

A survey of shareholders' requirements for corporate social and environmental disclosures in Nigeria

James Osabuohien ODIA¹

Abstract: The paper examines shareholders' requirement of corporate social and environmental disclosures (CSED) in Nigeria based on the survey of individual shareholders. It was found that less than half of the respondents (about 47%) depend on social and environment disclosures for their investment decision; and more female shareholders require CSED than the males for investment decisions. It was observed gender differences in the concerns for CSED. The regression result reveals that investment and gender has negative association with CSED. Specifically, shareholders' concern for CSED is due to the need to know company's environmental management policies, employee welfare and growth, accountability and stewardship of company's resources. Moreover, the main reasons for companies' CSED was to show their compliance with social and environmental standard and the board of directors, managing director, chairman of the board and institutional shareholders have the greatest influence on CSED in Nigeria. The result has important implications for corporate social reporting by companies, shareholders' investment decision making and accounting regulatory bodies in Nigeria.

Keywords: corporate social and environmental disclosures, shareholders opinions, gender.

1 Introduction

Corporate social and environmental reporting has received attention in recent years as a part of sustainable development process across the world (Uwalomwa & Uadiale, 2011). Although, there is low level of social and environmental disclosures by companies in Nigeria (Odia, 2013) and other developing countries compared to the developed countries (Chambers et al,2003), probably due to the relatively weak institutions, standards and appeal systems (Kemp,2001),more companies are disclosing social and environmental information (O'Dwyer & Owen,2005, KPMG,2008).Until the late 1980s, there was no great need for environmental disclosure (Solomon & Solomon, 2006).But, investors started attaching increasing importance to environmental information from the 1990s because it is material to their decision-making (Epstein & Freedman,1994,Goodwin, Goodwin & Konieczny,1996, Deegan & Rankin,1997, Neu et al, 1998, Milne & Pattern, 2002, De Villiers & Van Staden,2010). Solomon & Solomon (2006) find institutional investors are regarding increasingly social, ethical and environmental information because they are relevant for decision making.The capital market participants and other users of annual reports are also interested in CSED (Stratos,2004) in their decision-making process (Deegan & Rankin,1997). However, Odia (2009) examines the relationship between stock price and corporate social responsibility disclosures by listed companies in Nigeria. The result indicates that the

¹ odijames@yahoo.com

capital market and market participants have less interest on CSR information in determination of stock prices. It is not clear whether shareholders in Nigeria are interested in CSED during their investment decision making. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to find out shareholders' requirements for corporate social and environmental disclosures in Nigeria. The research questions are:

1. Do the shareholders' require social and environmental information for their investment decision- makings?
2. Are there shareholders' concerns for social and environmental information in Nigeria?
3. What is the extent of corporate social and environmental disclosures?
4. What are the shareholders' reasons for corporate social and environmental disclosures?
5. Which stakeholders had influences on corporate social and environmental disclosures?
- 6: Do shareholders' characteristics such as age, education, marital status, place of residence and investment profile affect their need for social and environmental disclosures?

The rest of the paper is divided into four sections. Section two is the review of relevant literature. Section three is the methodology adopted in the study and the regression model. Section four is the data analysis and discussion of research findings. Section five is the conclusion

Literature Review

Previously it was observed that institutional shareholders and analysts do not to require environmental disclosures (Solomon & Solomon, 2006). But now, there is much interest by these stakeholders in many countries for this information (De Villiers et al, 2010). Analysts and individual shareholders are found to react to good and bad environmental information (Chan & Milne, 1999). The management were found to consider the interests of shareholders, legislators and regulators in their environmental decision-making process. Rockness & Williams (1998) survey directors of ethical mutual funds and find a strong demand for many types of social information. Deegan & Rankin (1997) survey various classes of annual report users in Australia and find that 72% of the shareholders consider environmental information to be material in their decision-making processes. In a New Zealand survey, Godwin et al (1996) find that shareholders require seven environmental information. Epstein & Freedman (1994) show that the economic impact of social and environmental disclosures is important to respondents. Also it was found that CSED has potential economic significance and useful for investment decision-making by financial stakeholders (Cormier et al, 2005, De Villiers, et al, 2010).

De Villiers, et al (2010) find the shareholders want environmental information in US, UK and Australia but observe country and gender differences with respect to Australian and female respondents requirement

for environmental disclosures. Moreover, females have higher concern regarding environmental issues (Davidson & Freudenburg 1996) and hold stronger attitudes towards environmental quality than males (Diamantopoulos et al, 2003). Generally, there are differences in attitudes of males and females towards the norm of social responsibility (Schopler & Bateson,1965).A positive and significant relation is found between education qualification and environmental consciousness (Diamantopoulos et al,2003).But Samdahl & Robertson (1989) find that the level of education was negatively correlated with environmental attitudes whereas Serwinek (1992) finds no significant relationship. There are mixed results regarding place of residence. For instance, Samdahl & Robertson (1989) find that urban residents show higher concern for the environment than rural residents whereas Arcury & Christianson (1993) and Harmon & Adelman (2007) find no difference among rural, urban and suburban residents. Younger people are found to be more sensitive and knowledgeable about environmental issues (Serwinek,1992,Zimmer et al 1994, Diamantopoulos et al,2003) conclude that younger people are more knowledgeable about environmental issues. Harry et al (1969) find older people have more concerned for the environment.

The increasing motivations for disclosure of corporate social and environmental disclosure are due to: globalization of the activities of multinational companies,non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society activists and pressures (from investors) to obtain a clearer picture of corporate social, environmental and economic performances (Roberts,1992, Patten, 1992 & 2002, Deegan & Gordon,1996, Deegan & Rankin, 1997, Buhr, 2002).There is also the cries and campaign for sustainable development, pressures in global market forces, increased ethical and moral concerns in business operations, corporate governance and ethical consumerism. Ernst & Young's (2002) study of 147 of the Global 1000 companies shows that majority of the key drivers of CSR are greater stakeholder awareness of corporate ethical, social and environmental behaviour, direct stakeholder pressures, investor pressures, peer pressures and an increased sense of social responsibility. Dixon, Mousa & Woodhead (2005) state the needs for environmental disclosures include: the increasing number of environmental regulations and pressure groups which are demanding for clean air, clean water and sustainable development. Owing to increasing pressures from the public, the process of communication of environmental and social issues is embarked upon by companies to make self-congratulating claims and to influence people's perception of the companies' image and reputation (Deegan & Rankin, 1999, Hooglienstra, 2000, Pattern 1992)..

2 Research hypotheses

Based on the literature review, the following hypotheses are stated:

1. There is significant differences between male and female shareholders on the requirement of corporate social and environmental disclosures for investment decision
2. There is significant differences between male and female shareholders on their concerns for social and environmental information
 - 3a There is significant difference between male and female shareholders on the extent of environmental disclosures
 - 3b: There is significant difference between male and female shareholders on the extent of social disclosures
4. The age of respondents has significant impact on the need for social and environmental disclosures
5. The place of residence of respondents impacts on their need for social and environmental disclosures
6. The level of education respondents has significant impact on the need for social and environmental disclosures
7. The marital status of respondents has significant impact on the need for social and environmental disclosures.

3 Methodology

The survey method was employed to seek the views of respondents for the study. Copies of questionnaire were administered to shareholders who comprised individual shareholders and members of Proactive Shareholders Associations. The respondents represent various occupations such as directors, CEOs, professors, managers, accountants, teachers, public servants, businessmen etc In order to gain the advantage of an in-depth study and effective coverage, samples for the survey was drawn using stratified random sampling from the six geopolitical zones in Nigeria based on the Cochran's (1977) correlation formula, which is:

$$\underline{n}_1 = \underline{n}_o / [1 + (\underline{n}_o / N)],$$

Where: \underline{n}_1 is the sample size, N is the population size and \underline{n}_o is the required return sample size, and

$$\underline{n}_o = (t)^2 * (s^2) / (d)^2$$

Where t is value of alpha level or 0.05%, s is the estimate of standard deviation and d is the acceptable margin of error (that is error the researcher is willing to accept, or 3%) . Given that the population of Nigeria was about 165 million in 2012, (with literacy rate of 72% gives a literate population (N) of) alpha level of 0.05% (1.96),s is number of rating scale/n-1 (5/5-1 or 1.25), d is 3% multiply by the rating point scale (3% x5).Therefore, the required returned rate (\underline{n}_o) will be 269 [(0.05²)(1.25²)/(0.15²)] and the minimum sample size (\underline{n}_1) will be : $\underline{n}_1 = 269 / \{1 + (269/165,000,000)\}$ or $\underline{n} = 268$

Due to the relatively low response rate envisage, a total of 500 hundred copies of the questionnaire were distributed in the six geopolitical zones in Nigeria [South-West (150), South-East (75), South-South (150), North-Central (75), North-West (50) and North-East (-)]. Of the 500 copies sent out to various respondents, 201 was returned and but only 182 questionnaires representing 36.4% were duly completed and used for the analysis. The construction of questionnaire follows O'

Dywer (2002), Doonan et al (2005), Panwaar et al (2010) and Wagner (2011). The questionnaire was divided into two parts. Part one comprised personal information about the shareholders such as: State, occupation, number of companies with investment, sex, marital status, age, education and residential area whereas Part two dwells on the extent, reasons and influence of stakeholders on CSED. Most of the questions in part two follow the likert scale of five-point ranking scale. The independent t-test is used to test significant differences between males and females. The ordinary least square was used to test the association between the dependent and independent variables.

The regression model is:

CSEDR = f (Age 50+, Investments, Residence, Gender, Education, Marital status)

Where: CSEDR: Corporate social and environmental disclosure requirements

Age: Over 50 =1, otherwise 0

Investment: Above 10 companies =1, otherwise 0

Residence: Rural & Sub-urban =0, Urban =1

Education: Elementary and Primary=0, Secondary=1, Graduate and Post-graduate=2

Marital status- Married 1 otherwise 0.

4 Data analysis

This section contains the presentation and analysis of responses obtained from the questionnaire. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics of the respondents.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of the respondents

	Shareholders	
	No	(%)
Regions		
North-East	-	
North-West	13	7.2
North-Central	15	8.3
South-East	25	13.7
South-West	79	43.4
South-South	50	27.4
Total	182	100%
Gender		
Male	94	51.6
Female	88	48.4
Total	182	100%
Marital Status		
Single	35	19.2
Married	134	73.7
Divorce	7	3.8
Separated	6	3.3
Total	182	100%
Age (Years)		
Below 20	3	1.6
20-30	32	17.6
31-40	61	33.5
41-50	49	26.9
Above 50	37	20.4
Total	182	100%
Educational Qualifications		
Elementary	3	1.6
Primary	6	3.2
Secondary	43	23.6
Graduate	84	46.2
Post Graduate	46	25.4

Total	182	100%
Place of Residence		
Rural	29	16
Sub-urban	34	19
Urban	119	65
Total	182	100%
Category of Respondents		
Shareholders' groups/ associations	82	45.1
Individual investors	100	54.9
Total	182	100%
Companies with investment		
Less than 10	129	70.8
Above 10	53	29.2
Total	182	100%
Investment decisions		
By Self	129	70.8
Reliance on Others	53	29.2
Total	182	100%

Source: Field survey (2012)

The marital status composition of respondents reveals the single are 35 (19.2%), married are 134 (73.7%), divorced are 7 (3.8%) and separated are 6 (3.3%). Regarding the age structure, the respondents below 20 years are 3 (1.6%), 20-30 years (17.6%), 31-40 years (33.5%), 41-50 years (26.9%) and above 50 years (20.4%). As regards the highest educational qualifications of the respondents, the bulk of the respondents are graduates 84 (46.2%) and post graduate degree holders 46 (25.4%). Those with elementary qualification are 3 (1.6%), primary are 6 (3.2%) and secondary are 43 (23.6%). The place of residence indicates that more than half of the respondents or 119 (65 %) resides in urban areas whereas 29 (16%) resides in rural areas and 34 (19%) resides in sub-urban areas. The analysis of the category of respondents indicates that 82 (45.1%) were members of shareholders association unlike 100 (54.9%) who are free lance investors. About 129 (70.8%) of the respondents make investment decisions by themselves compare to 53 (29.25%) respondents who rely on others. Gender-wise, about 78% male respondents make investment decisions by themselves compare to 72% of the female respondents, while 22% male respondents against 28% female respondents depend on others for their investment decision making. Nevertheless there is no significant mean difference between male and female respondents of shareholders in their mode of investment decisions (see table 9).

4.1 Discussion of Results

4.1.1. Corporate social and environmental disclosures for investment decisions

From table 2, it was observed that less than half of the respondents (about 47%) require corporate social and environmental disclosures for their investment decisions. A comparison of the mean for male (1.37) and female (1.48) shows that more female shareholders depend on CSED for their investment decisions. This result agrees with Davidson & Freudenburg (1996) Diamantopoulos et al (2003) and De Villiers et al (2010)

Table 2 : Dependence on CSED for investment decisions

	Statement	Mean	Std Dev	Yes	No
1	Dependence on CSED for investment decision	1.48	0.63	47%	50%

Source: Field survey (2012)

4.1.2. Shareholders' concerns for social and environmental information

From table 3, the shareholders agree environmental information should be disclosed by companies to defend their environmental management policies such as pollution control and wastage management (87.1%), assess employees' welfare and growth (86.42%), environmental degradation (76.2%), accountability and environmental stewardship of companies (74.6%) and climate change (67.7%). Specifically, 73.2% shows concerns for CSED because it is material for financial decisions. In terms of mean ranking, the three top-most shareholders need of social and environmental information are: employees' welfare and growth (4.02), defense of environmental management (3.91) and, accountability and environmental stewardship of companies (3.81). The least shareholders' concern which is attributable to climate change (3.65) indicates that the shareholders do not pay particular attention to the activities of corporations as contributing to climate change. Moreover, giving the t-value of 2.915, $p=0.004$, Hypothesis 2 shows that there is a significant difference between male and female shareholders on their concerns for environmental information. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected (see table 9)

Table 3 Shareholders' concern for company's social and environmental information

	Statement	Mean*	Std Dev	Disagree (1 &2)	Agree (4&5)	Mean Ranking
	Companies should disclose environmental information because					
1	Material for financial decisions	3.79	1.04	9.6%	73.2%	4
2	Defense of environmental management by companies	3.91	0.89	8.1%	87.1%	2
3	Accountability and environmental stewardship of companies	3.81	1.01	12.2%	74.6%	3
4	Climate change	3.64	1.06	17.2%	67.7%	7
5	Environmental degradation	3.79	1.03	13.8%	76.2%	4
6	Employees welfare and growth	4.02	0.96	8.6%	86.42%	1
7	Employment of disabled, minorities and women	3.65	0.99	13.6%	65.7%	6

*Mean Values-Scoring: 1= Strongly disagree; 3= Uncertain; 5= Strongly agree

Source: Field survey (2012)

A comparison with other studies in other countries reveals that more than 60% of the respondent require environmental information in the US, UK and Australia (De Villiers,2010)

	Items	Study	Country	
1	Requirement for environmental information	Deegan & Rankin (1997)	Australia	72%
		De Villiers et al (2010)	US, UK & Australia	Over 60%
2	Requirement for social and environmental information	Our study	Nigeria	47%

4.1.3 The extent of corporate social and environmental disclosures

4.1.3.1. Social disclosures

From table 5, the respondents believed that the social disclosures by companies are mostly on community development, products, and employees. Over 70% of the

respondents agree to the disclosure of all social information. However, the social disclosures with 80% agreement are: employees training and development (79.9%), product development (81.6%), product quality (82%), product safety (83%) and community development (84%). The five most social disclosures by the mean score, are sponsoring community projects (4.07), product quality and improvement (4.04), product safety (4.02), product development (4.01), employee training and development (3.78). The least social disclosures are categories, location of customers (3.65) and employment of disabled, minorities as well as provision of opportunity for them (3.56).

Table 5: Perceptions of respondents on the extent of corporate social disclosures

	Social Disclosures	Mean	Std Dev	Disagree (1 & 2)	Agree (4 & 5)	Ranking
1	Employees Health and safety	3.79	1.28	19.9%	77.1%	8
2	Employees training and development	3.93	1.14	14.5 %	79.9%	5
3	Employment of disabled, minorities and equal opportunity for them	3.56	1.12	18%	61%	15
4	Employees remuneration	3.76	1.17	16%	72%	11
5	Employees benefits, motivation & advancement	3.78	1.24	18%	74%	9
6	Donations to community	3.74	1.02	13%	68%	13
7	Sponsor community projects & infrastructures-educational, public healthcare water etc	4.07	0.93	7.5%	84%	1
8	Assist in community security & fighting crimes	3.82	1.08	13%	69%	7
9	Funding scholarship programmes	3.75	1.07	14%	72%	12
10	Aid & sponsor research in universities, colleges	3.78	1.04	11%	72 %	9
11	Product quality & improvements	4.04	0.93	8%	82%	2
12	Product development including R&D on product	4.01	0.93	9.6%	81.6%	4
13	Product safety	4.02	0.95	7%	83%	3
14	Product Awards e.g. ISO 9000	3.83	1.06	12%	73%	6
15	Categories ,locations of customers	3.65	1.01	16.4%	69.1%	14

Mean Values-Scoring: 1= Strongly disagree; 3= Uncertain; 5= Strongly agree

Source: Field survey (2012)

4.1.3.2. Environmental disclosures

In table 6, the five most environmental disclosures based on the mean ranking are: compliance with environmental laws and regulations (4.03), environmental pollution and control policy (3.84), environmental impact assessment (3.82), waste prevention (3.78) and beautification of the environment (3.74). The least environmental disclosures are energy policies (3.61), energy use and conservation (3.65) and awards receive for environmental management (3.66). The environmental disclosures above 70% agreement by the respondents include: environmental beautification, waste prevention, environmental audit (71%), environmental pollution and control policy (75.5%), environmental impact assessment (77%) and compliance with environmental regulation (82%).

Table 6. Perceptions of respondents on the extent of environmental disclosures

	Environmental Disclosures	Mean	Std Dev	Disagree (1 & 2)	Agree (4 & 5)	Ranking
1	Environmental pollution and control policy	3.84	1.02	11.1%	75.8%	2
2	Compliance with environmental laws and regulations	4.03	0.94	7%	82%	1
3	Materials recycling & conservation of resources	3.69	1.14	16%	68%	7
4	Waste prevention	3.78	1.01	12%	71%	4
5	Beautification of the environment	3.74	1.06	13%	70%	5
6	Environmental impact assessment	3.82	1.03	12%	77%	3

7	Environmental audit	3.71	1.03	12%	71%	6
8	Energy use & conservation	3.65	1.03	11%	67%	10
9	Energy policies	3.61	1.04	13.5%	66.7%	11
10	Awards receive for environmental management e.g. ISO 14001	3.66	1.10	14.7%	64.5%	9
11	Environmental risk	3.68	1.14	15.2%	69.2%	8

Mean Values-Scoring: 1= Strongly disagree; 3= Uncertain; 5= Strongly agree

Source: Field survey (2012)

4.1.4. Reasons for corporate social and environmental disclosures

From table 7, about 78.9% of the respondents agree that the main reason for CSED is to comply with social and environmental standards. This agrees with Haniffa & Cooke (2005) who argued that “corporate social disclosure is attributed mainly to government policy and it is used as a reactive legitimacy strategy to divert attention from questionable business practices, cronyism, nepotism and close affinity with the government and a proactive legitimacy strategy to ensure a continued influential voice in government and institutional levels”. Moreover, Deegan & Gordon (1996) and Chan & Kent (2003) provide evidence that environmentally sensitive industries provide more environmental disclosures possibly to deter government sanctions. Watts & Zimmerman (1978) argue that corporations use socially responsible activities to reduce the risk of governmental intrusions and sanctions.

Table 7: Reasons for disclosures on social and environmental activities

	Reasons for CSED	Mean	Std Dev	Disagree (1 & 2)	Agree (4&5)	Ranking
1	Enhance corporate image & for good corporate citizenship	3.76	0.99	12.9%	69.9%	4
2	Win awards- e.g. CSR ,ISO, NSE presidential awards etc	3.16	1.13	30.6%	45.4%	14
3	Bandwagon effect /Fashionable to do so	3.09	1.12	33.9%	42.1%	15
4	Obligation to community /accountability	3.58	1.11	19%	67%	7
5	Public awareness and concerns on CSED issues	3.84	0.95	11%	75%	2
6	Improve morale of employees	3.79	1.01	14.2%	72.6%	3
7	Appease ethical investors/seek credit for good deeds	3.64	1.02	15%	65%	6
8	Obtain funds from wider sources	3.37	1.08	20.9%	52.4%	11
9	Pressures from stakeholders	3.31	1.09	23%	48%	12
10	Lower political pressures	3.25	1.15	28.9%	48.5%	13
11	Competitors in the industry	3.46	1.14	23.7%	55.7%	9
12	Receive government support	3.46	1.14	24.4%	59.1%	9
13	Legitimize company's operation	3.68	1.01	14.9%	69.1%	5
14	Compliance with social and environmental standards	3.88	0.97	9.7%	78.5%	1
15	Avoid sanctions for non-compliance	3.47	1.25	23%	57.6%	8

Mean Values-Scoring: 1= Strongly disagree; 3= Uncertain; 5= Strongly agree.

Source: Field survey (2012)

The respondents believe that the second most important reason for corporate social and environmental disclosures is due to public awareness and concerns for CSED issues. The third and fourth reasons in table 7 are: to improve the morale of employees and enhance the company's image or reputation and portray them as good corporate citizen. It has been found that CSED help companies to improve their corporate reputation (Hooghiemstra,2000, Deegan et al., 2000,Gray et al. 1995, Adams et al. 1998, Patten,1992 and Deegan & Rankin,1996

&1999).However, the six least reasons for CSED are: bandwagon effect (3.09), win awards (3.16), lower political pressures (3.25), pressures from stakeholders (3.31), obtain funds from wider sources (3.37).

4.1.5 Stakeholders' influence on corporate social and environmental disclosures

Table 8 shows that the board of directors (62%) , managing director (61%), chairman of the board (59.5%) and institutional shareholders (58.6%) have the greatest influence on CSED and determine whether a company discloses or not, as well as the extent of corporate social and environmental disclosures. This finding confirms with Odia (2013) that the main locations or sections of the annual reports for the disclosure of CSED by Nigerian listed companies are mainly: the directors' report, managing director's statement of review, corporate social responsibility report and chairman's statement. The least influence is local community (2.94).

Table 8: Stakeholders' influence on corporate social and environmental disclosures

s/no	Parties	Mean	Std Dev	Little influence (2 & 3)	Much Influence (4 & 5)	Ranking
1	Finance Director /Chief Accountant	3.36	1.23	23%	49%	8
2	Chairman of the board of directors	3.56	1.33	20.5%	59.5%	2
3	Managing Director	3.52	1.25	19%	61%	3
4	External Auditor	3.22	1.29	26%	48%	10
5	Audit Committee	3.38	1.25	25%	56%	7
6	Board of directors	3.59	1.20	18%	62%	1
7	Committee on corporate social responsibility	3.35	1.15	22%	53%	9
8	Local community	2.94	1.17	35%	35%	15
9	Press/ local media	3.09	1.26	32%	46%	13
10	National legislators	3.12	1.18	27.2%	40.3%	12
11	NGOs & civil society	3.08	1.17	29%	39%	14
12	Public relations consultant	3.18	1.18	26.5%	45.5%	11
13	Company's shareholders	3.47	1.06	17%	53%	5
14	Institutional shareholders	3.52	1.10	16.8%	58.6%	3
15	Company's Creditors	3.44	1.18	22%	54.5%	6

Mean Values-Scoring: 1= No influence; 3= Little Influence 5= Very Much Influence
Source: Field survey (2012)

In particular, the company's shareholders and institutional investors have more influence on the company's CSED policy than the local community, NGOs, local media and legislators. Nevertheless, mandatory legislation on corporate social responsibility, increased agitations and pressures from civil societies and press on the negative impacts of a company's operations may force companies to begin or increase disclosures on their social and environmental activities.

4.2. Gender differences

Table 9 illustrates the differences between male and female respondents regarding their views on their mode of investment decision making, requirements of CSED for investment decisions, concerns for CSED, extent of environmental and social disclosures. There is convincing evidence that male respondents have significant and more concerns for social and environmental information ($p=0.004$) and environmental disclosures (0.001) than female respondents.

Table 9. Differences between male and female respondents' perceptions requirements of CSED for investment decisions, needs of CSED, environmental and social disclosures

	Male (mean)	Female (mean)	t-value	p-value
Mode of Investment decisions	1.21	1.28	0.986	0.326
Require CSED for Investment decisions (H1)	1.37	1.48	-1.502	0.135
Environmental and social information concerns (H2)	3.93	3.65	2.915	0.004
Environmental disclosures (H3a)	3.92	3.56	3.290	0.001
Social disclosures (H3b)	3.98	3.79	1.245	0.214

Moreover, the females depend more on others for investment decision than the males (0.326), have greater requirements of CSED for investment decision (0.135) and social disclosures (0.214) are insignificant. Thus, these results indicate that hypotheses H2 and H3a are supported while H1 and H3b are not supported.

4.3. Test of Hypotheses (H4-H7)

4.3.1 Correlation analysis

Table 10 shows the descriptive statistics and the correlation result. Only gender and investment in more than 10 companies are significant but negatively correlated with CSED. Age 50+ and place of residence and negative and insignificant correlated with CSED whereas marital status and level of education have insignificantly but positive correlation with CSED. Again the marital status is significant and positive correlated with investment, and the level of education is positive and significantly related to the place of residence. In other words, respondents who are graduate and post degree holders tend to live in urban areas and vice versa. Equally, the environmental and social disclosures are positive and significantly low correlation with CSED requirement indicates that if companies make these disclosures, they will be required at least minimally by the shareholders.

Table 10: Descriptive statistics and Correlation analysis

	Mean	Standard deviation	CSE D	Age50+	Investment > 10	Residence	Gender	Education	Marital status	Env discl	So c discl
CSED	3.79	0.656	1								
Age (50+)	0.20	0.403	-0.052	1							
Investment > 10	0.40	0.492	-0.178**	0.144	1						
Residence	0.66	0.476	-0.008	0.027	0.053	1					

Gender	1.5 2	0.53 0	-0.234 ***	0.044	0.125	-0.027	1				
Education	1.6 2	0.61 4	0.060	-0.054	-0.049	0.329 ***	-0.194 ***	1			
Marital status	0.8 2	0.38 7	0.076	0.107	0.188**	-0.083	0.034	-0.011	1		
Envdiscl	3.7 1	0.84 4	0.841 ***	0.000	-0.170**	-0.015	-0.253 ***	0.067	0.078	1	
Socdiscl	3.8 2	0.672	0.934 ***	-0.077	-0.167	-0.004	-0.195 ***	0.018	0.041	0.646 ***	1

Ignificant at the 1%,5% and 19% respectively

4.3.2. Regression Result

Table 11 shows the OLS regression result of the impact of age, investment, gender, education and marital status of the respondents on the CSED requirement.

Table 11. OLS regression results.

	CSED	ENV DISCL	SOCDISCL
Intercept	4.298*** (15.583)	4.269*** (12.551)	4.373*** (15.403)
Age Over 50+ = 1	-0.098 (-0.720)	-0.010 (-0.061)	-0.154 (-1.094)
Investment > 10 =1	-0.199* (-1.777)	-0.262* (-1.900)	-0.176 (-1.529)
Residence Urban=1	-0.001 (-.005)	0.020 (0.133)	0.010 (0.082)
Gender Mal	-0.299** (-2.938)	-0.392** (-3.119)	-0.252 (-2.409)
Education	-0.026 (-0.265)	0.000 (0.003)	-0.066 (-0.660)
Marital status Married =1	0.114 (0.803)	0.168 (0.960)	0.067 (0.459)
Adjusted R ²	0.053	0.061	0.031
F stat	2.442**	2.677***	1.828
DW stat	1.826	2.042	1.715

t-stat in parenthesis. * ** *** significant at 10%,5% and 1% respectively

The regression analysis was conducted using SPSS 20.0. The result in table 11 shows that investment and gender are significantly associated with CSED at the 10% and 5% level of significance respectively. Marital status is positive but insignificantly associated with CSED whereas education, age and place of residence have negative and insignificant association with CSED. The results indicate that respondents who are older, with investment in more than ten companies, higher educational qualification and live in urban area tend to require less CSED. Thus hypotheses H4, H5, H6 and H7 are not supported.

5 Conclusion

It can be concluded that most shareholders in Nigeria do require some social and environmental information for their investment decisions. Although male shareholders have more concerns for social and environmental information the

females were found to require more CSED in their investment decisions. Besides, there are significant impact of gender and investment on shareholders' requirement of CSED. The result agree with Villiers et al (2010) that gender affect the requirement for environmental disclosures.

The main reasons for corporate social and environmental disclosures are to: comply with social and environmental standards and regulations, enhance corporate image and promote good citizenship and due to heighten public awareness and concerns on social and environmental issues. The main influencing stakeholders of corporate social and environmental disclosures are the company's board of directors, managing director and the chairman. The local community seems to be the least influencing factor of corporate social and environmental disclosures. Given the importance of CSED to the shareholders, it is recommended that companies in Nigeria should increase the disclosure of social and environmental information in their annual reports.

Since only shareholders were involved in this study, further studies could investigate the opinions of other stakeholders on their requirement for corporate social and information.

6 References

- Adams, C.A., Hill, W.Y. and Roberts, C.B., Corporate social reporting practices in Western Europe: legitimating corporate behavior? *British Accounting Review*, 30, 1-21, 1998
- Arcury, T.A & Christianson, E.H., Rural and urban differences in environmental knowledge and action, *Journal of Environmental Education*, 25 (1), 19-25, 1993.
- Buhr, N. (2002). A structuration view on the initiation of environmental reports. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, 13, 17-38
- Chan, C. & Kent, P., Application of stakeholder theory to the quantity and quality of Australian voluntary corporate environmental disclosures. Paper presented to Accounting and Finance Association of Australia and New Zealand (AFAANZ), July, Brisbane. 2003
- Chan, C. C. C. & Milne, M. J. .Investor reaction to corporate environmental saints and sinners: An Experimental analysis. *Accounting and Business Research*, 29 (4), 265-279, 1999.
- Chambers, E., Chapple, W., Moon, J. & Sullivan, M., Corporate social responsibility in Asia: A seven country study of CSR website reporting. Research Paper Series, International Centre for Corporate Social Responsibility, 2003
- Cochrane, W.G., Sampling techniques (3rd ed.). New York, John Wiley & Sons, 1977
- Cormier, D., Magnan, M., Velthoven, B. V., Environmental disclosure quality in large German companies: Economic incentives, public pressures or institutional conditions? *European Accounting Review*, 14(1), 3-39 2005
- Davidson, D.J & Freudenburg, W.R. Gender and environmental risk concerns, *Environment and Behavior*, 28(3), 302-303, 1996
- Deegan, C., Introduction. The legitimizing effect of social and environmental disclosures- A theoretical foundation. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 282-311, 2002
- Deegan, C. & Gordon, B., A study of the environmental disclosure policies of Australian corporations. *Accounting and Business Research* 26(3) 187-199, 1996
- Deegan, C. & Rankin, M., Do Australian companies report environmental news objectively? An analysis of environmental disclosures by firms prosecuted successfully by the environmental protection authority. *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*, 9(2), 50-67, 1996

- Deegan, C. & Rankin, M., The materiality of environmental information to users of annual reports. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 10(4), 562-583, 1997
- Deegan, C. & Rankin, M., The environmental reporting expectations gap. Australian evidence. *British Accounting Review*, 31, 313-349, 1999
- De Villiers, C. & Van Staden, C.J., Shareholders' requirements for corporate environmental disclosures: Across country comparison. *The British Accounting Review*, doi 10.1016/j.bar.2010.08.002, 2010
- Diamantopoulos, A., A review of the evidence and an empirical investigation, *Journal of Business Research*, 56(6), 465-480, 2003.
- Dixon, R., Mousa, G.A. & Woodhead, A., The role of environmental initiatives in encouraging companies to engage in environmental reporting. *European Management Journal*, 23(6), 702-716, 2005
- Doonan, J., Lanoie, P. & Laplante, B., Determinants of environmental performance in the Canadian pulp and paper industry: An assessment from inside the industry. *Ecological Economics*, 55(1), 73-84 October, 2005
- Ernst and Young., *Corporate Social Responsibility: A Survey of Global Companies*. Ernst & Young, Environmental and Sustainability Services Group, Australia. 2002
- Epstein, M.J. & Freedman, M., Social disclosure and the individual investor. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 7(4), 94-109, 2004
- Goodwin D., Goodwin J. & Konieczny K., The voluntary disclosure of environmental information, a comparison of investor and company perceptions. *Accounting Research Journal*, 9(1), 29-39, 1996
- Guthrie, J. & Parker, L.D., Corporate social reporting: A rebuttal of legitimacy theory. *Accounting and Business Research*, 19 (76), 343-352, 1989
- Haniffa, R. M. & Cooke, T. E., The impact of culture and governance on corporate social reporting. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 24(5), 391-430, 2005
- Harmon, M. & Adelman, R., Environmental attitudes and residential location: are there differences across urban, suburban and rural residents, Paper Presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, New York 2007.
- Harry, J., Gale, R.P. & Hendee, J.C. Conservation: An upper-middle class social movement, *Journal of Leisure Research*, 1(2), 246-254, 1969
- Hooghiemstra, R., Corporate communication and impression-New perspectives why companies engaged in corporate social reporting. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 27, 55-68, 2000
- Kemp, M., Corporate Social Responsibility in Indonesia. quixotic dream or confident expectation? United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (UNRISD) & Technology, Business and Society Programme, Paper Number 6, December 2001.
- KPMG, KPMG international survey of corporate responsibility reporting 2008. KPMG Global Sustainability Services, 2008
- Milne, M.J. & Patten, D.M., Securing organizational legitimacy: An experimental decision case examining the impact of environmental disclosures. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 15(3), 372-405, 2002
- Neu, D., Warsame, H. & Pedwell, K., Managing public impression: Environmental disclosures in annual reports. *Accounting Organization and Society*, 23 (3), 265-282, 1998
- Odia, J.O., Corporate social responsibility and stock prices: An empirical analysis of Nigerian listed companies. *Management Sciences Review (MSR)*, 2(1&2) Jan/July, 74-87, 2009
- Odia, J.O., Corporate Social and environmental Disclosures in Nigeria. The Determinants and Consequences; PhD Thesis, University of Benin, 2013

- O'Dwyer, B., Managerial perceptions of corporate social disclosures. An Irish story. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal* 15 (3), 406-436, 2002
- Patten, D.M., Intra-industry disclosure in response to the Alaskan oil spill: A note on legitimacy theory. *Accounting, Organization and Society*, 17 (5), 471-75, 1992
- Patten, D. M., The Relation between Environmental Performance and Environmental Disclosure: A Research Note. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 27(8), 763-773, 2002
- Panwaar, R., Han, X & Hansen, E, A demographic examination of societal views regarding corporate social responsibility in the US forest products industry. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 12(2), 121-128 February, 2010
- Roberts, R.W., Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosure: An application of stakeholder theory. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 17 (6), 595-612, 1992
- Rockness, J. & Williams, P.F., A descriptive study of social accounting responsibility mutual funds. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 13(4), 397-411, 1988
- Samdahl, D.M & Robertson, R., Social determinants of environmental concern: specification and test of the model, *Environment and Behavior*, 21, 57-81, 1989
- Schopler, J & Bateson, N., The Power of Dependence, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 2, 247-254, 1965.
- Serwinek, P.J., Demographic and related difference in ethical views among small businesses, *Journal of Business Ethics* 11(7), 555-566, 1992
- Solomon, J.F. & Solomon, A., Private social, ethical and environmental disclosure. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 19(4), 564-591, 2006
- Uwalomwa, U. & Uadiale, O.M., Corporate social and environmental disclosure in Nigeria: A comparative study of the building material and brewery industry. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 6(2), 258-264, 2011
- Wagner, M., Corporate performance implications of extended stakeholder management: New insights on mediation and moderation effects. *Ecological Economics*, 70(5), 942-950, March, 2011
- Watts, R. & Zimmerman, J., Towards a positive theory of the determination of accounting standards. *Accounting Review*, January, 112-134, 1978
- Zimmer, M.R., Stafford, T.F. & Stafford, M.R., Green issues: dimensions of environmental concern, *Journal of Business Research*, 30(1), 63-74, 1994.