

**NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT
ISSUES IN ARTS AND MANAGEMENT (NIJCIAM)
Volume 3 Issue 1 2023**

The relationship that exist between board independence and corporate social responsibility reporting of listed non-financial firms in Nigeria

Helenna Akpandem and Eno Ukpong

Department of Accounting, Faculty of management sciences. Akwa Ibom State University, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The study investigated the relationship that exist between board independence and corporate social responsibility reporting of listed non-financial firms in Nigeria. The variable under studied is : (1)Board independence. In this study, ex-post facto research design and descriptive research design on a panel data set which were sourced from annual financial report of seventy-three listed non- financial companies in Nigeria were employed. Furthermore, two econometric models were specified and the study hypotheses was listed using binary logistic regression analysis and moderated binary logistic regression analysis (MBLR) technique. Specifically, the probability values, (p-values) for the regression output formed the basis for decision on the statistical significance of the coefficients obtained for each tested hypotheses. The result revealed that CEO educational qualification has a significant moderating effect on the relationship between board independence and CSR reporting of non-financial firms in Nigeria. It is recommended among others, that strong emphasis should be given to simultaneous policies that consider improved board independence together with hiring a CEO with more educational qualification.

Keywords: Board independence, corporate, social, non-financial and firms

INTRODUCTION

Social responsibility disclosures also enhance the users' trust and diminish information asymmetry between companies and stakeholders [1]. Presently, corporate social responsibility disclosures in Nigeria are still voluntary disclosures. This is because there are no reporting standards regulating social and environmental information to be reported in annual reports in line with global best practices which encourages voluntary reporting [2]. It is no more fashionable for companies to keep increasing profits at the detriment of its stakeholders, such as the community, staff, customers and the environment. There is also a growing social awareness that increases the pressure on firms regarding their responsibility to the community and environments in the conduct of their businesses. In view of this, many firms take as much responsibility for environmental protection and corporate social responsibility as they do for economic issues. Growing environmental protection anticipations from various stakeholders as well as considerations for their host communities and staff has led to the inclusion of these stakeholders in their welfare packages. [3] reports that this is what led to the concept of triple bottom line as coined by John Elkington in 1994. According to him the triple bottom line is an accounting tool that takes into account , not just the firms' profit, but their care of the environment or planet or their stakeholders or people; hence the 3Ps of people , planet and profit. This is also known as the 3Ps of sustainability [4]. Through their annual reports presented on a regular basis, these firms reflect their responsibility concerning environmental, social, economic and corporate governance issues. Social and environmental accounting has become necessary because traditional accounting system which handles most social and environmental costs as overhead costs has become inadequate in providing managers with sufficient information for strategic decision making [5]. In spite of the

© Helenna and Eno

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

overwhelming benefits of corporate social environment reporting (CSR), the decision whether a firm engages in CSR or not can be influenced by a lot of factors and chief of them are corporate governance attributes. This is defined as a firm's characteristics or specific features that distinguish one firm from another [6]. The corporate attributes that distinguish a corporate organization from others include: the board size, board independence, board ownership, board gender diversity among others. Corporate governance attributes can influence the levels of performance of a firm and to a great extent, can influence the decisions and operations of the firm. A business corporation cannot maximize the gains inherent in social responsibility reporting without good corporate governance practices [7]. Therefore, in recent times, corporations are increasingly under pressure for good governance and sustainability. Corporate governance is the structure by which firms can be directed and controlled [8]. This has been further highlighted after the East Asian financial crisis and collapse of Enron and WorldCom in the United States such that the need to strengthen mechanisms for corporate control became inevitable [9]. All over the world countries have instituted various codes of corporate governance with the sole aim of improving the quality of governance outcomes. Consequently, there have been an increasing number of authors who have studied the impact of corporate governance attributes such as board size; board independence, board gender diversity and board ownership on the external environment [10] [11] [12], record that the duo of corporate governance and social sustainability are essential for continuous operations of any corporation such that much attention should be paid to these concepts and they are applied. Accordingly, these two concepts are fundamentally related to each other since good corporate governance is generally expected to have a positive impact on social sustainability performance and its associated reporting [13].

However, in line with the evolving nature of CSR reporting and the pressing need for academics to understand the economic and executive incentives behind firms' CSR reporting practices as reported by [14], this study explored the role of Chief Executive Officer's (CEO) educational qualification on the relationship between corporate governance attributes and CSR reporting. This line of thinking has been provoked following on the Upper Echelons Theory (UET). This theory is based on the idea that managerial values and perceptions have a direct influence on corporate strategic decisions so that unobservable characteristics of the CEO who is at the helm of management is expected to have a direct influence on CSR reporting. Therefore, the need to examine the effect of CEO educational qualification on the relationship between corporate governance attributes and CSR reporting becomes very interesting and compelling. Hence the knowledge of the interaction between the CEO's educational qualification and the four corporate governance attributes employed in this study, will greatly benefit stakeholders, corporate managers as well as corporate CEOs. The corporate governance attributes studied are; 1) board size, 2) board independence, 3) board gender diversity and 4) board ownership. The benefit of these studies will open up the need for managers to simultaneously adopt dual policy application as against single/individual policy application in the process of beefing up CSR performance of the firm. However, a review of prior similar studies suggests that there is a wide knowledge gap towards the effect of CEO's educational qualification on the relationship between corporate attributes and CSR reporting particularly in developing countries like Nigeria. Consequently, the focus of this study is to present a much broader and deeper insight into the relationship between corporate attributes and CSR reporting while simultaneously considering the effect of CEO's educational qualifications. According to [15], corporate governance (CG) is a system through which objectives are developed, and ways by which the objectives can be achieved. The issue of CG arose because of the distinction between the ownership of a business and its control based on the way in which organizations are managed and controlled (Cadbury, 1992). However, the fundamental objective of CG is to enhance shareholders' wealth by enhancing company performance and transparency, while considering the interest of all the stakeholders. Various forms of companies operate in many environments to deliver goods and/or services to achieve certain defined objectives. However, all companies impact on the community in which they are operating through their operations, products and their association with the relevant stakeholders. It is worthy to note that even those companies and organizations which their production causes no injury or degradation on the environment such as service providers also engaged in CSR activities so as to solicit for customers' patronage, government support and demonstrate their ethical and social responsiveness to the public [16].

The move towards integrating CSR activity into CG suggests potential link of CSR, CG and financial performance of companies. It is also widely believed that corporate governance attributes influence the quality and quantity of social and environmental information reported by firms [17]. Equally essential for the control of any company is the chief executive officer. It also worth noting that central to all company activities is the role of the chief executive officer (CEO). The Chief Executive Officer (CEO) is one of the critical players in the corporate sector. Sitting in the top positions of the management teams in firms, CEOs are able to guide the firms to actively pursue opportunities and control the structures and strategies of the firms [18]. Specifically, CEOs pursue important and strategic decisions that can influence the performances

© Helenna and Eno

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

of their firms. [19, 20], averred that the most important determinant of the survival and success of a firm are based on the performance and quality of the top managers in the firm. In other words, CEOs have crucial roles to play for the firm's successes or failures. Evidently, CEO characteristics have been listed among numerous factors that influence firms, as reported by several studies. The CEO's personality is likely to have an important impact on a firm's success [21]. One key characteristic of the CEO with capacity to influence performance is the CEO educational qualification.

Aim of the study

The aim of this study is to investigate the relationship that exist between board independence and corporate social responsibility reporting of listed non-financial firms in Nigeria

Research question

To enable the researcher, achieve the above objective the following research question that was raised;

1. To what extent does board independence relate with corporate social responsibility reporting of listed non-financial firms in Nigeria?

Research hypothesis

This study tested the following null hypothesis.

H₀₁ There is no significant relationship between board independence and corporate social responsibility reporting of non-financial listed firms in Nigeria.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study adopts *ex-post facto* and analytical research design based on secondary data collected from annual financial reports of selected listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria. The study is based on *ex-post facto* research design since the event has taken place, hence the data already exist and no attempt was made to manipulate the data of the study. Also, the study is based on analytical research design because it sought to analyze the moderating effects of CEO educational qualification on the relationship between corporate governance attributes and corporate social responsibility reporting. Content analyses procedure was also undertaken as the moderator variable of CEO educational qualification required that we transform the qualitative information (contained in CEO educational qualification) into quantitative information for the purpose of carrying out the analyses.

Selection of Data

This study employs secondary source of data. Annual reports of the sampled firms were obtained to source information on the variables of corporate social sustainability reporting, corporate governance attributes and the moderator variable of CEO educational qualification. Information on CEO educational qualification were obtained from the profile content of the firms' CEO displayed in the annual report. However, the final compilation of the data set was carried out by Machame Ratios a registered corporate body saddled with the responsibility of collecting empirical data for related studies.

Population of the Study

The population of this study covers all listed firms engaged in non-financial activities in Nigeria during the period 2011 to 2020. The non-financial sector of Nigeria had a total of one hundred and eight (108) listed firms as of December 31st, 2020. Therefore, the population of the study consist of all 108 non-financial firms listed on the floor of the Nigerian Stock Exchange market as of December 31st, 2020. [22] noted that the real sector (non-financial sector) of any economy represents the engine of growth and development. It fosters industrialization, employment creation, wealth redistribution and generates more tax revenue when compared to other sectors of the economy. More than these, we find from extant literature that similar studies (especially within the Nigerian context) are rare when it comes to obtaining samples from non-financial sector. Therefore, it is worthwhile to conduct this study taking samples from firms within the frame of non-financial firms in Nigeria. However, the table below provides a breakdown of various sectors contained within the non-financial group as of December 31st, 2020.

Consumer Services Sector =	17	
Healthcare Sector	=	10
Basic Materials Sector	=	11
Consumer Goods Sector	=	26
Industrial Sector	=	24
Oil & Gas Sector	=	13
Technology Sector	=	07
Total	=	108

Source: Nigerian Stock Exchange (NSE) Website.

© Helenna and Eno

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Sample and Sampling Technique

For some studies, the population may be small enough to warrant the inclusion of all of them. But a study may entail a large population which cannot all be included. That portion of the population that is studied is called a sample of the population [23]. Hence, a sample in this study is defined as a smaller group of elements drawn through a definite procedure from an accessible population. The elements making up this sample are those that are studied. The process of selecting a portion of the population to represent the entire population is known as sampling [24]. However, in deriving the sample size from the total population, this study adopted [25] sample size computation. Krejcie and Morgan's sample size calculation is based on $p = 0.05$ where the probability of committing type I error is less than 5 % or $p < 0.05$. Hence, the sample size is computed below as:

Where:

N = value of alpha is assumed to be 0.05

P = Population size

d = degree of accuracy is 0.05.

S = Sample Size

$$S = \frac{x^2 NP(1-P)}{d^2(N-1) + x^2 P(1-P)}$$

$$S = \frac{1.96^2 \times 108 \times 0.5 (1-0.5)}{0.05^2(108-1) + 1.96^2 \times 0.5 (1-0.5)}$$

$$S = \frac{3.8416 \times 108 \times 0.5 (1-0.5)}{0.0025 (108-1) + 3.8416 \times 0.5 (1-0.5)}$$

$$S = \frac{414.89 \times 0.5 (0.5)}{0.0025 (108-1) + 3.8416 \times 0.5 (1-0.5)}$$

$$S = \frac{414.89 \times 0.5 (0.5)}{0.0025 (107) + 3.8416 \times 0.5 (0.5)}$$

$$S = \frac{414.89 \times 0.25}{0.2675 + 3.8416 \times 0.25}$$

$$S = \frac{103.7225}{0.2675 + 0.9604}$$

$$S = \frac{103.7225}{1.2279}$$

$$S = 84.47$$

From the above computation, with a population size of 108, the sample size becomes 84. However, the researcher intends a balanced panel data together with a homogenous sample representation due to the nature of the study. Hence, we deselect firms whose required information were incomplete. Furthermore, we deselect firms that joined the Nigerian Stock Exchange after 2011 as we consider them to be too young to avoid sample bias and also removed all the firms that did not provide information relating to CEO educational qualification which served as the moderator variable. However, only seventy-three (73) companies were used for the study. These were those who had complete financial for the period under review.

Method of Data Analysis

The data set was first subjected to pre-regression analyses which includes descriptive statistics analyses, correlation analyses and the test for normality of residua. The descriptive statistics is employed to examine the characteristics of the data: Mean Maximum, Minimum, and Standard Deviation. The correlation analysis is employed to evaluate the association between the variables and to check for possible multi-collinearity among the variables of interest. Regression (Logistic Regression) analyses technique as a method of data analyses is employed to establish the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable of interest and to identify the direction of the effect.

© Helenna and Eno

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Binary Logistic Regression

Logistic regression is a specialised form of regression that is formulated to predict and explain a binary categorical variable rather than a metric dependent measure. It has a unique relationship between the dependent and independent variables; hence, it requires a different approach in estimating the variate, assessing goodness-of-fit, and interpreting the coefficients when compared to multiple regression [26]. Logistic regression is employed in this study based on the following reasons. First, logistic regression has the advantage of being less affected than discriminant analysis when the basic assumptions particularly normality of the variables, are not met [27]. Second, in logistic regression, the estimated coefficients can be interpreted separately as the significance of each of the predictive variables. Third, statistically, logistic regression seems to fit well with the features of the CSR reporting model, where the dependent variable is binary and with the groups being discrete, non-overlapping and identifiable [28]. Fourth, it has straightforward statistical tests, similar approaches to incorporating metric and non-metric variables and non-linear effects, with a wide range of diagnostics [29]. Fifth, logistic regression produces reliable results because of its ability to produce a nonlinear transformation of the input data that reduces the effects of outliers. Therefore, in line with existing literature on CSR reporting, the general form of a logistic regression model is shown below.

$$Y_{it} = \alpha_i + X_{it}\beta + U_{it}, i = 1, \dots, N \text{ and } t = 1, \dots, T, \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

Where Y_{it} is a response variable for the i th individual at the t th time period, α_i is a fixed constant varying across individuals, X_{it} is a K -vector of covariates and U_{it} is an error term with zero mean and known variance, β represents the regression coefficient [30].

Sensitivity and Specificity Test

Sensitivity (also called the true positive rate) measures the proportion of actual positives which are correctly identified as such and is complementary to the false negative rate while Specificity (also called the true negative rate) measures the proportion of negatives which are correctly identified as such and is complementary to the false positive rate.

Collinearity Test

Collinearity can mainly be detected with the help of tolerance and its reciprocal, called variance inflation factor (VIF). The tolerance is the percentage of the variance in each predictor that cannot be explained by the other predictors. Tolerance close to 1 indicates that there is no collinearity, whereas a value close to zero suggests that collinearity may be a threat. There is no formal cutoff value with tolerance for determining presence of collinearity [31]. However, [32] suggests that a tolerance value below 0.1 indicates serious collinearity problem and [33] suggests that a tolerance value less than 0.2 indicates a potential collinearity problem. As a rule of thumb, a tolerance of 0.1 or less is a cause for concern.

Model Specification

In this study we specify econometric models as seen in previous related studies of [34]. However, we adopt the model of [35] employed for samples obtained from commercial banks of Kazakhstan and modified it to suit the hypotheses of this study. The adopted model is represented as

$$csr_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 bsize_{it} + \beta_2 bind_{it} + \beta_3 bgd_{it} + \mu_{it} \dots \dots \dots (1)$$

Where,

- CSR = Corporate Social Responsibility
- BSIZE = Board Size
- BIND = Board Independence
- BGD = Board Gender Diversity

We modified the above model to suit the hypotheses of this study by including the variable of board ownership (bown)

CSR Reporting Unmoderated Model Specification

$$csrd_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 bsize_{it} + \beta_2 bind_{it} + \beta_3 bgd_{it} + \beta_4 bown_{it} + \mu_{it} \dots \dots \dots (2)$$

Furthermore, we introduce the moderator variable (interaction term) "CEO Educational Qualification" to access its moderating effect on the relationship between corporate governance attributes and CSR reporting in Nigeria

CSR Reporting Moderated Model Specification

$$csrd_{it} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 bsize_{it} + \beta_2 bind_{it} + \beta_3 bgd_{it} + \beta_4 bown_{it} + \beta_5 bsize_{it} * CEOEDUQ + \beta_6 bind_{it} * CEOEDUQ + \beta_7 bgd_{it} * CEOEDUQ + \beta_8 bown_{it} * CEOEDUQ + \mu_{it} \dots \dots \dots (3)$$

Where,

- CSRD = Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting

© Helenna and Eno

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

BFSIZE = Board Size

BIND = Board Independence

BGD = Board Gender Diversity

BOWN = Board Ownership

CEOEDUQ = CEO Educational Qualification

β_s to β_7 are interaction terms obtained between CEO Educational Qualification and board size (β_s) board independence (β_6) board gender diversity (β_7) and managerial ownership (β_8)

i = ith firm

t= time

Table 1:Variable Definition Measurement and Source

Variable	Definition	Measurement	Source	Aprori sign
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting	CSR reporting in dummy (1,0) is measured as "1" for firms that have a section in the Annual Reports for social responsibility or Community activities and "0" otherwise	Welback,Owusu, Bekoe&Kusi, (2017), Javeed &Lefen (2019)	
BGD	Board Gender Diversity	Ratio of female to total board size of seating directors	Becchetti&Ciciretti (2006).	+
BOWN	Board Ownership	Computed as directors direct and indirect shares divided by outstanding shares.	Howard (2008)	+
BDSIZE	Board size	Number of Directors on the Board	Dakhlalh et al (2019)	+
BDIND	Board Independence	Number of Non-Executive Directors on the Board	Ghosh, & Ansari, (2018)	+
CEOEDUQ	CEO-Educational Qualification	Measured as a scale variable of 1 = B.Sc, 2 = M.Sc and 3 = Ph.D	Kor, (2006)	+/-

Source: Author's Computation 2021

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Data Presentation

The study evaluates the moderating effect of CEO educational qualification on the relationship between corporate governance attributes and CSR reporting of listed non-finance firms in Nigeria. The scope of this study covers a 10year period ranging from 2011 to 2020.

Table 2 Summary of Descriptive Statistics for Variables of the Study

	N	Mean		Minimum	Maximum	Std. Deviation
	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic
CSR	73	1.3699	.05689	1.00	2.00	.48611
BGD	73	2.5205	.09578	1.00	4.00	.81836
BOWN	73	1.9452	.08916	1.00	3.00	.76177
BDSIZE	73	8.2329	.11124	7.00	10.00	.95045
BDIND	73	2.4384	.12180	1.00	4.00	1.04065
CEOEDUQ	73	2.0959	.08082	1.00	3.00	.69050
Valid N (listwise)	73					

The result of the descriptive statistics could be referred to on Table 2. The descriptive statistics describes some of the basic statistics for all the variables of the study. The table highlighted some of the basic statistics about the data which include the mean, maximum, and minimum values for each of the variables. The maximum value for board gender diversity (BGD) is 4, while the minimum is 1 and an average (Mean) value

© Helenna and Eno

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

of 3. The Mean (average value) of Board ownership (BOWN) is 1.94 (2), with a minimum and maximum values of 1 and 3 respectively. For board size, (BDSIZE), the average board size is 8, with a minimum and maximum values of 7 and 10 respectively. For Board Independence (BDIND), the average number of non-executive directors in the board is 2, with a minimum of 1 and maximum of 4.

Table 3: Descriptive Analysis of CEO Educational Qualification

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	BSC	14	18.7	19.2	19.2
	MSC	38	50.7	52.1	71.2
	PHD	21	28.0	28.8	100.0
	Total	73	97.3	100.0	
Missing	System	2	2.7		
Total		75	100.0		

The CEO educational qualification has 14 CEOs with BSc, 38 had masters and 21 had PhD.

Table 4 : Correlation Matrix for Relationship among Variables

		CSRD	BDSIZE	BDIND	BGD	BOWN	CEOEDUQ
CSRD	Pearson Correlation	1					
	Sig. (2-tailed)						
	N	73					
BDSIZE	Pearson Correlation	.115	1				
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.333					
	N	73	73				
BDIND	Pearson Correlation	.096	.077	1			
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.421	.520				
	N	73	73	73			
BGD	Pearson Correlation	.181	.229	.370**	1		
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.126	.052	.001			
	N	73	73	73	73		
BOWN	Pearson Correlation	.257*	.152	.188	.207	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.028	.199	.110	.079		
	N	73	73	73	73	73	
CEOEDUQ	Pearson Correlation	.393**	.435**	.075	.361**	.475**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.000	.529	.002	.000	
	N	73	73	73	73	73	73

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4. highlights the correlation among the variables using the Pearson correlation technique. The table shows that there is a weak positive correlation between Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure (CSRD) and Board size (BDSIZE) (0.115). The correlation index between CSRD and board independence (BDIND) is 0.096. CSRD and Board gender diversity (BGD) has a correlation index of 181 indicating a low very low relationship. The result also showed low positive relationship between CEO educational qualification (CEOEDUQ) and CSRD (0.393).

© Helenna and Eno

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Multicollinearity Test

The study tested for multicollinearity to detect whether there is a strong or perfect correlation among the independent variables. The presence of multicollinearity can affect the regression output and lead to the wrong conclusion. The study used the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance to detect the presence of multicollinearity.

Table 5 : Summary of Variance Inflation Factor (VIF)

Model	Collinearity Statistics	
	Tolerance	VIF
1		
(Constant)		
BGD	.848	1.179
BOWN	.588	1.700
BDSIZE	.636	1.572
BDIND	.930	1.076
CEOEDUQ	.433	2.307

a. Dependent Variable: CSR

Table 5 shows that the VIF values of all the independent variables are greater than one and less than 10, which implies the absence of multicollinearity. In Like manner, tolerance values which are greater than 0 but less than one shows there is no multicollinearity problem. The intercorrelations for all the explanatory variables have been examined by applying the variance inflation factors (VIF) analysis, which revealed no sign of multicollinearity. The highest reported VIF value is 2.307 for the CEOEDUQ variable, and the lowest is 1.076 for BDIND. When a VIF value exceeds 10, it indicates a potential multicollinearity problem. These findings are deemed statistically appropriate, demonstrating that there is no multicollinearity.

Ho₁: There is no significant relationship between board independence and corporate social responsibility reporting of non-financial firms in Nigeria.

Table 6: Summary of Regression Analysis for relationship between board independence and corporate social responsibility reporting of non-financial firms

		Coefficient (β)	S.E.	Wald	R Square	Sig.	Exp(B)
Step 1 ^a	BDIND	.226	.277	.662		.001	.798
	Constant	1.836	.768	5.719	0.09	.017	6.269

Wald $\chi^2(9)$ 0.671 significant @ p.001

Table 6 shows that board independence (BDIND) has a β value of .226. This indicates that every unit rise in board independence will most likely increase corporate social responsibility reporting by .226. The result also shows that that Nagelkerke R Square value is .09 indicating 9% changes in corporate social responsibility reporting is as a result of board independence. The result shows that the probability value is .001 ($p < .05_{.001}$), indicating that the result is statistically significant. Thus, there is a significant relationship between board independence and corporate social responsibility reporting of non-financial firms in Nigeria.

DISCUSSION

From the unmoderated regression analyses we find from the equation depicting the relationship between board independence and CSR reporting that increasing the level of board independence has no statistically significant tendency of improving CSR reporting, and aligns with the findings obtained by [35] in Malaysia, [36] in [37] in Bangladesh [38] in Iran and [39] in Ghana who found a non- significant relationship between board independence and CSR reporting . However, we see clearly that the interaction effect of CEO educational qualification enhances the outcome of the relationship with strong supports for the Upper Echelon Theory which suggest that values, beliefs, and thinking patterns of upper-level management may influence corporate decisions (in this study the need to disclose CSR activities). Therefore, a policy mix that

© Helenna and Eno

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

will result in higher board independence together with appointing CEO with high educational qualification will likely promote CSR reporting. This result is consistent with those of [40] who contended that CEOs with high education and knowledge levels make decisions, bear considerable risks, and implement proactive management which could include increased reporting of CSR activities. They also noted that CEOs with master's in business administration (MBA) are more inclined to adopt different corporate governance measures (including CSR reporting) than those without an MBA degree. The authors also argue that CEOs with MBA is most likely to actively participate in international strategies of a firm.

CONCLUSION

Board independence has no statistically significant likelihood relationship with corporate social responsibility reporting of listed non-finance firms in Nigeria during the period under study.

REFERENCES

1. Ali, M. A. M., &Atan, R. (2013). The relationship between corporate governance and corporate social responsibility reporting: a case of high Malaysian sustainability firms and global sustainability firms. *Economics and Law*, 3(1), 39-48.
2. Al-Janadi, Y., Rahman, R. A., & Omar, N. H. (2013). Corporate governance mechanisms and voluntary reporting in Saudi Arabia. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 4(4).
3. Aras, G., & Crowther, D. (2008). Governance and sustainability: An investigation into the relationship between corporate governance and corporate sustainability. *Management Decision*.
4. Arcay, M. R. B., & Vazquez, M. F. M. (2015). Corporate characteristics, governance rules and the extent of voluntary reporting in Spain. *Advances in Accounting*, 21, 299-331.
5. Arcay, R., Vazquez, F., 2005. Corporate *characteristics, governance rules and the extent of voluntary reporting in Spain. *Advances in Accounting*, 21: 299-331.
6. Arun, T. G., & Turner, J. D. (2002). Financial sector reforms in developing countries: The Indian experience. *World Economy*, 25(3), 429-445.
7. Aslam, S., Makki, M. A. M., Mahmood, S., & Amin, S. (2017). Gender diversity and managerial ownership response to corporate social responsibility initiatives: Empirical Evidence from Australia. *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, 12(2).
8. Audit Commission. (2009). Are we being served? For the first time all public services to be held to account in one place. [press release]. London: Audit Commission.
9. Baghi, I., Rubaltelli, E., & Tedeschi, M. (2009). A strategy to communicate corporate social responsibility: Cause related marketing and its dark side. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 16(1), 15-26.
10. Baklouti, N., Gautier, F., & Affes, H. (2016). Corporate governance and financial distress of European commercial banks. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 7(3), 75.
11. Bamber, L. S., Jiang, J., & Wang, I. Y. (2011). What's my style? The influence of top managers on voluntary corporate financial reporting. *Accounting Review*, 85(4), 1131-1162.
12. Bandara, P. M. (2016). Corporate Social Responsibility Reporting Practices in Papua New Guinea. *Advances in Economics and Business*, 4(4), 63-75.
13. Bansal, S., Lopez-Perez, M. V., & Rodriguez-Ariza, L. (2018). Board independence and corporate social responsibility reporting: The mediating role of the presence of family ownership. *Administrative Sciences*, 8(3), 33.
14. Bear, S., Rahman, N., & Post, C. (2010). The impact of board diversity and gender composition on corporate social responsibility and firm reputation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 97(2), 207-221.
15. Becchetti, L., & Ciciretti, R. (2006). Is There a Cooperative Bank Difference? Available at SSRN 3305898.
16. Belal, A. R., & Cooper, S. (2011). The absence of corporate social responsibility reporting in Bangladesh. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 22(7), 654-667.
17. Bera, A. K., and Jarque, C. M. 1982. "Model specification tests: A simultaneous approach." *Journal of Econometrics* 20: 59-82.
18. Bernardi, R. A., & Threadgill, V. H. (2011). Women directors and corporate social responsibility. *EJBO: Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organizational Studies*. 21, 299-331.
19. Borkowski, S. C. & Ugras, Y. J. (1998). "Business students and ethics: A meta-analysis", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17, 1117-1127
20. Brin, P. V., & Nehme, M. N. (2018). Corporate and governmental social responsibility: Possible approaches to unemployment reduction. *Бизнес-навигатор*, (2-2), 71-75.
21. Cadbury, S. A. (2000). The corporate governance agenda. *Corporate Governance: An International Review*, 8(1), 7-15.

22. Cadbury, C. (1992). *The Report of the Committee on the Financial Aspects of Corporate Governance*. Gee, London.
23. Carroll, A. B., & Shabana, K. M. (2010). The business case for corporate social responsibility: A review of concepts, research, and practice. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 12(1), 85-105.
24. Chabowski, B., Mena, J., & Gonzalez-Padron, T. (2011). The structure of sustainability research in marketing, 1958-2008: A basis for future research opportunities. Official *Publication of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 39(1), 55-70.
25. Chapple, W., & Moon, J. (2005). Corporate social responsibility (CSR) in Asia: A seven-country study of CSR web site reporting. *Business & Society*, 44(4), 415-441.
26. Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy and the Society of Local Authority Chief Executives, (2007), *Corporate governance in local government: a keystone for community governance*, Chartered Institute of Public Finance and Accountancy and the Society of Local Authority Chief Executive
27. Engardio, P. (2007). Beyond the green corporation: Moving away from platitudes to strategies that help world and bottom line. *Business Week*.
28. European Commission (2011). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the regions. A renewed EU strategy 2011-14 for Corporate Social Responsibility
29. Fama, E. F., & Jensen, M. C. (1983). Separation of ownership and control. *Journal of Law and Economics*, 26: 301-325.
30. Fasanya, I.O., & Onakoya, A. B. O. (2013). Does corporate social responsibility improve financial performance of Nigerian firms? Empirical evidence from triangulation analysis. *Acta Universitatis Danubius*, 9 (3), 22-36.
31. Fernandez-Feijoo, B., Romero, S., & Ruiz, S. (2012). Does board gender composition affect corporate social responsibility reporting? *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(1), 31-38.
32. Giannarakis, G. (2014). The determinants influencing the extent of CSR reporting. *International Journal of Law and Management*. 37(1), 39-67.
33. Gnanaweera, K. A. K., & Kunori, N. (2018). Corporate sustainability reporting: Linkage of corporate reporting information and performance indicators. *Cogent Business & Management*, 5(1), 1423872.
34. Johnson, J. L., Ellstrand, A. E., Dalton, D. R., & Dalton, C. M. (2005). The influence of the financial press on stockholder wealth: The case of corporate governance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(5), 461-471.
35. Johnson, R. A., & Greening, D. W. (1999). The effects of corporate governance and institutional ownership types on corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42(5), 564-576.
36. Kabir, T.H. & Mohammed, I. (2020). The moderating effect of corporate governance on the relationship Between corporate social responsibility and financial performance of Listed non-financial services companies in Nigeria. *International Journal of Accounting & Finance (IJAF)*, 9(1):69-89.
37. Khan, H. U. Z. (2010). The effect of corporate governance elements on corporate social responsibility (CSR) reporting: Empirical evidence from private commercial banks of Bangladesh. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 52(2), 82-109.
38. Khan, T. M., Gang, B., Fareed, Z., & Yasmeen, R. (2020). The impact of CEO tenure on corporate social and environmental performance: an emerging country's analysis. *Environmental Science & Pollution Research*, 27(16).
39. Kor, Y. Y. (2006). Direct and interaction effects of top management team and board compositions on R&D investment strategy. *Strategic Management Journal*, 27(11), 1081-1099.
40. KPMG (2011a). Corporate Sustainability – A progress report; Pdf from Website: Corporate Sustainability: A progress report – KPMG – GLOBAL

Helenna Akpandem and Eno Ukpong (2023). The relationship that exist between board independence and corporate social responsibility reporting of listed non-financial firms in Nigeria. NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT ISSUES IN ARTS AND MANAGEMENT (NIJCIAM) 3(1):22-31.