NATIONAL INNOVATION AND RESEARCH ACADEMIA
International Journal of Economics, Finance & Entrepreneurship (NIRA-IJEFE)
ISSN: 2713-4679. Volume 9, Issue 8. Pages 225-254. February, 2025
OTL: 6472-208-9-125-38-997-1
Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal
https://arcnjournals.org
arcnjournals@gmail.com

DETERMINANTS OF CORPORATE SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY OF LISTED DEPOSIT MONEY BANKS IN NIGERIA

Dr. Akaa Samuel Terzungwe
Department of Business Management, University of Calabar, Calabar -Nigeria
Professor P.I.Zayol
Department of Accounting, Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Makurdi-Nigeria
Dr. M.T. Soomyol
Department of Accounting, Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University Makurdi-Nigeria.

Abstract: *This study investigated the determinants of corporate social responsibility of listed deposit money banks in Nigeria. This study employed correlational research design with a view to assessing determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility of listed Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria. The population of the study comprises of 14 listed DMBs that have available data for the period under study on disclosure of CSR information. The study also used secondary data due to the high level of reliability obtainable from the use of quantitative data. The data, which are quantitative in nature, was extracted from the audited annual reports and accounts of the selected listed deposit money banks in Nigeria for the period, 2009-2016. This study used descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis for data analysis. The study found that there is significant relationship between leverage and corporate social responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. Since the relationship is negative, it can be concluded that use of leverage prevents banks from carrying out CSR activities. This can be attributed to interest payment obligations. The study also found that firm size significantly affects Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. It can therefore be concluded that larger banks will be more wary of their reputation and will invest into CSR activities more than smaller firms. Findings from the study also showed that firm growth significantly affects Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. Since the relationship is negative, it can be concluded that high growing banks will be confronted with investment opportunities that will deter them from carrying out CSR activities. Findings of the study revealed that dividend payout significantly affects Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. The relationship is however negative. The conclusion that can be drawn from this is that banks that pay dividends will have less funds for CSR activities. The study also found that profitability has significant relationship with Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. High profitability will enable banks to fulfil their financial obligations including CSR activities.The study recommends that regulatory authorities especially the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) should monitor levels of indebtedness to prevent them from maintaining high proportions of leverage that can affect their CSR activities.*

Key words: *Profitability, leverage, firm size, corporate social responsibility, tangibility, dividend payout.*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background to the Study

Business enterprises do not operate in a vacuum. In order to carry out their economic activities to earn profit, they consciously or unconsciously operate in an environment, which could be economic, socio-cultural, legal, and political. Their activities affect the environment in which they operate. This understanding has led to global clamor for business organizations to contribute towards some of the most pressing developmental needs of the environment in which they operate, for the sake of strategic sustainability of their operations and the environment. Consequently, business organizations around the world are saddled with a renewed role, which is to preserve the environment of their operations. Organizations have to be conscious of the effect of their activities on the environment. Based on this new trend, companies all over the world have come under intense pressure to be socially and environmentally responsible. Hence, every firm needs to focus attention on both increasing profitability and being a good corporate citizen. Keeping abreast of global trends on environmental consciousness and remaining committed to financial obligations to deliver both private and public benefits have forced organizations to reshape their frameworks, rules, and business models (Naser & Hassan, 2013). This has led to increasing attention on corporate social responsibility (CSR).

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a management concept that is used in relation to callings on companies to incorporate social and environmental concerns into their business operations. CSR refers to a business practice that involves participating in initiatives that benefit society without jeopardizing profitability (Lucyanda & Siagian, 2012). The concept of corporate social responsibility (CSR) has multidisciplinary underpinnings including sociology, philosophy, accounting, management, finance, law, and politics (Porter & Kramer, 2012 and Jones, 1995). It has also been subject of intense debate. In the debate on CSR, two broad schools of thought have been documented in literature, the classical or free market view and the socio-economic view. Contenders of the free-market view such as Levitt (1958), Friedman (1970) and Mackey and Mackey (2007) opine that it is not the job of businesses to be concerned about social issues. This argument is anchored on the contention that business has an only task to maximize profits and create wealth for shareholders. Therefore, it should not interfere in social problems, which is the responsibility of government.

Proponents of socio-economic theory argue that business is more than just an economic unit, rather, it is a part of complex structure, consisting of stakeholders such as consumers, suppliers, mass-media, unions, employees, and shareholders (Caroll, 1979). As a result, there is need for a business to help the society, in carrying out various social programs and cooperate with the government (Freeman, 1984; Jones, 1995; Caroll, 1979 and Detomasi, 2008). Companies are social creations whose sustainability is contingent on willingness of society to provide adequate resources. Companies often provide sustainable economic benefit to the society; in return, the society supplies them with numerous critical resources such as qualified employees, natural resources, infrastructures, and customers. Therefore, they are under obligation to perform various socially desired actions in return for their acceptance by the society.

In advanced countries, CSR has become a core issue that government regulations, society pressure groups and green consumer pressures tie the potential of organizations to survive with the extent of their compliance with CSR. This notwithstanding, the level of consciousness of stakeholders on issues regarding CSR in Nigeria is still much weak as there are no strong government regulations and organized pressure groups to put organizations on the front burner of CSR (Ngwakwe, 2009).
In Nigeria, CSR came to public discourse with the upswing of militancy in the Niger Delta region. The militant actions were induced by cradle for firms in the Niger Delta region to be environmentally responsible (Ejumudo, Edo, Avweromre & Sagay, 2012). With increased pressures, Nigerian firms have been compelled to integrate CSR into their corporate policy. This instigates concerns as to what determines firms' participation in CSR. This concern has motivated several scholars such as Adeyemo, Oyebamiji and Alimi (2013), Kansal, Joshi and Batra (2014), as well as Roitto (2013) to examine factors that determine firm's social responsibility behavior. Several different factors have been found to be the determinants of social behavior of firms. Such factors include profitability, firm size, firm growth, assets tangibility, and leverage.

Still, some scholars adduce other factors behind companies' involvement in CSR activities. For instance, Campbell (2007) lists factors that lure companies to engage in CSR activities to include general financial condition of the firm, health of the economy, level of competition, among others. To Adeyemo, Oyebamiji and Alimi (2013), competition, employees' demand, government policy, organizational culture and customers' demand are significant factors that determine CSR of companies. From the above submissions, it can be distilled that the list of factors that determine companies' CSR are inexhaustive. This creates the need for an examination of the most significant factors that should be considered by companies who aspire to engage in CSR activities as well as in judging the extent of involvement of companies into CSR activities. According to Hussainey, Elsayed and Razik, (2011), Musa and Hassan (2013) and Tsoutsoura (2004), profitability, firm size, firm growth, assets tangibility, and leverage are factors that are usually associated with corporate social responsibility. An investigation on the factors that affect CRS is particularly needful for the Deposit Money Banks (DMBs). A cursory analysis of the Nigerian economy indicates that the Deposit Money Banks (DMBs) play significant roles related to the financial deepening of the Nigerian economy. They are constantly in touch with the social environment during financial and investment activities. Hence, it has become necessary for an investigation on the corporate social responsibility of the DMBs to be assessed. Therefore, this study examines the determinants of corporate social responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

1.2 Statement of the Problem

Notwithstanding the universal pressure on business organizations to be socially responsible, not all firms practice CSR. The companies that practice it have varying degrees of motivation. Hence, what determines CSR of firms is not clear. The findings of some studies show that variables such as profitability, leverage, firm growth, assets tangibility, among others, affect the practice of CSR (Hussainey, Elsayed & Razik, 2011; Musa & Hassan, 2013; Ahmad, Hassan & Mohammad, 2003 and Tsoutsoura, 2004). On the contrary, some studies (Ho & Taylor, 2007; Rahman, 2011; Patten, 1991) have

reported that profitability, leverage, firm growth, assets tangibility, among others do not affect the practice of CSR. A critical analysis of the above variables (profitability, leverage, firm growth, assets tangibility) suggests that they are firm specific attributes. It is noteworthy to state that other variables, internal or external to the firm, might have influence on CSR. Musa and Hassan (2013) argue that apart from the above variables (profitability, leverage, firm growth, assets tangibility), other variables such as firm age, industry affiliation, ownership structure, among others, that have theoretical link with CSR need to be empirically tested. This calls for the need to confirm the variables that tend to pose much influence on corporate social responsibility of firms.
A number of studies such as Vintilla (2013), Akrout and Othman (2013), Reverte (2009), Li and Zhang (2010), Faris, Abdelfattah and Warwan (2012), Yao, Wang and Song (2011), Isa and Muhammad (2015), as well as Nawaiseh (2015) examined the determinants of CSR but did not consider the uniqueness of the DMBs. A critical analysis of the annual reports submitted by DMBs in Nigeria reveals that there has been increased commitment to CSR by the banks. This could be attributed to continuous yearnings from the public. Since the pressures from stakeholders are expected to intensify, DMBs and regulatory authorities need to know the specific variables that should be considered when determining the level of commitment into CSR by the banks. In view of the preceding, there is dire need for empirical examination of the key determinants of CSR of DMBs in Nigeria. This is necessary as the study will provide basis for ascertaining the level with which the banks need to be socially responsible. Despite this need, there is scanty literature on determinants of CSR, as far as the DMBs in Nigeria are concerned. Therefore, this study seeks to investigate the determinants of CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

The major objective of this study is to examine the determinants of corporate social responsibility of listed Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria. The specific objectives of the study are to:

i. Ascertain whether assets tangibility affect CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria.
ii. Investigate the relationship between leverage and CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria.
iii. Evaluate whether size affects corporate social responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.
iv. Examine whether firm growth affects corporate social responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.
v. Determine the effect of institutional ownership on CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria.
vi. Assess the effect of dividend payout on CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria.
vii. Investigate whether profitability has significant effect on CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

1.4 Significance of the Study

The significance of this study cannot be overemphasized. Upon completion of the study, different stakeholders could benefit from the outcome of the study. These stakeholders include managers, government, investors as well as potential investors, and the general public as elaborated below.

The work provides findings which could be useful to managers of Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria. This is because, they could use the outcome of the study to identify factors that need to be taken into consideration in deciding the amount of investment in CSR activities. This has the overall effect of improving the quality of their decision making on CSR activities. The policy significance of this study is that it provides findings which could be useful to government, particularly with respect to its agencies that have responsibility for policy formulation. The findings of this study provide useful background information which the government could use in making policies that relate to companies' compliance with CSR. Current and potential investors are other categories of stakeholders that could benefit immensely from the outcome of this study. Investors that are interested in banks that have high profit potential without compromising their CSR billings could use the outcome of this study to identify them. This constitutes practical significance of the study. The findings of the study could enable creditors to identify with the banks that are financially strong enough to settle their claim with preferential treatment as at when due, as well as contribute to the community at large. This could guide their decision as to the firms in which they could invest their funds. The theoretical significance of this study is that it could enrich literature on the determinants of corporate social responsibility. Current and potential researchers can leverage on the outcome of the study to carry out future research on the subject matter.

1.0 LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Theoretical Review

This study is anchored on legitimacy theory and stakeholders' theory.

2.1.1 Legitimacy Theory

The theory was propounded by Dowling and Pfeffer in 1975. It assumes that organizations' policies agree with the policies of the larger society**.** Legitimacy theory states that every company directly or indirectly is engaged in a social contract. Under this contract, every company is expected to perform accepted actions for the society it operates in order that the existence of the society will not be threatened. This is justified on the basis that the society is the guarantor of the existence of the company through provision of necessary resources that are critical to corporate survival (Degan, 2002). The theory sees a company as product of society meant to provide as far as possible, economic benefits to the society. In the like manner, the society is expected to supply requisite resources for the company. These resources include both human and non-human resources. The strength of this interrelatedness defines the survival of every company (Degan, 2002). The underlying assumption of the legitimacy theory is that organizations are bound to fulfil their social contract. This is key to meeting the corporate objectives. This in turn requires the adoption of a CSR strategy affecting various areas of activity, including management accounting.

Therefore, the legitimacy theory compels corporate entities to initiate and implement actions that will uplift the betterment of the society. The theory upholds practice of corporate social responsibility. This however depends on factors such as profitability, firm size, firm growth, assets tangibility and leverage. Profitable firms are more visible and are likely to be pressured by interested groups to carry out CSR activities. This same analogy applies to firm size, firm growth and assets tangibility. Highly leveraged firms are more likely to be under stringent debt covenants especially in terms of loan repayments that investment in CSR may be seen as luxury (Degan, 2002). Many scholars have criticized the promotion of legitimacy theory in this respect. The abstract nature of legitimacy theory makes it very difficult to discover the mechanism by which the organizations are motivated to voluntarily disclose social and environmental information (Owen, 2008).

2.1.2 Stakeholders' Theory

Stakeholders' theory was proposed by Freeman (1984). The theory states that a company's continued existence requires the support of stakeholders. This brings into context the need for companies to gain acceptance or support of critical stakeholders. This further implies that stakeholders define the survival of companies to the extent that the more powerful they are, the more the company must adapt. Reports on CSR provide basis for promotion of good relationship between a company and its stakeholders. Stakeholders include shareholders, management, suppliers, customers, public media, local communities, non-governmental organizations. These stakeholders have various, and seemingly conflicting interests, which have some power to influence corporations. Strict adherence to the tenets of the stakeholders' theory requires a firm to carry out activities that will positively affect all stakeholders. This can be achieved through the instrumentality of corporate social responsibility.

2.2 Conceptual Review

This study revolves around corporate social responsibility and its determinants. Therefore, the concepts that are reviewed in this study include corporate social responsibility, profitability, firm size, firm growth, and leverage.

2.2.1 Concept of Corporate Social Responsibility

Kanji and Chopra (2010) define Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as an integral component of the company's operations where the company voluntarily contributes to the environment in terms of economic, environmental, ethical, and social investment. Smith (2011) adds a key element of CSR which has not been captured by kanji and Chopra (2010). Smith (2011) reaffirms that CSR is "a business system that enables the production and distribution of wealth for the betterment of its stakeholders through the implementation and integration of ethical systems and sustainable management practices". Rizk, Dixon and Woodhead (2008) put a further dimension to CSR. They define CSR as "the process of communicating the social and environmental effects of organization's economic actions to particular interest groups within society and to society at large. In their definition, reporting on CSR has been identified as being a key component of CSR. This is important as it is through the communication of CSR activities that stakeholders can critically evaluate the company's performance in CSR.

This study measures CSR based on the lump sum value invested in CSR as measured by Shehu and Farouk (2013). This measurement is chosen owing to the high level of objectivity and precision involved in the measurement. Researchers have used various proxy measures to assess CSR including one-dimensional surrogate measures such as reputation ranking of companies on pollution control performance (Chen & Metcalf, 1980; Freedman and Jaggi, 1982), Moskowitz's social responsibility ratings (Cochran & Wood, 1984; Moskowitz, 1972), and fortune corporate reputation index (Fomburn & Shanley, 1990). These measures have been criticized for their inability to incorporate stakeholders' issues (Ullman, 1985). There has been a tremendous growth in the awareness of social responsibility of corporations in recent years. A large number of companies appear increasingly engaged in a serious effort to define and integrate CSR into all aspects of their businesses. Studies (Al-Shubiri, Al-Abedallat & Orabi, 2012; Arshad & Vakhidulla, 2011) have shown that several factors serve as determinants of CSR. Some of these factors are explained below.

2.2.2 Concept of Profitability

Profitability is used to explain financial success of an enterprise. It is the ability of a business to earn a profit. It is the ability of the enterprise to make profit on sales. It is the ability of enterprise to get sufficient return on the capital and employees used in the business operation. Profitability of firms is a factor that could determine the engagement of firms in socially responsible projects (Akindele, 2011). This is because, ceteris paribus; highly profitable firms would have the ability to execute CSR projects without affecting its capacity to pay dividends and retain earnings for future growth (Tsoutsoura, 2004 and Ho & Taylor, 2007). Devi and Devi (2014) define profitability as the level to which an organization can successfully and efficiently make the most of its obtainable funds and assets, and alter them into outstanding profit. This forms the basis for boosting income of employees, providing better quality products for customers, and having better environment friendly production units. Also, more profits precipitate more future investments, thereby creating more employment opportunities and enhancing income of people. This study sees profitability as return realized from utilization of assets, the return of which is the excess of revenues over expenses.

2.2.3 Concept of Firm Size

The size of a firm is the amount and variety of production capacity and ability a firm possesses or the amount and variety of services a firm can provide concurrently to its customers. Firm size remains a concept that has been defined in different ways. It can be represented as the number of employees, total assets, sales or market capitalization, among others. Large firms often enjoy economies of scale and other many benefits with eminent potentials for making profits. The size of a firm has close association with firm profitability and therefore, firm size is a significant factor in CSR decisions of firms (Hackston & Milne, 1996). There are different measurements for firm size (Kouser, Bank & Azeem, 2012). Josson (2007) and Banchuevijit (2012) who measured firm size in terms of total employment. They construe firm assets as total number of employees hired by a firm. The second style of measurement is through output. Under this category, firm size is commonly measured in terms of physical output such as sales turnover, units of products produced, among others, instead of a monetary value. The last form of measurement is through 'values' of firm. Studies that have used this style of measurement include Saliha and Abdessatar (2011), Asgari, Pour, Zedeh and Pahalavan (2015) who measured firm size as total assets. However, others such as Serrasqueiro and Nunes (2008) and Pratheepan (2014), define size in terms of total sales. This study conceptualizes firm size in the context of total assets.

2.2.4 Concept of Firm Growth

Firm growth can be referred to as the process of improving some measure of an enterprise's success. It can be achieved either by boosting the top line or revenue of the business with greater product sales or service income, or by increasing the bottom line or profitability of the operation by minimizing costs. Firm growth results to profitability of firms which places firms in position to be able to behave in socially responsible manner. Kouser, Bano and Azeem (2012) see firm growth as a gradual process. This is because, it does not occur in a day. It is on this basis that they define firm growth as an increase in sales of company, expansion of business through acquisition or merger, growth of profits, product development, and diversification and also an increase in the number of employees of the firm. It can be defined in terms of increase in asset, increase in the number of employees and increase in the branches of the organization. However, Vijayakumar and Devi (2011) put a restraint to the above definition by submitting that growth must occur devoid of external financing for it to be reckoned as business' growth. Therefore, firm growth is often defined in terms of sales growth. The growth rate in many researches (Asgari, Pour, Zedeh & Pahlavan, 2015; Coban, 2014) is measured in terms of sales growth because it reflects the users' demand of products and services of company. For this reason, this study sees firm growth as a function of changes in sales. It is measured as the ration of the difference in current turnover and previous turnover to previous turnover.

2.2.5 Concept of Leverage

Leverage is the degree to which an investor or business is utilizing borrowed money. It is the use of borrowed money to increase production volume, and thus sales and earnings. It is measured as the ratio of total debt to total assets. The greater the amount of debt, the greater the financial leverage. Kurfi (2003) asserts that leverage ratios measure the relationship between the funds provided by the owners (shareholders) of a firm and funds provided by the creditors of the firm. They also measure the ability of the firm to service the charges accruing from the use of outsiders' funds (creditors). Leverage increases the returns on investment of shareholders. Therefore, highly levered firms with good returns may be able to engage in CSR projects. Significant association has been found to exist between leverage and CSR (Ho & Taylor, 2007). On the contrary, leverage could negatively affect firms' ability to engage in CSR; as highly levered firms spend chunk of their profits on costly debt servicing. The findings of Omondi and Mutiori (2013) support this position. There seems to be common consensus in the literature that leverage has to do with use of debt capital, by firm in relation to equity capital. Syed (2013) describes leverage as the extent to which a business or investor is using borrowed money. This means that leverage shows the extent to which the total assets of the company are funded by loans. It is necessary to state that an increase in the ratio ensures an increase in the amount of the business's financing sources. The negative aspect of it is that it also leads to lesser degree of independence by a firm and threatens its financial solvency. Mohammad (2014) explains that leverage is referred to capacity of an organization to use borrowed money. This definition seeks to imply that leverage is the extent of use of fixed income securities by an organization. Leverage is measured as the ratio of debt to total assets. This is in alignment with the measurement basis of Lobos and Szewcyyk (2013) who measured leverage ratio as the ratio of total debt to total assets. This study uses the ratio of total debt to total assets as a measure of leverage.

2.2.6 Institutional Ownership

Institutional ownership is a variable of ownership structure that is defined as the ratio of shareholding held by institutions to the total number of shares (Nuryanah & Islam, 2011). This occurs when organizations pool significant amounts of money to invest in companies for instance, banks, mutual funds, insurance companies among others. Institutional shareholders have the potential to command the board to engage into CRS. They have the authority to select directors (for some board seats) and thus may be able to employ them to oversee the company on their behalf. Directors are more inclined to commit their loyalty to corporate officers as opposed to shareholders who the directors nominally serve. The separation of ownership and control also has a significant role. According to Kakaria, Paranimally, and Puhanudin (2014), the institutional investors' role in corporate governance system of the company is debatable. However, some are convinced that their role in governance moves the firm from good to great. Studies reveal that institutional investors must have some say in the company's corporate governance system. The findings of these studies indicate that for the corporate governance system in the companies to be successful, institutional investors should play a role in the complete process. For instance, Cremers and Nair (2005) stress that some institutional investors like pension funds may be more encouraged to monitor managers better, compared to others.

2.2.7 Concept of Dividend Payout

The dividend payout ratio is the proportion of earnings paid out as dividends to shareholders, typically expressed as a percentage (Budagaga, 2017). The dividend payout ratio is the ratio of the total amount of dividends paid out to shareholders relative to the net income of the company. It is the percentage of earnings paid to shareholders in dividends. The amount that is not paid to shareholders is retained by the company to pay off debt or to reinvest in core operations. It is sometimes simply referred to as the 'payout ratio.' The dividend payout ratio provides an indication of how much money a company is returning to shareholders versus how much it is keeping on hand to reinvest in growth, pay off debt, or add to cash reserves (retained earnings). Some companies pay out all their earnings to shareholders, while some only pay out a portion of their earnings. If a company pays out some of its earnings as dividends, the remaining portion is retained by the business. To measure the level of earnings retained, the retention ratio is calculated (Budagaga, 2017). Several considerations go into interpreting the dividend payout ratio, most importantly the company's level of maturity. A new, growth-oriented company that aims to expand, develop new products, and move into new markets would be expected to reinvest most or all its earnings and could be forgiven for having a low or even zero payout ratio (Budagaga, 2017).

2.2.8 Concept of Assets Tangibility

Assets are everything a company owns. Tangible assets are physical; they include cash, inventory, vehicles, equipment, buildings and investments (Nawaiseh, 2015). Intangible assets do not exist in physical form and include things like accounts receivable, pre-paid expenses, and patents and goodwill. A tangible asset is an asset that has a finite monetary value and usually a physical form. Tangible assets can typically always be transacted for some monetary value though the liquidity of different markets will vary. Tangible assets are the opposite of intangible assets which have a theorized value rather than a transactional exchange value (Nawaiseh, 2015). Tangible assets are assets with a finite or discrete value and usually a physical form. A quick review of a balance sheet will provide a layout of a company's tangible assets listed by liquidity. The asset portion of the balance sheet is broken out into two parts, current assets and long-term assets. Current assets are assets that can be converted to cash in less than one year. Long-term assets are assets that will not be converted to cash within a year. All types of assets support the operations of a company and help it to achieve its main goal which is generating revenue (Nawaiseh, 2015).

2.3 Review of Related Empirical Studies

Onyali (2024), ascertained the determinants of social responsibility costs of listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria. Specifically, the study determined the relationship between firms' total assets and community development cost; total sales and staff development cost; and total equity and public utility cost respectively of listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria. The population of the study comprised all the 21 listed consumer goods manufacturing firms in Nigeria. Purposive sampling was applied in selecting the 15 consumer goods firms that made up the sample size for the study. Secondary data were collected from the annual reports of the sampled firms over a ten-year accounting period which spanned through 2013 to 2022. The Pooled Ordinary Least Square regression was used in testing the hypotheses. The findings of the study indicated that: there is a significant positive relationship between firms' total assets and community development cost of listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria (p-value = 0.0059); there is a significant positive relationship between firms' total sales and staff development cost of listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria (p-value = 0.0000); there is positive but non-significant relationship between firms' total equity and public utility cost of listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria (p-value = 0.7002). Based on the findings, it was generally recommended in the study that firms should prioritise their investment in social responsibility as their financial metrics progress so as to enhance their reputation and strengthen their relationship with their host communities and stakeholders.

Mohammed et al. *(2023), examines the determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosure by listed cement companies in Nigeria. The main problem which the study has addressed is variable inclusion gap which has been observed in the previous literature on the factors that influence corporate social responsibility disclosure by listed cement companies in Nigeria. A were also collected from the annual reports and accounts and further analyzed using generalized least square (GLS) Regression. The study found a positive and significant relationship between profitability and corporate social responsibility disclosure by listed cement companies in Nigeria. With respect to firm size, the study also found a positive and statistically significant relationship with corporate social responsibility disclosure. The study recommends that listed cement companies should employ more resources and competent manpower towards the attainment of* *wealth maximization, as this will enhance the companies' disclosure level to corporate social responsibility.*

Barde (2022), examines trends and patterns of Deposit Money Banks' Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) to various socio-economic sectors in Nigeria. Using a dataset of 10 years, 2004-2014, and based on simple descriptive analysis, the study demonstrates that DMBs in Nigeria spend more on social empowerment than in more productive areas that would better the livelihood of the citizenry. DMBs' preferences for social sectors are largely informed by their drive to protect their interest defined in terms of profit. However, lack of a policy guiding and regulating CSR activities generally in Nigeria is responsible for DMBs biased CSR activities and for lack of diversification. The study, therefore, recommends that Nigeria should design a CSR policy framework as a guiding principle for all CSR activities in the country. It is only through this that the corporate world would be tamed to invest their CSR in more productive sectors that would better the livelihood of their host communities and the country at large.

Abdullahi and Abdulrazaq (2018), examined the determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility in Nigerian Cement Industry in Nigeria for the period of 2012-2016. The listed Cement companies are five in numbers, which a sample of all the five (5) companies were used for the study. Specifically, the study examines the effect of profitability, firm size and dividend on CSR of the listed Cement firms in Nigeria. The study adopted multiple regression techniques and data were collected from secondary source through annual reports and accounts of the firms. The findings of the study revealed that profitability, firm size and dividend paid positively and significantly influence the CSR practice of listed Cement Industry in Nigeria. It is recommended among others that the management should strive in making high economic profit, expanding the firm's assets, and also maintain a consistent dividend payment as it has been found empirically to be a determining factor for Cement firms in Nigeria to embark on CSR.

3.0 METHODOLOGY

This study employed correlational research design with a view to assessing determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility of listed Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria. The population of the study comprises of 14 listed DMBs that have available data for the period under study on disclosure of CSR information. The choice of the listed DMBs is since they spend vast amount of funds on CSR owing to the nature of their activities. In view of this, the study used purposive sampling technique to select all the elements of the adjusted population. Hence, the sample of the study is the fourteen (14) Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria. The choice of 14 banks in the industry is predicated on the desire of the study to derive findings that will warrant objective generalization.

The study used secondary data. Secondary data is considered most appropriate in this kind of the study as there is need to ensure high level of objectivity in data that was collected. The study also used secondary data due to the high level of reliability obtainable from the use of quantitative data. The data, which are quantitative in nature, was extracted from the audited annual reports and accounts of the selected listed deposit money banks in Nigeria for the period, 2009-2016. Asset tangibility, firm size and leverage were obtained from statement of financial position while dividend payout, profitability and firm growth were obtained from statement of profit or loss and other comprehensive income for the relevant years. Data on institutional ownership were obtained from notes to the financial statements.

The model is as stated below.

$CSR_{it} = \alpha_{it} + \beta_1 AST_{it} + \beta_2 LEV_{it} + \beta_3 SZE_{it} + \beta_4 GRT_{it} + \beta_5 INO_{it} + \beta_6 DPO_{it} + \beta_7 PRO_{it} + \varepsilon$

Where:
CSR=Corporate Social Responsibility
AST =Assets tangibility
LEV= Leverage
SZE=Firm Size
GRT=Firm Growth
INO=Institutional Ownership
DPO=Dividend Payout
PRO= Profitability
it= Firm and time identifiers
ε=error term

This study used descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and multiple regression analysis. Descriptive statistics was used to compute summary statistics for both the dependent and independent variables of the study. The use of descriptive statistics is important because it summarizes and enhances understanding of the data collected for analysis in a study. Some robustness tests were carried out to enhance the reliability of findings. Data normality test was done using Shapiro-Wilk statistics. Under this test, variables that were significant were ascribed as not being normally distributed and vice versa. Similarly, Hetroskedasticity test was conducted using Breuch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg statistics. If the test is significant, heteroscedasticity is said to have occurred, otherwise, the data is deemed free of heteroscedasticity. Multi-colinearity test was carried out using Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) and Tolerance Value (TV) statistics. The decision rule was that VIF values must not be more than 2.0 while TV statistics must not be 0.1.In addition, fixed and random effects regression models were estimated using STATA as a tool of analysis. Hausman specification test was conducted to ascertain whether fixed or random effects model is most appropriate for the data. The tests were carried out to reduce misspecification errors.

Multiple regression analysis was used to measure the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables. The study employed this technique because it aims towards investigating determinants of CSR.

4.0 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

The sample descriptive statistics are displayed in table 3 below where minimum; maximum, mean and standard deviation of the data for all variables used in the study are described. The rationale is to provide insight into the nature of data being used.

Table 3: Summary of Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev	Min	Max
CSR	98	5.50	1.07	2.95	8.08
AST	98	4.93	3.23	1.01	17.96
LEV	98	0.45	0.17	0.05	0.89
SIZ	98	10.05	10.71	0.03	53.96
GRT	98	0.09	0.19	-0.58	1.26
INO	98	0.13	0.15	0.01	0.79
DIV	98	0.68	0.15	0.34	0.98
PRO	98	15.51	1.84	13.26	20.84

Source: STATA Output, 2016.

The above table reports descriptive statistics for the dependent and independent variables. The dependent variable is Corporate Social Responsibility while the independent variables are AST, LEV, SZE, GRT, INO, DIV and PRO. The CSR has a mean value of 5.50 with standard deviation of 1.07, minimum and maximum values of 2.95 and 8.08 respectively. This implies that on average, CSR for Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria is N5.5million and the deviation from both sides of the mean is N1.07million. This suggests a small variability given that the standard deviation is lower than the mean. Table 3 also indicates that the minimum and maximum values for AST are 1.01 and 17.96 respectively with a mean value of 4.93 while the standard deviation is 3.23. The mean of 4.93 shows that on average, N4.93million is spent by Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria on CSR while a standard deviation of 3.23 compared to a mean of 4.93 suggests a narrow dispersion of the data from the mean. The table also gives the minimum and maximum values of LEV as 0.05 and 0.89 respectively with a mean of 0.45. This indicates that on average deposit money banks in Nigeria finance 45% of their operations with debt capital. This could suggest that deposit money banks in Nigeria use less of debt financing than equity financing. The variability rate of use of leverage by the banks is shown by standard deviation of 0.18 which is below the mean meaning that there is low level of variability in the use of leverage by deposit money banks in Nigeria. The table further reveals a mean of 10.05 for SZE. This indicates that on average DMBs in Nigeria have assets base of N10million. The minimum value of SZE is 0.03 while the maximum value is 53.96. The standard deviation of SZE is 10.71 which is higher than the mean, implying that there is high variability of rate of SZE of banks in Nigeria. GRT has minimum value of -0.58 and maximum value of 1.26. The minimum value of -0.58 reflects decrease in growth of the banks by 58% while maximum value of 0.26 suggests that the maximum amount of decrease recorded by the banks is 26%. The mean value of GRT is 0.09 while the standard deviation is 0.19 which is higher than the mean implying higher variability rate.

INO has minimum value of 0.001 which implies that the lowest level of institutional shareholding of the banks is 0.1% while the maximum of INO is 0.79 which implies that the highest level of institutional shareholding in Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria is 79%. The mean value of INO is 0.13 which shows that on average INO of DMBs is 13%. Relatedly, the standard deviation of INO is 0.14 which is higher than the mean implying higher variability in INO of the banks under study.

Table 3 shows that DIV has minimum value of 0.34, maximum value of 0.98 with mean value of 0.68. This is with variability rate of 0.15 which is less than the mean, indicating low level of variability in the amount of dividend paid by the Deposit Money Banks (DMBs) in Nigeria. Lastly, the PRO of DMBs in Nigeria is 13.26% while the maximum value is 20.84%. The mean value of PRO is 15.51%. This suggests that on average, the DMBs earned about 15.51% profit from assets utilized. This is with standard deviation of 1.84 which shows low variability in the profitability of deposit money banks in Nigeria as the standard deviation is less than the mean.

4.2 Correlation Matrix

Table 4 presents the correlation matrix between the independent and dependent variables as well as the correlation among the independent variables themselves.

Table 4: Correlation Matrix

	CSR	AST	LEV	SIZ	GRT	INO	DIV	PRO
CSR	1							
AST	0.43	1						
LEV	-0.29	-0.03	1					
SIZ	0.32	0.56	0.14	1				
GRT	-0.11	0.18	0.04	0.04	1			
INO	0.26	0.54	0.14	0.96	0.04	1		
DIV	-0.47	-0.58	-0.05	-0.52	-0.21	-0.50	1	
PRO	0.56	0.48	-0.23	-0.23	-0.04	0.07	-0.34	1

Source: Output from Stata, 12

Table 4 presents result of correlation analysis. The table shows that CSR and AST, CSR and SZE, CSR and INO, CSR and PRO are positively correlated. This means that the paired variables move in the same direction. On the other hand, CSR and LEV, CSR and GRT, CSR and DIV are negatively correlated. The implication of this is that the paired variables move in opposite direction, as one is increasing, the other is decreasing and vice versa. Table 4 also shows the correlation between all independent variables (AST, LEV, SZE, GRT INO, DIV and PRO). AST and SZE, AST and GRT, AST and GRT, AST and INO, LEV and SZE, LEV and GRT, LEV and GRT, LEV and INO, SZE and GRT, SZE and INO, GRT and INO as well as INO and PRO are positively correlated. On the contrary, AST and LEV, AST and DIV, LEV and DIV, LEV and PRO, SZEand DIV, GRT and DIV, GRT and PRO, INO and DIV as well as DIV and PRO are negatively correlated. Overall, in terms of the strength of the associations, table 4 shows that the correlation among the independent variables does not pose multicollinearity. There is however an exception as can be observed from the association between INO and SZE which is 0.96. Since this value is above the threshold of 0.7, there might be multicollinearity between the variables. In view of this, multicollinearity test was performed as reported in the ensuing sections.

However, since correlation does not indicate causality, further analysis was carried out using regression.

4.3 Robustness Test

This section of the study presents and discusses the various robustness tests conducted to improve the validity and reliability of statistical inferences derived from the findings of the study. These tests include Multicollinearity test, Cook-Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity, fixed and random effect test, Hausman specification test for fixed and random and Breusch-Pagan lagrangian multiplier test for random effect.

4.4 Multicollinearity Test

This test was carried out to check whether there is high correlation between and among the independent variables. High correlation between explanatory variables normally indicates either wrong selection or redundancy of some independent variables relative to the dependent variable. From the correlation matrix in table 3 most of the correlation coefficients, except for the correlation between SIZ and INO, are less than 0.70. The low scale of correlation among the independent variables suggests that multicollinearity should not pose a threat for the sampled firms. However, to formally substantiate the absence of multicollinearity between the independent variables, collinearity diagnostics were carried out. The Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) was used to test excessive correlation among variables, which in turn, produced evidence of robustness of the model specified in this study. Variance Inflation Factors (VIFs) are a method of measuring the level of collinearity between the regressors in an equation. VIFs show how much of the variance of a coefficient estimate of a regressor has been inflated due to collinearity with the other regressors. There are two forms of the Variance Inflation Factor: centered and uncentered. The centered VIF is the ratio of the variance of the coefficient estimate from the original equation divided by the variance from a coefficient estimate from an equation with only that regressor and a constant. The uncentered VIF is the ratio of the variance of the coefficient estimate from the original equation divided by the variance from a coefficient estimate from an equation with only one regressor (and no constant). This goes to imply that if the original equation did not have a constant, only the uncentered VIF will be displayed. This study displays the centred VIF since the original equation has a constant. The benchmark for diagnosing multi-collinearity is that if the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) of variables is above 10, it indicates a strong presence of multi-collinearity. The result is presented in the table 5:

Table 5: Multicollinearity Test Using Variance Inflation Factors and Tolerance Values

Variable	VIF	1/VIF (Tolerance Value)
AST	1.86	0.536311
DIV	1.82	0.550284
SIZ	1.71	0.585806
PRO	1.51	0.662779
INO	1.47	0.682099
GRT	1.12	0.893466
LEV	1.09	0.914431

Source: Output from Stata, 12

Using STATA, the VIF values are computed and found to be consistently smaller than 10, indicating the absence of multicollinearity (Necter, Kutner, Nachtsheim & Wasserman, 1996; Casey & Aderson (1999). In particular, the VIF values of SZE and INO are less than the threshold of 10, indicating that the high correlation coefficient between SZE and INO earlier reported in table 3 does not pose threat of multicollinearity. This shows the appropriateness of fitting the model of the study with the seven independent variables. In addition, the tolerance values are consistently smaller than 1 which further reinforces the fact that there is no multicollinearity between the independent variables (Tobachnick & Fidell, 1996).

4.5 Heteroskedasticity

This test is conducted to check whether the variability of the error terms is constant or not. The presence of heteroskedasticity indicates that the variation of the error terms is not constant which would affect the best linear unbiased estimators of the study. The result of the test reveals the presence of heteroskedasticity because the probability value of chi-square is statistically significant at 5%. This result is a violation of one of the basic assumptions of the classical linear regression model which states that there must be constant variance in the error term. The implication of this is that the original pooled ordinary least squares (OLS) regression cannot be suitable for the study. As a result (see Appendix II), the study proceeded to run robust test in which the result shows that the model is suitable for analysis.

4.6 Hausman Specification Test

Hausman specification test was performed to test whether the unique errors (stochastic disturbances) are correlated with the regressors. Since the dataset is panel, both fixed and random effect models were run. Hausman specification test was then conducted to decide between the two models, to select the preferred one. The Hausman test detects violation of the random effects modeling assumption that the explanatory variables are orthogonal to the unit effects. If correlation does not exist between the independent variables and the unit effects, then the estimates of beta coefficients in the fixed effects model should be like estimates of beta in the random effects model.

The result (see appendix II) obtained from the test returned a chi^2 value of 0.6993 that is not statistically significant. This shows that the dataset does not meet the asymptotic assumption of the Hausman specification test. As a result, the random effect model was preferred.

4.7 Lagrangian Multiplier Test

The Lagrangian Multiplier test helps in deciding between random effects regression and pooled OLS regression. The test was conducted after running the random effects model to see if there is presence or absence of cross-sectional effect in the panel dataset. The rule is that if it is significant, random effect is the preferred model otherwise seemingly unrelated OLS regression suffices. Based on the result of the lagrangian multiplier test, the null hypothesis was not rejected and it was concluded that an OLS regression is appropriate. This is evidenced by prob>chi2= 0.5389, which is not significant. Therefore, the study interpreted OLS regression result. The summary of the regression results obtained from the OLS model is presented in table 5.

Table 6: OLS Regression Results

Variables	Coefficient	t-value	Sig
Constant	4.35	3.83	0.000
AST	0.01	0.36	0.719
LEV	-1.46	-3.09	0.003
SIZ	0.05	1.77	0.080
GRT	-0.86	-1.99	0.050
INO	-2.89	-1.34	0.183
DIV	-2.07	-2.95	0.004
PRO	0.20	3.60	0.001
R^2			0.5006
F-statistics			12.89
Prob			0.000

Source: STATA Output, 2017.

The results from table 6 indicates that the independent variables, AST, LEV, SZE, GRT, INO, DIssV and PRO explain 50.06% of the total variation in the dependent variable, CSR of listed Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria (R^2=0.5006). Similarly, the result of the F-Statistics (12.89) shows that the model is well fitted and that the independent variables used in the study are well selected and utilized as confirmed by the probability of 0.0000 which is statistically significant at 1%. The coefficient of assets tangibility is 0.01. This suggests that a unit increase in AST will lead to a corresponding increase in CSR by 0.01. The t-value of AST is 0.36 while its probability is 0.719. This indicates positive relationship between AST and CSR of listed Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria and the relationship is not significant. The positive relationship between AST and CSR is in line with the *a priori* expectation of the study. The results of the econometric analysis also show that LEV is negatively related to CSR as the coefficient of LEV is -1.46, implying that a unit increase in LEV will lead to a decrease in CSR of DMBs in Nigeria by 1.46. The t-value of LEV is -3.09 while its probability is 0.003 which is significant at 1%. This suggests that leverage significantly affects CSR.

Also, SIZ has a coefficient of 0.05 which means that a unit increase in SIZ will lead to about 0.05 increase in CSR of listed Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria. The t-value of SIZ is 1.77 while its probability is 0.080 which is significant at 10%. This is suggestive of the fact that there is significant relationship between SIZ and CSR of listed Deposit money Banks in Nigeria. The coefficient of GRT is -0.86 which implies that there is negative relationship between GRT and CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. This relationship is such that a unit increase in GRT will lead to a 0.86 decrease in CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. The t-value of GRT is -1.99 while its probability is 0.050 which is significant at 5%. This further implies that the relationship between GRT and CSR is statistically significant. INO has coefficient of -2.89 suggesting that there is negative relationship between INO and CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. The relationship is such that a unit increase in INO will lead to a 2.89 increase in CSR of listed deposit money banks in Nigeria. This relationship is not statistically significant given that its t-value is 1.34 while its probability is 0.183. The coefficient of DIV is -2.07which suggests that there is negative relationship between DIV and CSR to the extent that a unit increase in DIV will lead to a 2.07 decrease in CSR of listed Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria. The relationship between DIV and CSR is significant at 1% since the t-value of DIV is -2.95 and its probability is 0.004. Finally, PRO has coefficient of 0.20, t-value of 3.60 with a significance value of 0.001. The coefficient of 0.20 implies that a unit increase in PRO will lead to a corresponding increase in CSR by 0.20. The t-value of 3.60 with a corresponding significance value of 0.001 suggests that there is significant relationship between PRO and CSR and the relationship is significant at 1%.

4.8 Hypotheses Testing and Discussion of Findings

This section presents the analysis undertaken in order to test the hypotheses stated earlier in chapter one. Based on result presented in table 5, the test of individual hypothesis is presented as follows.

Hypothesis 1

$H0_1$: Asset tangibility does not significantly affect Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

Assets tangibility (AST) is found to be positively related to the CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. However, the relationship is not significant as the t-value of AST is 0.36 and probability, 0.719. The insignificant relationship could be as a result of the fact that banks that invest much in tangible assets will have less funds to carry out CSR activities. The explanation to this is that banks that have more tangible assets tend to be more visible and are therefore pressured to carry out CSR activities. Consequently, the study fails to reject null hypothesis 1 which states that asset tangibility does not significantly affect Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. This leads to the conclusion that assets tangibility is not a significant predictor of CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. This finding is consistent with the finding of Nawaiseh (2015) who found no significant relationship between assets tangibility and Corporate Social Responsibility of firms. The study is however inconsistent with the findings of Branco and Rodrigues (2008) who showed that CSR is uninfluenced by assets tangibility.

Hypothesis Two

$H0_2$: There is no significant relationship between leverage and Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

According to the regression results, leverage is negatively related with the CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. The t-value of LEV is 3.09 with a p-value of 0.003 which is significant at 1%. This leverage has a negative significant effect on CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. Based on this result, the study rejects null hypothesis 2 of no statistical relationship between leverage and CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. This finding is in alignment with the findings of Naser and Hassan (2013) as well as Shehu and Farouk (2013) who submitted that leverage influences level of Corporate Social Responsibility of firms. The implication of this finding is that banks that are highly geared are prone to practice more Corporate Social Responsibility than those with less gearing.

Hypothesis Three

$H0_3$: Firm size does not significantly affect Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

Firm size is found by the study to have positive and significant relationship with CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. This is because, the t-value of SZE is 1.77 while its probability is 0.080 which is significant at 10%. Hence, the null hypothesis which states that firm size does not significantly affect Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria is rejected. This is suggestive of the fact that the size of a firm is not a significant determinant of corporate social responsibility of firms. This finding is consistent with the findings of Alam and Debo (2010) as well as Vintila (2013) who upheld the significant influence of firm size to Corporate Social Responsibility of firms. They submitted that larger firms are prone to engage deeply in Corporate Social Responsibility than smaller firms due to fear of loss of reputation and threat of long-term sustainability.

Hypothesis Four

Firm growth does not significantly affect Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

Table 5 indicates that Firm growth has negative relationship with CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. The relationship is significant at 5% given that the t-value of GRT is -1.99 while its probability is 0.050. Therefore, the study rejects the null hypothesis which states that Firm growth does not significantly affect Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. This finding corroborates the findings of Al-Shubiri, Al-Abedallat and Abu-Orabi (2012) who also found significant relationship between firm growth and Corporate Social Responsibility of firms.

Hypothesis Five

There is no significant relationship between institutional ownership and Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

From table 5, the strength of the relationship between institutional ownership and CSR is found to be weak. This is because, the t-value of INO is -1.34 while its probability is 0.183 which is not significant. Based on this finding, the study fails to reject the hypothesis which states that there is no significant relationship between institutional ownership and corporate social responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. This result is consistent with the finding of Naser and Hassan (2013) who found significant relationship between institutional ownership and Corporate Social Responsibility of firms.

Hypothesis Six

Dividend payout does not significantly affect Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

The t-value of DIV is -2.95 with a probability of 0.004 which is significant at 1%. This implies that the relationship between dividend payout and CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria is significant. Therefore, the study rejects the hypothesis of the study which states that dividend payout does not significantly affect Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

Hypothesis Seven

Profitability has no significant relationship with Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria.

The t-value of PRO is 3.60 with a p-value of 0.001 which is significant at 1%. The implication is that PRO has positive relationship with CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. On this basis, the study rejects the hypothesis of the study which states that profitability has no significant relationship with Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. This result corroborates the findings of Alam and Deb (2010), Vintilla (2013) who found significant relationship between profitability and Corporate Social Responsibility of firms. On the other hand, Instianigsih (2013), Hussainey, Elsayed and Razik (2011) found no significant relationship between profitability and Corporate Social Responsibility of firms.

5.0 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Conclusions

Based on the preceding analysis and discussions, the study concludes as follows:
The study found that there is significant relationship between leverage and Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. Since the relationship is negative, it can be concluded that use of leverage prevents banks from carrying out CSR activities. This can be attributed to interest payment obligations. The study also found that firm size significantly affects Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. It can therefore be concluded that larger banks will be more wary of their reputation and will invest into CSR activities more than smaller firms.
Findings from the study also showed that firm growth significantly affects Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. Since the relationship is negative, it can be concluded that high growing banks will be confronted with investment opportunities that will deter them from carrying out CSR activities. Findings of the study revealed that dividend payout significantly affects Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. The relationship is however negative. The conclusion that can be drawn from this is that banks that pay dividends will have less funds for CSR activities. The study also found that profitability has significant relationship with Corporate Social Responsibility of listed DMBs in Nigeria. High profitability will enable banks to fulfil their financial obligations including CSR activities.

5. 2 Recommendations

In line with the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made:

i. The study recommends that regulatory authorities especially the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN) should monitor levels of indebtedness to prevent them from maintaining high proportions of leverage that can affect their CSR activities.
ii. More pressure should be put on bigger firms than smaller firms in terms of fulfilling CSR activities. This is because, larger firms have more stakeholders than smaller firms.
iii. Investment activities of banks should be closely watched by the regulator authorities such as the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). This is necessary because since over-investment will tend to be counter-productive and derail banks from carrying out CSR activities.
iv. Deposit money banks should ensure that dividends paid to investors do not prevent them to practice CSR. Although it is essential to pay dividends to investors, it is needful to state that CSR activities should not be sacrificed for dividend payment.
v. Banks in Nigeria that report higher profit should be encouraged to carry out CSR activities. This will help improve on their reputation which will be instrumental to sustainability.

5.3 Limitations of the Study and Suggestions for Further Studies

Like any other research, the results of this study are subject to some limitations. The study focused on listed Deposit Money Banks in Nigeria. Therefore, the findings of this research might not be applicable to other firms in other sectors of the economy. In addition, the study focused only on internal determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility since the external ones might not be controllable.

This study suggests that further researches should be carried out on determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility on the generality of the financial services firms in Nigeria. This will help include the insurance firms which have not been investigated by this study. Furthermore, it will be interesting to conduct a similar study to test the outcomes of this study using external determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility. Such determinants such as government regulation, pressure from civil societies, among others.

5.4 Contribution to Knowledge

The basic contribution of this study to knowledge lies in its findings. The findings shed light on the determinants of CSR of listed DMBs in Nigeria. Based on the findings, the controversy over what is key to assessing degree of involvement into CSR by DMBs in Nigeria is addressed. The findings show how a corporate governance variable (institutional ownership) works with firm characteristics to influence DMBs' involvement in CSR in Nigeria.

REFERENCES

Abu-Sufyan, M. (2010). The impact of corporate characteristics and corporate social responsibility in Bangladesh. *Global Journal of Business and Management Research*, 12(14), 2249-4588.

Adeyemo, S. A., Oyebamiji, F. F. and Alimi, K. O. (2013). An evaluation of factors influencing corporate social responsibility in Nigerian manufacturing companies. *International Journal of Academic Research in Economics and Management Sciences, 2*(6), 34-38.

Ahmad, A.H., Murtala, I. and Bashiru, D. (2014). Exploring the Roles of Stakeholder Engagement and Stakeholder Management in CSR Practice. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 4 (5), 1-8.

Ahmad, Z., Hassan, S., and Mohammad, J. (2003). Determinants of Environmental Reporting in Malaysia. *International Journal of Business Studies*, *11*(1), 69–90.

Akindele, A. I. (2011). Corporate and social responsibility: An organizational tool for survival in Nigeria. *African Journal for the Psychological Study of Social Issues*, 19(2), 10-15.

Akrout, M. A., and Ben-Othman, M. (2013). Determinants of corporate environmental disclosure in MENA emerging markets. *Journal of Reviews on Global Economies*, 2: 46- 59.

Alam, I. and Deb, S. K. (2010). Human Resource Accounting Disclosure (HRAD) in Bangladesh: Multifactor regression analysis – A decisive tool of quality assessment. *The Cost and Management*, 38 (3), 9-13.

Al-shubiri, F. N., Al-abedallat, A. Z. and Orabi, M. M. A. (2012). Financial and non-financial determinants of corporate social responsibility. Asian Economic and Financial Review, 2(8), 1001-1012.

Arshad, H. and Vakhidulla, Z. (2011). Determinants of CSR Disclosure in the Swedish Setting: Effect of firm/industry characteristics along with Media Exposure on CSR disclosure practices. Department of Business Administration, School of Economics and Management, Lund University.

Asgari, M., Pour, E.N., Zadeh, M.E., & Pahlavan, M. (2015). Investigating the Relationship between Intellectual Capital and Firm Growth. International Journal of Leaning and intellectual capital, 12(10, 34-47.

Andreas, J., & Warda, A. (2015). The impact of firm size on financial performance: Evidence from Indonesia. International Journal of Business and Management, 10(3), 137-145.

Akrout, M. Akrout and Ben-Othman, M. (2013). Determinants of corporate environmental disclosure in MENA emerging markets, journal of reviews on global economies, 2: 46-59.

Bateman, T.S. and S.A. (1999). Snell, management: Building competitive advantage. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Blowfield, M. and Frynas, J. G. (2005). Setting new agendas: Critical perspectives on corporate social responsibility in the developing world. *International Affairs*, 81(3), 499–513.

Bowen H. R. (1953). *Social responsibilities of the businessman*. New York: Harper and Row.

Brammer, S., Pavelin, S. (2004). Voluntary social disclosure by large UK companies. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, 13(2-3), 86-99.

Budagaga, A. (2017). Dividend payment and its impact on the value of firms listed on Istanbul Stock Exchange: A residual income approach. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 7(2), 370-376.

Branco, M.C., & Rodrigues, L.L. (2008). Factors influence social responsibility disclosure by Portuguese companies. “Journal of Business Ethics, 83(4), 686-701.

Bayoud, N. S., Kavanagh, M., & Slaughter, G. (2012). Factors Influencing Levels of Corporate Social Responsibility Disclosure by Libyan Firms: A Mixed Study. International Journal of Economics and Finance, 4, 13-29. https://doi.org/10.5539/ijef.v4n4p13

Branco M.C. and Rodrigues (2008). Factors Influencing Social Responsibility Disclosure by Portuguese Companies. Journal of Business Ethics. 83(4): 85-701. https: www.researchgate.netpublications/226063369.

Campbell, J. L. (2007). Why would corporations behave in socially responsible ways? An institutional theory of corporate social responsibility. *Academy of Management Review*, 32(3), 946 – 967.

Caroll, A.B. (1979). A three-dimensional conceptual model of corporate performance. *The Academy of Management Review*, 4(4), 497-505.

Carroll, A.B. (1999). Corporate social responsibility – evolution of a definitional construct. *Business and Society*, 38(3), 268– 295.

Chih, H., Chih, H. and Chen, T. (2010). On the determinants of corporate social responsibility: international evidence on the financial Industry*. Journal of Business Ethics, 93, 115 – 135.*

Cormier, D. and Magnan, M. (2003), Environmental reporting management: A continental European perspective. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*, 22(1), 43-62.

Cremers, K. J.M. & Nair, V.B. (2005). Governance mechanisms and equity prices. *Journal of the Finance, 5*(6), 2859-2894.

Crisóstomo, V. L. and Oliveira, M. R. (2016). An Analysis of the Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility of Brazilian Firms. *Brazilian Business Review*, 13(4), 72-93.

Carroll, A. B. (1991). The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: toward the moral management of organizational stakeholders. *Business Horizons, 34*(4), 39–48.

Carroll A. B. (1999). A Corporate Social Responsibility: Evolution of a Definitional Construct, Business and Society 38(3), 268-295

Chen, K. H. and Metcalf R. W. (1980). The Relationship Between Pollution Control Records and Financial Indicators Revisited, The Accounting Review 55(1), 168–177.

Dahlsrud, A. (2008). How corporate social responsibility is defined: An analysis of 37 definitions. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*, 15, 1-13.

Degan, C. (2002). The legitimizing effect of social and environmental disclosures–A theoretical foundation. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal,* 15(3), 282–311.

Detomasi, D. A. (2008). The political roots of corporate social responsibility. *Journal of Business Ethics, 82, 807- 819.*

DiMaggio, P. and Powell, W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48, 147–160.

Drucker, P.F. (1954). *The practice of management.* New York: Collins.

Davis, K., (1973).The Case for and against Business Assumption of Social Responsibilities, The Academy of Management Journal 16(2),312-322

De Regil, A.J (2003). Corporate Social Responsibility still an infant discipline. The Jus Sember Global Alliance Issue Brief.

Dowling., & Pfeffer, J. (1975). Organizational Legitimacy: Social Values and Organizational Behaviour. Pacific Sociological Review, 18(1), 122-136.

Ebiringa, O. T, Yadirichukwu, E., Chigbu, E. E. and Obi, J. O. O. J. (2013). The effect of firm size and profitability on corporate social disclosure: The Nigerian oil and gas in focus. *British Journal of Economics, Management and Trade,* 3(4), 563-574.

Edmondson, V.C. and Carroll, A.B. (1999). Giving back: An examination of the philanthropic motivations, orientations and activities of large black-owned businesses. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 19(2), 171–179.

Ejumudo, K., Edo, Z. O., Avweromre, L., and Sagay, J. (2012). Environmental issues and Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in Nigeria Niger Delta Region: The need for a pragmatic approach. *Journal of Social Science and Public Policy*, 4, 1-5.

Falck, O. and Heblich, S. (2007). Corporate social responsibility: Doing well by doing good. *Business Horizons*, 50, 247-254.

Faris, N. S., Abedalfattah, Z. A. and Marwan, M. A. (2012). Financial and non-financial determinants of CSR: *Journal of Knowledge Management, Economics and Information Technology*, 5(3), 14-19.

Fernando, M. (2007) Corporate Social Responsibility in the Wake of the Asian Tsunami: A Comparative Case Study of Two Sri Lankan Companies. *European Management Journal*, [25](1): 1–10.

Ferrell, O.C. and Fraedrich, J. (1997). Business ethics: Ethical decision making. New York: Irwin Inc.

Fodio, M. I., Abu-Abdissamad, A.M. and Oba, V.C. (2013). Corporate social responsibility and firm value in quoted Nigerian financial services. *International Journal of Finance and Accounting,* 2(7), 331-340.

Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder perspective*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Friedman, M. (1970). The Social Responsibility of Business is to Increase its Profits. NewYork *Times Magazine*, September 13, 32-33, 122, 124, 126.

Fomburn, C.J., & Shanley, M. (1990)." What's in a Name? Reputation Building and Corporate Strategy. "Academy of Management Journal 33(1), 233-258.

Galan, J. I. (2006). Corporate social responsibility and strategic management. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(7), 1629-1641.

Gamerschlag, R., Moller, K. and Verbeeten, F. (2011). Determinants of voluntary CSR disclosure: Empirical evidence from Germany. *Review of Management Science, 5(*2-3), 233-262.

Grayson, D. and Hodges, A. (2004) Corporate social opportunity: seven steps to make corporate social responsibility work for your business. Sheffield: Greenleaf.

Griffin, R. M. (1997). *Management.* New York: Irwin McGraw-Hill.

Glan, (2006). Corporate Social Responsibility: A Review of Literature.

Hackston, D., and Milne, M. J. (1996). Some determinants of social and environmental disclosures in New Zealand Companies. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, *9*(1), 77–108.

Handy, C. (1996). Beyond university: The changing world of organizations. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Ho, L.C. J. and Taylor, M. E. (2007). An empirical analysis of triple bottom-line reporting and its determinants: Evidence from the United States and Japan. *Journal of International Financial Management and Accounting, 18*(2), 123-150.

Hossain, M., Islam, K. and Andrew, J. (2006). Corporate social and environmental disclosure in developing countries: Evidence from Bangladesh. Working paper, Faculty of Commerce, University of Wollongong.

Hussainey, k., Elsayed, M. and Rasik,, A. M. (2011). Factors affecting corporate social responsibility disclosure in Egypt. *A Publication of Corporate Ownership and Control*, 2(1), 34-39.

Husted, B. W. and Allen, D.B. (2006) Corporate social responsibility in the multinational enterprise: strategic and institutional approaches. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 37(6), 838-849.

Hsiang-Lin, C. H., Chih, H. and Chen, Y. (2010). Determinants of Corporate social responsibility: International Evidence on the Financial Industry, Journal of Business Ethics, 93 (115-135).

Hussainey, k., Elsayed, M. and Abdel Razik, M. (2011). Factors Affecting Corporate Social
Responsibility Disclosure in Egypt.A Publication of Corporate ownership and Control.

Hsiang-Lin, C., Chih, H., & Chen, W.Y. (2010). The Influence of Corporate Social responsibility on customer loyalty. Journal of Business Ethics, 96(4), 637-646.

Hermawan, A., & Mulyawan, I. (2014). The impact of corporate social responsibility on profitability: Evidence from Indonesia. Journal of Business and Management, 16(1), 45-56.

Hopkins, M. (2004). Corporate Social Responsibility: An Issue Paper.
International Labour Organization.

Isa, M. A. and Muhammad, S. (2015). The impact of board characteristics on corporate social responsibility disclosure: Evidence from Nigerian food product firms. *International Journal of Management Science and Business Administration,* 1(12), 34-45.

Istianingsih, H. (2013). Impact of firm characteristics on CSR disclosure: evidence from Indonesia stock exchange*. I J A B E R*, 13 (6), 4265-4281.

Istianigsih, M.S.Ak. (2013). Impact of Firm Characteristics on CSR Disclosure: Evidence from
Indonesia Stock Exchange, Proceedings Of 3rd Asia Pacific Research Conference, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

Jones, T. (1995). Instrumental stakeholder theory: A synthesis of ethics and economics. *Academy of Management Review*, *20*, 404-437.

Jothi, M. (2016). Driving Factors of Corporate Social Responsibility Practices in India: An Empirical Study based on the Perceptions of Selected Executives from Public and Private Firms in India. *Amity Journal of Corporate Governance,* 1(1), (39–53).

Kakaria, Z., Paranimally, Y. R. and Puhanudin, N. (2014). Ownership structure and firm performance: Evidence from Malaysian trading and services sector. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3 (2), 32-43.

Kanji, G. K. and Chopra, P. K. (2010). CSR in a global economy. *Total Quality Management*, 21 (2), 119–143.

Kansal, M., Joshi, M. and Batra, G. S. (2014). Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosures: Evidence from India. *Advances in Accounting, 30*(1), 12-15.

Katz, D and Kahn, R. L. (1966). *The social psychology of organizations.* New York: John McGraw Hill Book Company.

Kurfi, A. K. (2003). *Principles of financial management*. Kano: Benchmark Publishers limited.

Kader Sahin, Cigdem Sahin Basfirinci and Aygun Ozsalih, "The impact of board composition on corporate financial and social responsibility performance: Evidence from public-listed companies in Turkey" African Journal of Business Management Vol.5 (7), pp. 2959-2978.

Kouser, R., Bank, T., & Azeem, M. (2012). Effects of Corporate Social Responsibility on Consumer Behaviour. African Journal of Business Management, 6(21), 6277-6286.

Lei, W. (2011). Factors affecting perceptions of Corporate Social Responsibility implementation: an emphasis on values, an unpublished PhD thesis, University of Helsinki.

Levitt, T. (1983). The dangers of social responsibility. *Harvard Business Review*, *September- October*, 41-50.

Li, R. and Zhang, T. (2010). CSR, ownership structure and political interference: Evidence from Chinese. *Journal of Business Ethics,* (96) 631-645.

Lucyanda, J. and Siagian, L. G. (2012). The influence of company characteristics toward corporate social responsibility disclosure. The 2012 International Conference on Business and Management6 – 7 September held at Phuket-Thailand.

Lobos, M., & Szewczyk, M. (2013). The Impact of Leverage on Financial Performance of Companies. Journal of Economics and Management, 14, 113-127.

Mackey, A. and Mackey, T. (2007). Corporate social responsibility and firm performance: investor preferences and corporate strategies. *Academy of Management Review, 32*(3), 817-835.

Matten, D. and Moon, J. (2004). Implicit and explicit CSR: A conceptual framework for understanding CSR in Europe. *ICCSR Research Paper Series* (29-2004), University of Nottingham.

Mullins,L. J. (1996). *Management and organizational behaviour*. London: Pitman Publishing

Musa, A. F. and Hassan, S. U. (2013). Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibility in the Nigerian Listed Deposit Money Banks. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Finance,* 110*.*

Naser, K. and Hassan, Y. (2013). Determinants of corporate social responsibility reporting: evidence from an emerging economy. *Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business Research, 2*(3), 56 – 74.

Nawaiseh, M. E. (2015). Do firm size and financial performance affect corporate social responsibility disclosure: Employees' and environmental dimensions? *American Journal of Applied Sciences*, 12 (12), 967-981.

Newell, P. (2005). Citizenship, accountability and community: The limits of the CSR Agenda. *International Affairs*, 81(3), 541–557.

Ngwakwe, C. C. (2009). Environmental responsibility and firm performance: Evidence from Nigeria*. International Journal of Human and Social Sciences*, 4(6).

Niresh, J. A. and Velnampy, N. (2014). Firm size and profitability: A study of listed manufacturing firms in Sri Lanka. *International Journal of Business and Management, 9* (4).

Nuryanah, S. and Islam, S. M. N. (2011). Corporate governance and performance: Evidence from an emerging market. *Malaysian Accounting Review*, *10*(1), 17–42.

Okpara, J.O. and Wynn, P. M. (2012). Stakeholders' perceptions about corporate social responsibility: Implications for poverty alleviation. *Thunderbird International Business Review*, 54(1), 91-103.

Olayinka, M. U. and Temitope, O. F. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and financial performance in developing economies: The Nigerian experience. *New Orleans International Academic Conference*, 815-824.

Omondi, M. M. and Muturi, W. (2013). Factors affecting the financial performance of listed companies at the Nairobi Securities Exchange in Kenya. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting, 4*(15), 3-8.

Patten, D. M. (1991). Exposure, legitimacy, and social disclosure. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy, 10*, 297-308.

Porter, M. E. and Kramer, M. R. (2012). Creating shared value: How to reinvent capitalism – and unleash a wave of innovation and growth. *Harvard Business Review*, 2(3), 45-51.

Pratima, B. (2002). The corporate challenges of sustainable development. *Academy of Management Executive* 16(2), 122–132.

Rahman, S. (2011). Evaluation of definitions: Ten dimensions of corporate social responsibility. *World Review of Business Research*, 1(1), 166-176.

Reverte, C. (2009). Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosure ratings by Spanish listed firms. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88, 351-366.

Roitto, A. (2013). Factors effecting corporate social responsibility disclosure ratings: An empirical study of Finnish listed companies. Master's Thesis, Oulu Business School.

Rosamaria, C.M. and Robert, C.P. (2011) Historical background of corporate social responsibility. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 7 (4), 528–539.

Rizk, R., Dixon, R., & Woodhead, M. (2008). Corporate Social Responsibility and Stakeholder Value. Journal of Business Ethics, 81(1), 99-115.

Sari, R.A. (2012), Influence the company characteristics on corporate social responsibility disclosure in manufacturing companies listed in Indonesia stock exchange. *Nominal Journal*, 1(1), 124-140.

Scott, W. R. and Christensen, S. (1995). *The institutional construction of organizations: international and longitudinal studies*. New York: Sage Publications, Inc.

Shafiqur, R. (2011) Evaluation of Definitions: Ten Dimensions of Corporate Social Responsibility. *World Review of Business Research*, 1(1), 166 – 176.

Saliha, N., & Abdessatar, T. (2011). The Impact of Firm Size on Financial Performance. International Journal of Economics and Finance, 3(2), 268-275.

Syed, S.A. (2013). Leverage and its Impact on Firms Performance. Journal of Finance and Accounting, 10(2), 1-8.

Sahin, K., Basforonci, C., & Ozsalih, Y. (2011). The impact of board characteristics on corporate social responsibility: Evidence from Turkey. African Journal of Business Management, 5(16), 6923-6934.

Shehu, U.H & Farouk, M. A. (2013). Determinants of Corporate Social Responsibilities in the Nigerian Deposit Money Banks, International Journal of Economics, Business and Finance, 1(10), 342-351, ISSN: 2327-8188, http;//ijebf.com/

Stakeholder Alliance. (2002). Corporate Social Responsibility: A Stakeholder Approach. A Review of Literature.

Tetlock, P.C. (2007). Giving content to investor sentiment: The role of media in the stock market. *The Journal of Finance,* 42(3), 1139-1168.

Tsoutsoura, M. (2004). Corporate social responsibility. Applied financial project,Haas School of Business, University of California, Berkeley, California.

Turban, D. and Greening, D. (1997) Corporate social performance and organizational attractiveness to prospective employees. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 658-672.

Ullmann, A. (1985). Data in search of a theory: a critical examination of the relationships among social performance, social disclosure, and economic performance of U.S. firms. *Academy of Management Review*, 10 (3), 540–557.

Vintilă, G. (2013). A study of the relationship between corporate social responsibility-financial performance -firm size. RevistaRomână de Statistică Trim. I/2013 – Suppliment.

Vijayakumar, N., & Devi, S.S. (2011). Determinants of Firm Growth: A Review of Literature. Journal of Management and Organization, 17(6), 833-846.

Waddock, S. (2008). Building a new institutional infrastructure for corporate responsibility, *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 87-108.

World Business Council for Sustainable Development (2000). *Corporate social responsibility: Making good business sense*. Geneva: WBCSD.

Yao, S., Wang, J. and Song, L. (2011). Determinants of social responsibility disclosure by Chinese Firms. The University of Nottingham, China Policy Institute, Discussion Paper 72.

Zuhroh, S. (2003). Effect of social disclosure size in company annual reports on investor reaction, *National Symposium on Accounting (SNA),* 6, Surabaya 16-17 October.