP), prior year cash and cash equivalents (PYCCE), and prior year net assets (PYNA)

as corporate attributes, the study employed Pearson's Product Moment correlation and the two-tail T-test. Results showed a weak positive association between PYNA and CYD, a very weak relationship between PYCCE and CYD, and a moderate positive correlation between PYP and CYD. The study concluded that firm attributes positively influence CSR performance in oil and gas marketing firms.

METHODOLOGY

The study utilized an ex post facto research design to achieve its objective. The population of the study consisted of thirteen industrial goods businesses listed on the Nigerian Exchange Group (NGX). These businesses were identified from the NGX's official records as of December 2021. A purposeful sampling technique was employed to select eleven listed industrial goods companies from the total population. The study relied on audited annual financial reports and accounts from 2011 to 2021 as the source of secondary data. Additionally, panel estimation and descriptive methods were used for multiple regressions and correlation analysis, along with diagnostic tests for multicollinearity, heteroskedasticity, and autocorrelation

Table 1: Summary of Measurements of Variables

Variables	Type of Variable	Variable Labels	Measurement	Source	Expected Sign
Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure	Dependent	CSR D	This is measured as the total Corporate Social Responsibility reporting score of firms computed. It is proxy by Corporate Social Responsibility Index	Kajola et al, (2023) Eneh, and Amakor, 2022	
Board Size	Independent	BOS	This is the total number of directors on a board	Nnubia et al. (2023) Eneh, and Amakor, 2022	+
Profitability	Control	PRF	Return on Asset (ROA) the percentage of profit before tax to total assets	Kajola et al, (2023) Emeka-Nwokeji et al, (2021)	+
Firm Size	Control	FIS	measured by taking the natural logarithm of total assets	Obiora et al (2021) Yahaya and Apochi (2021)	±
Leverage	Control	LEV	<u>Total debt</u> Total assets.	Obiora et al (2021)) Yahaya and Apochi (2021)	±

Source: Researcher's Compilation (2024)

CSR Measurement

The study utilized a scoring system known as Cognisant of (Obiora et al., 2021), which assigns a value of '1' for disclosed items and '0' for those not disclosed, enabling analysis of CSR disclosure across the sample companies. The CSR D was categorized into eight groups, as detailed in the table below, as part of the scoring system's methodology.

Table 2. CSR Disclosure Index Checklist

items	Social
	Equality of opportunity and diversity
	Relations between labour and industry
	Safety and health at work
	Instruction and training
	Human rights
	Participation in the community
	Product accountability
	Charity

Source: Authors' Compilation (2024)

The formula for calculating the un-weighted reporting scores using the CSR is expressed as:

$$CSRDI = \sum_{i=1}^8 d_{1/d} \dots\dots\dots(1)$$

Where:

CSRDI is CSR disclosure index

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

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

Model specification

A model adapted from work of (Kajola et al, 2023) and consistent with some prior study of (Tarus, 2020) was used as specified in functional and stochastic forms. The adapted model is as follows:

$$CSR P_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 BSZ_{it} + \beta_2 BCO_{it} + \beta_3 BGD_{it} + \beta_4 PRF_{it} + \beta_5 FSZ_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$$

The model for this study stated as follows:

Model

$$CSR D = f(BOS, PRF, FSI, LEV) \dots\dots\dots(2)$$

$$CSR D_{it} = \delta_0 + \delta_1 BOS_{it} + \delta_2 PRF_{it} + \delta_3 FSI_{it} + \delta_4 LEV_{it} + \varepsilon_{it} \dots\dots\dots(3)$$

Where:

CSR D = CSR Disclosure

BOS = Board size

PRF = Profitability proxy by ROA;

FSI = Firm size

LEV= Leverage

ε_{it} = Error term

δ_0 , = Constant term

$\delta_1 \dots \delta_5$ = Regression Coefficients

Note the subscription index "it" i = company; t = time

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics

	CSR D	BOS	ROA	FSI	LEV
Mean	0.1373	9.0083	4.8826	7.0682	0.6175
Median	0.0000	8.0000	7.1069	6.8844	0.5310
Maximum	0.7500	19.0000	53.9594	9.2409	1.6175
Minimum	0.0000	5.0000	-179.9173	5.0927	0.0409
Std. Dev.	0.2476	3.1689	27.4893	0.9997	0.3948
Skewness	1.658	1.2452	-4.2425	0.4184	1.1446
Kurtosis	4.2455	3.8513	27.5061	2.5719	3.6633
Jarque-Bera	63.2597	34.9241	3390.748	4.4550	28.6394

Probability	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.1078	0.0000
Sum	16.6250	1090.00	590.7967	855.2532	74.7226
Sum Sq.Dev.	7.3564	1204.92	90679.09	119.9494	18.7058
Observations	121	121	121	121	121

Source: Authors' Computation,2024

The average CRSD value displayed in Table 3, is 0.137, indicating that the selected industrial goods firms performed below the average in CRS disclosure. The max. value is 0.75, and the min. value is 0, suggesting that the extent of CRS disclosure among the sampled Nigerian industrial goods firms is 13.7%, indicating a low level of CRS disclosure. The standard deviation of 0.24 indicates that the values are not widely spread around the average. Additionally, Table 3 shows that the average board size of selected companies over the study period is 9.0, implying that the sampled firms satisfied the min. number of board directors. The max. number was 19.00, and the min. was 5.00, with a standard deviation of 3.16. Furthermore, the average return on assets is 4.88%, with max. and min. values of 53.959 and -179.917, respectively. This indicates that the profitability of the sampled industrial goods firms was very poor and not encouraging. The average leverage was 0.6175, suggesting that the total assets of the sample companies exceeded their liabilities, with max. and min. values of 1.6175 and 0.0409 and a standard deviation of 0.3948. The firm size had a mean value of 7.068, with max and min. values of 9.2409 and 5.0927 and a standard deviation of 0.999. Most variables had a Jarque-Bera probability of less than 0.05, indicating rejection of the null hypothesis, except for FSI.

Correlation Analysis

Table 4: Correlation Matrix with VIF

	CSRD	BOS	ROA	FSI	LEV	VIF
CSRD	1.0000					NA
BOS	0.0864	1.0000				1.0848
ROA	0.0781	0.0415	1.0000			1.0915
FS	0.3578	0.2665	-0.0980	1.0000		1.2790
LEV	-0.2045	-0.1621	-0.2110	-0.3758	1.0000	1.2586

Source: Authors' Computation,2024

Table 4 showed the results of the correlation among the variables. The results show that board size had positive association with CRSD given coefficient 0.0864, indicating that board do proactive to issues of CSR. The results indicated that return on asset had positive correlation with CRSD given coeff. 0.0781 while firm size had positive correlation with CRSD with coefficient value of 0.3578, implies that larger companies do engage in social responsibility as against small firms. Leverage had strong and weak association with CRSD at coefficient of -0.2045. Other regressors have relatively weak relationship since their correlation coefficients are not up to 0.5. Therefore, there was no multicollinearity issue. Since the VIF values do not exceed the threshold of 10, the study's entire model is free of the multicollinearity issue.

Table 5: Serial Correlation and Heteroscedasticity Test Results

Test	Details	Remarks
Breusch-Godfrey Serial Correlation LM Test in panel data	H0: first-order autocorrelation F-stat= 49.4660 Prob. F(2,114) =0.0000	First Order Serial Correlation existence

Heteroskedasticity Test: Breusch-Pagan-Godfrey	Ho: Constant variance F=8.9233 Prob. F(4,116) =0.0000	There is evidence of heteroscedasticity
---	---	--

Source: Authors' Compilation, 2024

In order to accomplish its objective, the study employed the Breusch-Godfrey serial correlation, with the outcomes detailed in Table 5. The findings, as outlined in Table 5, demonstrated that, at the one percent level, the null hypothesis—that there is no serial correlation—was not accepted. Consequently, the study's objective revealed evidence of serial correlation. Table 5 presents an overview of the findings from the modified Wald test, which was utilized to determine the presence of heteroscedasticity. Based on the findings, the study's first objective's null hypotheses for the modified group-wise test of heteroscedasticity were rejected. Consequently, the investigation discovered evidence of the objective

Table 6: Correlated Random Effects - Hausman Test

Equation: Untitled

Test period random effects

Test Summary	Chi-Sq. Statistic	Chi-Sq. d.f.	Prob.
Period random	11.491462	4	0.0216

The Hausman Test's P-value of (0.0216) in Table 2 suggests that the Fixed effect is the most favoured.

Test of Hypothesis

Table 7: Panel Regression Results

Variables		POL	R.E	F.E
C	coef.	-0.3967**	-0.3967**	-0.4005**
	t-v	-2.1634	-2.1914	-2.1816
	p-v	(0.0326)	(0.0304)	(0.0313)
BOS	coef.	0.0163**	0.0163**	0.0154**
	t-v	2.3817	2.4126	2.2572
	p-v	(0.0189)	(0.0174)	(0.0260)
ROA	coef.	0.0010	0.0010	0.0017**
	t-v	1.2989	1.2989	(1.9514)
	p-v	(0.2023)	(0.1965)	(0.0536)
FSI	coef	0.0991**	0.0991**	0.0969**
	t-v	4.2171	4.2716	4.1202
	p-v	(0.0000)	(0.0000)	(0.0001)
LEV	coef	-0.0402	-0.0402	-0.0268
	t-v	-0.6812	-0.6900	-0.4524
	p-v	(0.4971)	(0.4916)	(0.6519)
R ²		0.183	0.183	0.272
F-stat		6.4998(0.000)	6.4998(0.000)	2.8356 (0.001)
Wald Test:				7.8188(0.0499)

Breusch-PaganT

14.0201 (0.1721)

p- values(), P-val<0.05**

Source: Authors' Compilation (2024)

As displayed in Table 7: The model is fit and significant at the 5% level of significance, and the variables were appropriately chosen and mixed, as indicated by the probability value of less than 0.05 and the F-statistic of 2.8356. This suggests that the sampled Nigerian industrial products manufacturers' CSR disclosure was influenced by the size of their board. The R^2 explanatory variables account for 27.2% of the total variation of CSRD while the stochastic error term accounts for the remaining 73.8% of the variation that is not explained. The p-value for the Wald Tests X^2 was $0.0499 < 0.05$, indicating that the explanatory variables were included in the components that determined the CSRD.

Board size had a positive and substantial effect on CRSD with (coeff. = 0.0154, p-v=0.0260), as Table 7 illustrates. It follows that having a director on the board would enhance CSR disclosure. This supports the idea that a more diverse board would have the knowledge, skills, and core competencies required to ensure proper management oversight and monitoring, which would enhance the caliber of the company's CSR information provided to stakeholders. These results are consistent with the research conducted by Kajola et al, (2023) and Nnubia et al. (2023). On the control variable's side, Profitability had a positive and significant impact on CRSD, as shown (coeff.= 0.0017, p-v=0.0536). The finding is consistent with Ganewatta and Priyadarshanie (2016), who found that firm profitability had a positive and statistically significant effect on CSR disclosure and that firm size had a positive and significant effect on CRSD with (coeff. = 0.0969, p-v=0.0001). Given that their exceptional exposure will draw more lawsuits and government interference, this shows that larger corporations are more inclined to reveal social and environmental information in an effort to reduce their political costs.

Thus, the study revealed that CSR of consumer products businesses in Nigeria is significantly impacted by firm size. The study's findings are consistent with those of Siritwatpatara (2018) and Obiora et al. (2021). The impact of leverage on CSRD was negative and statistically negligible (coeff.= -0.0268, p- 0.6519). This suggests that a company's debt may no longer be used to fund its assets or to fulfil its social obligations. This result validated the findings of (Obiora, 2021) who discovered that firm leverage has little influence on disclosure of corporate social responsibility.

Discussion of Findings

The study examined the influence of board size on CSR of the firms and found that board size had a positive and significant effect on CRSD. The results of this study supported the research conducted by Kajola et al, (2023), Nnubia et al. (2023), Agyemang et al. (2020), and Kilincarslan et al. (2020), which found that board size had a positive and significant effect on CRSD. This means that listed companies in Nigeria disclose their CSR more frequently the more members their board has. However, this contrasts with Emeka-Nwokeji et al.'s (2021) Eneh and Amakor (2022) studies, which found no substantial link between board size and CSRD. Overall findings provide evidence in support of stakeholder theory, as it suggests that board of directors acts as a representative for shareholders and stakeholders, pressuring management to release the company's sustainability report to enhance public credibility and present a positive image. The implication of the results indicates that larger boards should be encouraged, as they are more flexible and bring diverse perspectives that help mobilize resources for optimal use in the public interest.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study's findings and discussion demonstrated that a large enough board is immune to managerial influence and able to keep an eye on and rein in the executive directors' excesses, safeguarding and advancing the interests of stakeholders and shareholders alike. Thus, the study concluded that corporate boards act as a true mechanism to encourage listed industrial products companies in Nigeria to disclose their CSR. The study suggests that industrial products companies could benefit from establishing a more diverse board structure, with members possessing varying backgrounds in abilities and expertise, to navigate through challenging times. The study also recommends that industrial products companies should maintain an effective board size to oversee management and ensure that all actions align with the company's objectives. This study contributed to advancing knowledge in the area by providing a fresh perspective on how the company monitoring mechanism functions as a true method to encourage CSR disclosure among listed industrial goods firms in Nigeria

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.
- Agyemang, A. O., Yusheng, K., Ayamba, E. C., Twum, A. K., Chengpeng, Z., & Shaibu, A. (2020). Impact of board characteristics on environmental disclosures for listed mining companies in China. *Environmental Science and Pollution Research*, 27(17), 21188–21201.
- Aladwey, L., Elgharbawy, A. & Ganna, M.A. (2022). Attributes of corporate boards and assurance of corporate social responsibility reporting: evidence from the UK. *Corporate Governance*, 22 (4), 748-780.
- 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.
- Al-Qahtani, M., & Elgharbawy, A. (2020). The effect of board diversity on disclosure and management of greenhouse gas information: Evidence from the United Kingdom. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 33(6), 1557–1579.
- Al-Qudah, A.A. & Houcine, A. (2023). Firms' characteristics, corporate governance, and the adoption of sustainability reporting: evidence from Gulf Cooperation Council countries. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*, 21(1). 76-87<https://doi.org/10.1108/JFRA02-2023-0066>
- Alshhadat, M.Q. (2023). The determinants of sustainability reporting: evidence from Saudi petrochemical companies. *Journal of Financial Reporting and Accounting*, 21 (1)34-45
- Arayssi, M., Jizi, M. & Tabaja, H.H. (2020). The impact of board composition on the level of ESG disclosures in GCC countries. *Sustainability Accounting, Management and Policy Journal*, 11(1) 137-161.
- Babura, J. E. (2020). A framework for managing corporate governance, csr and stakeholder relationship. *Leadership, Security and National Development*, 874.
- 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.

- 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.
- Bai, K., Ullah, F., Arif, M., Erfanian, S. & Urooge, S. (2023). Stakeholder-centered corporate governance and corporate sustainable development: Evidence from CRS practices in the top companies by market capitalization at shanghai stock exchange of China. *Sustainability*. 2023; 15(4):2990. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15042990>.
- Brundtland, G. H. (1987). *Report of the World Commission on environment and development: "our common future."* United Nations
- Chinedu, E. N., & Ogochukwu, O. G. (2020). Relationship between environmental accounting disclosures and financial performance of manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *International Journal in Management and Social Science*, 8(2), 171-193.
- Coffie, W., Aboagye-Otchere, F., & Musah, A. (2018). Corporate social responsibility disclosures (CSR), corporate governance and the degree of multinational activities Evidence. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies*, 8(1), 106–123
- Egbunike, A. P & Efonayi, 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
- 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.
- 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
- Eneh, O. M. & Amakor, I. C. (2022) Board structure and corporate social responsibility performance in listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria using a double hurdle methodological path. *Research Journal of Management Practice* 2 (2), 17-28
- Etoko, M.E (2024) Firm attributes and corporate social responsibility performance of listed oil and gas marketing firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business & Law Research* 12(1), 168-180,
- Freeman, R. (1984). Strategic management: A stakeholder approach, *Advances in Strategic Management*, 1, (1), 31–60
- Fuente, J. A.S. (2017). The role of the board of directors in the adoption of GRI guidelines for the disclosure of CSR information. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 141, 737-750.
- 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
- Ganewatta R, & Priyadarshanie , E (2016) Corporate sustainability reporting: Linkage of corporate disclosure information and performance indicators. *Cogent Business and Management*, 5(1), 1-21.
- Hasanah, N., Syam, D., & Jati, A. W. (2017). Pengaruh Corporate Governance terhadap Pengungkapan Sustainability Report pada Perusahaan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Reviu Akuntansi Dan Keuangan*, 5(1), 711–720.
- Jamil, A., Ghazali, N.A.M & Nelson, S. P. (2021). The influence of corporate governance structure on sustainability reporting in Malaysia. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 17 (8), 1251-1278. <https://doi.org/10.1108/SRJ-08-2020-0310>

Ibrahim, J., Aina, E. T. and Akanji, O. O. (2024). Corporate board size and corporate social responsibility disclosure among listed industrial goods companies in Nigeria. *Malete Journal of Accounting and Finance*, 5 (1), 140-152

- Jarboui, A., Hlima, N. D. B. & Bouaziz, D. (2023). Do sustainability committee characteristics affect CSR performance? Evidence from India. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*, 30 (2), 628-652. <https://doi.org/10.1108/BIJ-04-2021-0225>
- Jiang, Y., Meca, E.G. & Ferrero, J.M. (2023). Do board and ownership factors affect Chinese companies in reporting sustainability development goals?. *Management Decision*, 61 (12), 3806-3834. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-01-2023-0113>
- Kajola, S., Adelowotan, M., Adeyemi, A., & Oshadare, S. (2023). Board features and corporate social responsibility practices in nigerian oil and gas companies. *Economic Insights – Trends and Challenges*, 12(1), 33- 46
- 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.
- Maughan, R. & O'Dochartaigh, A. (2023). New boundaries for sustainability accounting? A case study of multi-entity accounting and reporting in the agrifood sector. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 36 (9), 418-445. <https://doi.org/10.1108/AAAJ-10-2021-5520>
- 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.
- Nnubia, I.C., Anaïke, C.L. & Mmadubuobi, L.C. (2023). Board attributes and corporate social responsibility disclosure: Evidence from Nigeria and South Africa. *Open Access Journal of Social Sciences Research*, 1(3), 1- 20.
- Obiora, F.C, Ofor, N.T, & Ikenna, E. (2021) Firms attributes and corporate social responsibility disclosure in Nigerian. *JETMASE* 3(1), 211 – 221
- Osemene, O. F., & Fagbemi, T. O. (2019). A study of the relationship between corporate governance and environmental reporting in Nigeria's listed consumer goods companies. *Fountain University Osogbo Journal of Management*, 4(3), 1-22.
- 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.
- Tarus, J. K. (2020). Do board size and firm size affect environmental accounting disclosure? Evidence from selected listed firms in Kenya. *Journal of Business Management and Economic Research*, 4(1), 21-37
- Yahaya. O. A., & Apochi. J (2021) Board of directors and corporate social responsibility reporting of quoted companies in Nigeria. *Journal of Accounting, Finance and Auditing Studies* 7(2), 38-52
- Yahaya, O. A., & Bilyaminu, T. (2020). Internal corporate governance and intellectual capital of listed oil and gas firms in Nigeria. *European Journal of Accounting, Auditing. & Finance Research*, 8(9), 98-109