



Environmental Sustainability Disclosure and Market Performance of Listed Consumer Goods Firms in Nigeria

Gideon Tayo AKINLEYE ^{a*}
and Francis Bamidele OGUNDIPE ^a

^a Department of Accounting, Faculty of Management Science, Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria.

Authors' contributions

This work was carried out in collaboration between both authors. Both authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Article Information

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajebe/2024/v24i101520>

Open Peer Review History:

This journal follows the Advanced Open Peer Review policy. Identity of the Reviewers, Editor(s) and additional Reviewers, peer review comments, different versions of the manuscript, comments of the editors, etc are available here: <https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/124293>

Original Research Article

Received: 01/08/2024
Accepted: 04/10/2024
Published: 08/10/2024

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to examine the effect of environmental sustainability disclosure on the market performance of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria. This study utilized ex-post facto research design. Data were gathered from the annual reports, sustainability disclosures, and financial databases of Nigerian consumer goods manufacturing firms listed on the Nigerian Exchange Group (NGX) as of December 31, 2023. The study encompassed a population of 21 listed consumer goods manufacturing firms in Nigeria. A census sampling technique was adopted, to investigate the entire population. The research covered a twelve-year period, from 2012 to 2023, to observe trends, patterns, and long-term impacts, enabling a robust analysis. This study employed descriptive

*Corresponding author: E-mail: Gideon.akinleye@eksu.edu.ng;

Cite as: AKINLEYE, Gideon Tayo, and Francis Bamidele OGUNDIPE. 2024. "Environmental Sustainability Disclosure and Market Performance of Listed Consumer Goods Firms in Nigeria". *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting* 24 (10):161-77. <https://doi.org/10.9734/ajebe/2024/v24i101520>.

statistics (mean, median, variance, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis) and inferential statistics (panel regression analysis, correlational analysis etc.) to conduct data analysis. This regression analysis conducted revealed that both environmental protection cost disclosure, and environmental research and development cost disclosure had positive and significant effect on the market performance of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria. While environmental pollution cost disclosure had a negative but significant effect on market performance. Whereas environmental waste management control cost disclosure had positive and insignificant effect on market performance. The findings indicate that environmental cost disclosures play a significant role in shaping the market performance of consumer goods firms in Nigeria. Specifically, disclosures related to environmental protection and R&D have a positive impact, as they reflect a firm's commitment to sustainability and innovation. It was recommended that firms should prioritize and continue to disclose their investments in environmental protection and R&D, as these are positively viewed by investors and enhance market performance.

Keywords: Environmental sustainability disclosure; environmental research and development costs disclosure; environmental waste management control cost disclosure; environmental pollution control cost disclosure; environmental protection cost disclosure; market performance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Market performance is a vital indicator of a company's financial success and overall health [1]. Despite its importance, companies often face several practical challenges that can hinder their market performance, particularly in volatile markets like Nigeria. One of the key issues affecting market performance is the fluctuating macroeconomic environment [2]. Nigeria, as an emerging market, is often impacted by high inflation rates, volatile foreign exchange, and unpredictable regulatory policies, all of which create uncertainty in the business environment [3]. For instance, between 2022 and 2023, the Nigerian inflation rate hovered around 21%, significantly affecting consumer purchasing power and reducing profitability for consumer goods firms [4]. This economic volatility undermines the confidence of both local and foreign investors, leading to declining stock prices and overall market underperformance [5].

The level of transparency in corporate governance and sustainability practices is paramount [6]. Investors are increasingly prioritizing environmental, social, and governance (ESG) factors when evaluating the long-term viability of companies [7]. A lack of robust sustainability disclosures or poor governance practices can negatively affect market performance, as stakeholders may view these as risks to future earnings [8]. Studies have shown that companies with inadequate sustainability reporting tend to suffer from lower market valuations due to reduced investor confidence [9].

In addition to macroeconomic and governance issues, firms in Nigeria's consumer goods sector also face operational challenges, such as supply chain disruptions, rising energy costs, and infrastructure deficits [10]. For example, the cost of electricity in Nigeria increased by nearly 50% in 2022, placing an additional burden on manufacturing firms, which in turn affected their profitability [11]. These operational inefficiencies directly impact the bottom line and market performance. Furthermore, companies in Nigeria often struggle with capital access issues. High borrowing costs, coupled with stringent banking regulations, limit the ability of companies to raise capital for expansion or restructuring. According to the Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN), the average lending rate to businesses was around 18.5% in 2023, which discourages investment in growth initiatives [12]. This capital constraint impedes companies' ability to improve their market position and long-term profitability.

The effect of external shocks, such as the global pandemic and geopolitical tensions, on market performance. For example, the COVID-19 pandemic led to a sharp decline in global demand for products, affecting companies' sales and stock prices [13]. Similarly, disruptions in global supply chains due to geopolitical issues have significantly impacted the availability of raw materials, leading to production slowdowns and reduced market performance.

In recent years, environmental sustainability has emerged as a critical issue for firms operating in various sectors, including the consumer goods industry [14]. As businesses face increasing

pressure from stakeholders, governments, and global markets, there has been a growing demand for corporate accountability regarding environmental practices [15]. According to Lawal et al. [7], one of the ways firms demonstrate their commitment to sustainability is through environmental sustainability disclosure (ESD). This practice involves communicating a company's efforts to manage its environmental impact through reports that highlight measures such as waste reduction, energy efficiency, and carbon emission control [9].

The relevance of environmental sustainability disclosure has been amplified by the global shift towards responsible investment, where investors increasingly consider a firm's environmental, social, and governance (ESG) practices when making investment decisions [16]. In the Nigerian context, the regulatory environment has also evolved, with the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) mandating listed companies to provide more transparency in their sustainability practices [8]. However, the extent to which ESD influences the market performance of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria remains an area that requires further empirical investigation.

Previous studies have offered mixed findings on the relationship between environmental sustainability disclosure and market performance. For instance, while some studies have found a positive relationship between sustainability practices and market performance, attributing this to improved investor confidence and customer loyalty [3], others have found no significant impact, suggesting that the costs associated with sustainability initiatives may outweigh their financial benefits in the short term [13]. Therefore, this study seeks to examine the effect of environmental sustainability disclosure on the market performance of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria. By focusing on this sector, which is pivotal to the Nigerian economy, the research aims to provide insights into whether sustainability reporting can enhance market performance, thereby contributing to the ongoing discourse on corporate sustainability and financial outcomes.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Market Performance

Market performance refers to the ability of a firm to generate financial returns for its shareholders,

typically measured through key financial metrics such as stock price appreciation, Tobin's Q, return on equity (ROE), and return on assets (ROA) [17]. Market performance is the extent to which a company is able to sustain and improve its market share relative to its competitors in the same industry, reflecting its competitive strength and market dominance [18]. Market performance is the firm's capacity to create value for stakeholders, including shareholders, customers, and employees, through sustained profitability, innovation, and superior product offerings that drive long-term growth [15]. Market performance encompasses the overall financial and non-financial outcomes of a company that satisfy the expectations of stakeholders, including investors, regulators, and the community, particularly through adherence to environmental, social, and governance (ESG) standards [19]. Market performance is the degree to which a company's activities contribute to the broader economy, including its contribution to GDP, job creation, and industry growth, often reflected in its profitability, market capitalization, and efficiency in resource utilization [20].

2.2 Environmental Sustainability Disclosure

Environmental sustainability disclosure refers to the formal process through which companies report their environmental impact and compliance with regulations, including emissions, energy usage, and waste management, as mandated by regulatory bodies [21]. Environmental sustainability disclosure is the voluntary practice of communicating a company's environmental initiatives, strategies, and performance to stakeholders, aimed at showcasing the company's commitment to reducing its ecological footprint and promoting sustainability [1]. Environmental sustainability disclosure is the process through which firms provide information about their environmental policies, practices, and outcomes to stakeholders, ensuring transparency and accountability in how they manage their ecological responsibilities [2]. Environmental sustainability disclosure involves the quantification and reporting of a company's environmental performance, including carbon emissions, resource utilization, and waste management practices, to evaluate how well a firm is meeting its sustainability goals [22]. Environmental sustainability disclosure is the integration of environmental reporting into corporate governance practices, where firms

disclose how their board of directors and management oversee environmental risks and implement sustainability initiatives as part of long-term strategy [15].

2.2.1 Environmental research and development expenditure disclosure

Environmental research and development (R&D) expenditure disclosure refers to the process by which companies report their financial investments in R&D projects aimed at developing environmentally sustainable technologies, products, or processes [23]. Environmental research and development (R&D) expenditure disclosure is the communication of funds allocated to innovative projects and scientific research aimed at addressing environmental challenges, such as reducing carbon emissions, improving energy efficiency, or developing renewable resources [24]. Environmental research and development (R&D) expenditure disclosure involves companies providing transparent reporting on the financial resources they commit to research and development activities focused on environmental sustainability, as a way to show accountability to stakeholders for their ecological impact [25]. Environmental research and development (R&D) expenditure disclosure is the formal disclosure of a company's financial commitment to environmental research and innovation, reflecting the firm's dedication to long-term sustainability and its role in mitigating environmental risks [26]. Environmental research and development (R&D) expenditure disclosure refers to the practice of reporting financial data related to the company's strategic investments in environmentally focused research and development, aimed at fostering innovation for future sustainable business practices [16].

2.2.2 Environmental waste management control cost disclosure

Environmental waste management control cost disclosure refers to the practice of reporting the financial costs incurred by a company to manage, reduce, and dispose of waste in a manner that minimizes environmental impact, ensuring transparency for stakeholders [27]. Environmental waste management control cost disclosure is the formal communication of a firm's expenses related to waste management systems, such as recycling, treatment, and disposal, as part of its broader sustainability reporting efforts [28]. Environmental waste management control cost disclosure involves

providing detailed financial information on waste management expenditures to demonstrate compliance with environmental regulations and waste management standards [9]. Environmental waste management control cost disclosure refers to the disclosure of the investments made by a firm in controlling and reducing waste output, showing the company's accountability towards its environmental footprint and efforts in pollution control [29]. Environmental waste management control cost disclosure is the process of revealing the costs associated with waste management activities that aim to optimize operational efficiency by reducing waste production and implementing environmentally friendly waste disposal methods [2].

2.2.3 Environmental protection cost disclosure

Environmental protection cost disclosure refers to the process by which companies report the financial resources allocated to activities aimed at ensuring compliance with environmental regulations, such as pollution control measures and emission reductions [30]. Environmental protection cost disclosure is the practice of disclosing the costs related to initiatives that protect the environment, such as investments in renewable energy, waste management, and conservation efforts, as part of a company's sustainability reporting [31]. Environmental protection cost disclosure involves the detailed reporting of a firm's expenditures dedicated to mitigating environmental risks and preserving natural resources, demonstrating corporate responsibility and commitment to environmental stewardship [32]. Environmental protection cost disclosure refers to the transparent reporting of financial commitments made towards environmental protection initiatives, reflecting how these efforts are integrated into the company's corporate governance and risk management strategies [33]. Environmental protection cost disclosure is the communication of the costs incurred by a company in its efforts to reduce environmental impact, such as energy efficiency improvements, waste reduction programs, and water conservation, as part of an overall strategy to enhance operational sustainability [3].

2.2.4 Environmental pollution control cost disclosure

Environmental pollution control cost disclosure refers to the formal reporting of costs associated

with measures taken by a company to comply with environmental regulations and standards aimed at controlling pollution, such as emissions reduction, wastewater treatment, and hazardous waste management [14]. Environmental pollution control cost disclosure involves disclosing the financial expenditures a company allocates to pollution control initiatives as part of its broader corporate social responsibility efforts, aimed at minimizing the negative environmental impact of its operations [24]. Environmental pollution control cost disclosure is the process of communicating the costs incurred in implementing pollution mitigation strategies, including investments in cleaner technologies, pollution reduction systems, and waste management, as part of a company's sustainability reporting [15]. Environmental pollution control cost disclosure refers to the detailed reporting of costs associated with pollution prevention and control measures, which are part of a company's risk management strategy to reduce environmental liabilities and mitigate potential regulatory penalties [7]. Environmental pollution control cost disclosure is the communication of expenses incurred in pollution control activities, aimed at improving the firm's operational efficiency and reducing the environmental impact of its production processes through cleaner, more efficient technologies [2].

2.3 Theoretical Framework

This study was hinged on stakeholder theory. Stakeholder theory, propounded by R. Edward Freeman in 1984, posits that businesses should be accountable not only to shareholders but to all stakeholders affected by the company's activities. These stakeholders include employees, customers, suppliers, communities, and the environment. The theory assumes that a firm's success is interdependent on managing relationships with various stakeholders, promoting transparency, accountability, and ethical considerations [34]. Environmental sustainability disclosure aligns with the stakeholder theory's assumption that a company's performance is influenced by its relationships with various stakeholders [35]. Disclosing environmental practices fosters trust and engagement, especially with environmentally conscious investors and consumers, potentially leading to better market performance. Stakeholder theory assumes that transparency, such as through ESD, helps a firm align with societal and environmental expectations, which can enhance reputation and long-term market

performance [36]. The theory assumes that addressing stakeholder concerns, such as environmental sustainability, can lead to long-term value creation rather than short-term profit maximization [37].

Several studies underpinned by stakeholder theory, such as Clarkson et al. [36] found that firms with better environmental disclosures experienced enhanced market performance, as transparency in environmental matters strengthened stakeholder trust and firm reputation. Similarly, Reverte [38] examined the relationship between CSR disclosures, including environmental sustainability, and financial performance. It was found that firms with comprehensive environmental disclosures attracted investors, leading to improved market performance. Furthermore, Michelon et al. [39] findings suggested that when companies provide detailed and credible environmental information, stakeholders respond positively, leading to improved financial and market outcomes.

Environmental sustainability disclosure is a tool for companies to engage with a wide array of stakeholders, addressing concerns related to environmental impact. By disclosing sustainability efforts, firms can improve their relationships with key stakeholders such as investors, regulators, and consumers who prioritize sustainability, thereby positively influencing market performance [39]. Firms that are transparent about their environmental performance often enjoy enhanced reputation and credibility, leading to increased investor confidence and improved market performance. ESD serves as a signal to stakeholders that a company is committed to long-term sustainability, thus aligning with the stakeholder theory's focus on trust and accountability [36]. Investors increasingly prefer companies that align with environmental sustainability principles. Firms disclosing such information are more likely to attract socially responsible investors (SRI), leading to better market performance and aligning with the stakeholder theory's emphasis on catering to broader stakeholder interests [38].

Critics argue that stakeholder theory is vague in defining which stakeholders should be prioritized and how to balance their conflicting interests. The theory does not provide clear guidance on how firms can address environmental sustainability concerns while maximizing market performance [40]. Stakeholder theory is often criticized for placing too much emphasis on

ethical considerations and not enough on business realities, such as profitability and competitiveness. Companies may face difficulties in balancing environmental sustainability disclosure with immediate financial goals [41]. Opponents argue that adhering to stakeholder theory by incorporating extensive environmental disclosures can strain corporate resources, particularly for small firms, which may struggle to balance stakeholder demands with economic survival [42]. Stakeholder theory has been criticized for assuming that all stakeholder interests can be balanced. In reality, conflicts between environmental stakeholders and shareholders may arise, especially when environmental initiatives negatively impact short-term profits [43]. However, stakeholder theory provide a valuable understanding for the nexus between environmental sustainability disclosure and market performance in this study.

2.4 Empirical Review

This research examined pertinent literature concerning environmental sustainability disclosure and market performance. The meta-analysis conducted by Chen and Wu [33] synthesized findings from various studies on environmental R&D cost disclosure and firm performance. Their comprehensive review revealed a consistent positive relationship between the transparency of environmental R&D expenditures and firm financial performance across different industries and geographic regions. This suggests that firms disclosing their environmental R&D costs tend to experience improved financial outcomes, highlighting the importance of transparency in environmental reporting for enhancing firm performance. Furthermore, Zhang et al. [24] found that firms with strong corporate governance structures derived greater financial benefits from transparent environmental R&D expenditure reporting, emphasizing the role of governance practices in leveraging environmental initiatives for improved performance. This underscores the significance of not only disclosing environmental R&D costs but also having effective governance mechanisms in place to maximize the financial impact of such disclosures.

The research conducted by Jafari and Nikbakht [29] focused on the impact of environmental waste management disclosure on the financial performance of manufacturing firms in Iran. Utilizing panel data analysis covering 150 manufacturing firms listed on the Tehran Stock

Exchange, the study found a significant positive relationship between environmental waste management disclosure and firm performance, indicating that companies with better environmental practices tend to perform better financially. Similarly, Kim and Lee [27] examined the effect of environmental waste management reporting on the market performance of South Korean firms. Their mixed-methods approach combining quantitative regression analysis with qualitative case studies revealed that companies with higher levels of environmental disclosure had better stock market performance, highlighting increased investor confidence and higher market valuations.

Nurshabrina et al. [25] conducted a study analyzing PT Jamkrindo's financial performance over 2019-2021 and its Sustainability Report's disclosure on economic, environmental, and social aspects. Utilizing a descriptive quantitative approach, they found improved financial performance, particularly in profitability ratios, alongside fluctuations in solvency and liquidity ratios. The Sustainability Report scored highest in 2020, with the economic aspect dominant. This study offers insights into PT Jamkrindo's financial performance and sustainability reporting practices. In contrast, Etim and Akpan [31] examined sustainability disclosure's impact on oil and gas companies' financial performance from 2012 to 2021. Their findings highlighted significant positive effects of sustainability disclosures on return on capital employed, emphasizing the importance of transparent reporting in enhancing financial performance within the oil and gas sector. Similarly, Luo et al. [28] found that corporate size and performance positively influence Environmental Information Disclosure quality, suggesting measures to enhance corporate competitiveness and values. Meanwhile, Kolawole et al. [2] explored the impact of environmental accounting practices on the financial performance of Nigerian aviation companies, revealing a negative and insignificant relationship between environmental initiatives and financial performance within the aviation industry in Nigeria.

Adhania and Nurdiana [32] conducted a study on the relationship between financial performance, firm size, company age, and sustainability report disclosure among non-financial companies listed on the IDX. Utilizing quantitative secondary data from financial reports and employing multiple linear regression analysis, their findings indicated that profitability significantly influences

sustainability report disclosure, while firm size and company age had no significant effects. In contrast, Gerged et al. [14] investigated the role of environmental management accounting (EMA) in improving firm performance, particularly in SMEs in Pakistan. Through primary data collection via questionnaire surveys, they found a significant direct link between EMA and firm performance, with stakeholder integration enhancing its impact. Conversely, Igbekoyi et al. [30] investigated the influence of firms' profitability and liquidity status on their environmental reporting. Utilizing an Ex-post Facto Research Design and secondary data analysis, they found profit after tax significantly influenced environmental sustainability reporting practices among manufacturing firms, while earnings per share exhibited a positive but statistically insignificant effect, and liquidity ratio showed a negative and statistically insignificant relationship. These studies collectively underscore the multifaceted dynamics governing sustainability reporting, environmental management practices, and their impact on firm performance. Thus, this study state hypothesis as follows:

H₀₁: Environmental sustainability disclosure has no significant effect on market performance of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria.

2.5 Conceptual Framework

Fig. 1 below illustrates the interaction between the key variables in the study, focusing on the relationship between environmental sustainability disclosure and market performance. Environmental sustainability disclosure, which serves as the independent variable, refers to the extent to which companies report on their environmental practices, initiatives, and policies. This includes transparency on areas such as resource use, pollution reduction, waste management, and corporate environmental impact. On the other hand, market performance, the dependent variable, represents the company's ability to achieve success in the marketplace, typically measured through indicators such as stock prices, profitability, and market share. The model suggests that the level and quality of environmental sustainability disclosure can influence market performance by enhancing the company's reputation, building stakeholder trust, and potentially attracting environmentally conscious investors. Therefore, the Fig. 1 represents a direct link between how well a company discloses its environmental sustainability efforts and how this disclosure affects its overall performance in the market.




Fig. 1. Conceptual framework
Source: Authors' Design (2024)

3. METHODOLOGY

This study utilized *ex-post facto* research design. Data were gathered from the annual reports, sustainability disclosures, and financial databases of Nigerian consumer goods manufacturing firms listed on the Nigerian Exchange Group (NGX) as of December 31, 2023. The study encompassed a population of 21 listed consumer goods manufacturing firms in Nigeria. A census sampling technique was adopted, encompassing 100% of the population. The research covered a twelve-year period, from 2012 to 2023, to observe trends, patterns, and long-term impacts, enabling a robust analysis. This study employed descriptive statistics (mean, median, variance, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis) and inferential statistics (panel regression analysis, correlational analysis etc.) to conduct data analysis.

3.1 Model Specification

This study adapted its econometric model from Kurawa and Shaibu's [26], which investigated the relationship between environmental disclosure and the financial performance of listed non-financial companies in Nigeria. In this study, financial performance is replaced with market performance as the dependent variable.

$$MP_{it} = \alpha_0 + \beta_1 ERDD_{it} + \beta_2 EWMD_{it} + \beta_3 EPCD_{it} + \beta_4 ENPD_{it} + \epsilon_{it} \dots (i)$$

Where:

- MP = Market Performance
- ERDD = Environmental Research & Development Expenditure Disclosure
- EWMD = Environmental Waste Management Control Cost Disclosure
- EPCD = Environmental Pollution Control Cost Disclosure
- ENPD = Environmental Protection Cost Disclosure
- α = Constant Term
- β = Coefficient Term
- i = No of firms
- t = Time Period
- e = Error term

A priori expectation= $\beta_1 > 0$; $\beta_2 > 0$; $\beta_3 > 0$

3.2 Measurement and Description of Variables

Table 1 shows the description, measurement, data source, and literature evidence of the investigated variables.

Table 1. Measurement and description of research variables

SN	Variable	Description	Measurement	Literature Evidence
1a	Tobin's Q (TQ)	Tobin's Q is an economic metric that compares the market value of a company's assets to the replacement cost of those assets.	Measured as market capitalization divided by total asset	Oluwagbade et al. (2023) [44]; Awotomilusi et al. (2023) [17]
2a	Environmental Research and Development Disclosure (ERDD)	Environmental Research and Development (R&D) Disclosure involves the reporting of a company's investments, initiatives, and outcomes related to environmental research and development activities.	The Environmental Disclosure Index (EDI) receives a score of 3 when fully compliant with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), a score of 2 when partially compliant, a score of 1 when not compliant, and a score of 0 when no environmental information is disclosed by the investigated firms.	Mohammad et al. (2020) [45]; Kurawa and Shuaibu (2022) [26]
2b	Environmental Waste Management Disclosure (EWMD)	Environmental Waste Management Disclosure involves the reporting of a company's practices, policies, and	The Environmental Disclosure Index (EDI) receives a score of 3 when fully compliant with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), a score of 2 when	Mohammad et al. (2020) [45]; Kurawa and Shuaibu (2022) [26]

SN	Variable	Description	Measurement	Literature Evidence
		performance related to the management and disposal of waste generated from its operations.	partially compliant, a score of 1 when not compliant, and a score of 0 when no environmental information is disclosed by the investigated firms.	
2c	Environmental Pollution Control Disclosure (EPCD)	Environmental Pollution Control Disclosure involves the reporting of a company's efforts, initiatives, and outcomes related to controlling and reducing pollution from its operations.	The Environmental Disclosure Index (EDI) receives a score of 3 when fully compliant with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), a score of 2 when partially compliant, a score of 1 when not compliant, and a score of 0 when no environmental information is disclosed by the investigated firms.	Mohammad et al. (2020) [45]; Kurawa and Shuaibu (2022) [26]
2d	Environmental Protection Cost Disclosure (EPND)	Environmental Protection Cost Disclosure involves the reporting of a company's expenditures, investments, and activities related to environmental protection measures.	The Environmental Disclosure Index (EDI) receives a score of 3 when fully compliant with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), a score of 2 when partially compliant, a score of 1 when not compliant, and a score of 0 when no environmental information is disclosed by the investigated firms.	Mohammad et al. (2020) [45]; Kurawa and Shuaibu (2022) [26]

Source: Researchers' compilation (2024)

4. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

This section explains the characteristics of the variables used, data analysis, and study findings. These statistics summarise the variable distribution, including the mean and standard deviation.

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2 contains statistics for each variable, as well as information on their distribution and features across data. In this case, each variable had 252 observations, indicating that data was collected from 21 entities during a twelve-year period. This identifies the number of data points or observations in the sample. Conversely, the average value of ENPD is 0.9167. This implies that most firms are not fully compliant with the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) standards for environmental protection cost disclosure. While the minimum is 0, and the maximum is 3, there is a moderate spread of 0.8910, with scores ranging from 0 (no disclosure) to 3 (fully compliant). The ENPD

distribution is positively skewed, with a skewness of 0.7730. The distribution is platykurtic, as demonstrated by a kurtosis of roughly 2.8839 (less than 3).

Additionally, the mean size of EPCD is 0.9206, while the standard deviation is 0.8846. The average score is slightly below 1, indicating that most firms are not fully compliant with GRI standards for Pollution Control. The standard deviation shows variability across firms at 0.8846 while the minimum is 0 and the maximum is 3. The EPCD has a skewness of 0.7779, which indicates that it is positively skewed. The distribution is platykurtic, with a kurtosis of roughly 2.9355, which is less than 3. Again, the average value of EWMD is 1.0079, while the standard deviation is 0.9233. This suggests that firms tend to disclose slightly more on Waste Management. However, there's still substantial variation, with some firms not disclosing anything and others fully compliant at a Minimum of 0 and a Maximum of 3. A skewness of 0.7145 indicates that the distribution is positively skewed with respect to its form. The kurtosis of the distribution

is less than 3, or roughly 2.7376, indicating that it is platykurtic.

Also, the average value of ERDD is 1.1230 with a standard deviation of 0.9597. This implies that firms tend to be more transparent in disclosing Environmental Protection Costs. The standard deviation shows moderate variation across firms with a minimum value of 0 and a maximum of 4. The distribution exhibits a positive skewness, with a skewness of 0.6738. With a kurtosis of roughly 2.6994, the distribution can be considered platykurtic. However, the size of the mean of Tobin's Q is 9.3754 while the standard deviation is 41.8044. This is significantly higher than 1, indicating that many firms in this sample have a market value exceeding their replacement cost, potentially reflecting overvaluation. However, the extremely high standard deviation suggests substantial variation with a wide range from 0.000186 to 366.0795. This shows that some firms are extremely undervalued, while others are significantly overvalued. The distribution is positively skewed, as evidenced by a skewness of 7.1717. The distribution is leptokurtic, as demonstrated by a kurtosis of around 58.5119, which is greater than 3.

4.2 Test of Variables

To ensure reliable regression analysis, all variables were verified to validate the assumptions. This includes pre- and post-estimation tests, which are essential for accurate estimation.

4.2.1 Pre-estimation test

To make sure the assumptions of the chosen model were satisfied, and the data used for analysis was sufficient, the following tests were conducted. They also aid in preventing misspecification errors and confirming the validity of the model's output.

4.2.1.1 Unit root test

The panel unit root test results are shown in Table 3. The Harris-Tzavalis and Breitung unit-root test statistics were computed. The null hypothesis states that panels have unit roots (non-stationary). The alternate theory states that panels are stationary. If the p-value is less than 0.05, the null hypothesis—that the series has a unit root—is rejected; if not, it is accepted. In the Harris-Tzavalis unit-root test, the p-values for ENPD, EPCD, EWMD, and ERDD were all less than 0.05. This suggested that ENPD, EPCD, EWMD, and ERDD were stationary, while the EVA was not stationary.

4.2.1.2 Correlation test

The pairwise correlations between the independent variables are shown in Table 4. According to the study, there is a significant positive association between EPCD and ENPD (0.8610). The relationship between ENPD and EWMD is strong (0.8338). The link between EPCD and EWMD was significant (0.8837), however, the correlation between ENPD and ERDD was relatively strong (0.7948). The relationship between ERDD, EPCD and EWMD respectively, were positively significant at 0.814 and 0.8531 respectively. Except for EVA, the findings demonstrated that there was a strong association between the independent factors.

4.2.1.3 Multicollinearity

The degree of multicollinearity in the data distribution was ascertained by the application of variance inflation factor (VIF) analysis. It evaluates whether independent variables in a regression model can be predicted from one another. The EWMD is the one with the greatest VIF score (6.23), although it is still much below the cutoff of 10. This suggests that multicollinearity is absent from the model.

Table 2. Descriptive statistics

Variable	Obs	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis
ENPD	252	0.9167	0.8910	0.0000	3.0000	0.7730	2.8839
EPCD	252	0.9206	0.8846	0.0000	3.0000	0.7779	2.9355
EWMD	252	1.0079	0.9233	0.0000	3.0000	0.7145	2.7376
ERDD	252	1.1230	0.9597	0.0000	4.0000	0.6738	2.6994
EVA	252	9.3754	41.8044	0.0002	366.0795	7.1717	58.5119

Source: Researchers' Computation, (2024)

Table 3. Unit root test

Variable	Harris-Tzavalis unit-root		Breitung unit-root test	
	Z-statistics	P-value	Z-statistics	P-value
ENPD	-11.1602	0.000	-4.7998	0.0000
EPCD	-12.1547	0.000	-4.4215	0.0000
EWMD	-10.9453	0.000	-3.696	0.0000
ERDD	-12.8377	0.000	-4.8484	0.0000
EVA	2.3649	0.991	1.6178	0.9471

Source: Researchers' Computation, (2024)

Table 4. Correlation Analysis

	ENPD	EPCD	EWMD	ERDD	EVA
ENPD	1.0000				
EPCD	0.8610*	1.0000			
	0.0000				
EWMD	0.8338*	0.8837*	1.0000		
	0.0000	0.0000			
ERDD	0.7948*	0.8140*	0.8531*	1.0000	
	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000		
EVA	-0.0085	-0.0022	-0.0266	-0.0390	1.0000
	0.8929	0.9724	0.6747	0.5372	

Source: Researchers' Computation, (2024)

Table 5. Variable Inflation Factor

Variable	VIF	1/VIF
EWMD	6.23	0.160587
EPCD	6.03	0.165773
ENPD	4.45	0.224825
ERDD	4.08	0.245257
Mean VIF	5.2	

Source: Researchers' Computation, (2024)

Table 6. Post Estimation Test

Variable	chi-statistic	P-value
Ramsey RESET test	0.19	0.9012
Breusch-Pagan/Cook-Weisberg test heteroskedasticity	17.58	0.0000
Durbin-Watson	1.3236	
F-Test	1.39	0.1293
Shapiro-Wilk W test	11.449	0.0000
Breusch and Pagan Lagrange Multiplier test	0.67	0.2068

Source: Researchers' Computation, (2024)

4.2.2 Post estimation test

The Ramsey RESET was used to ensure that the model functioned properly. The null hypothesis is that the model is correctly specified, while the alternative hypothesis is that the model is incorrectly specified. If the p-value falls below 0.05, the null hypothesis is rejected. Otherwise, the alternative hypothesis is rejected. The p-

value of 0.9012 shows that the model was correctly configured. The Shapiro-Wilk test was employed to determine the normality of the data distribution. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, the data is considered regularly distributed; otherwise, normality is not assumed. The data in this situation is not normally distributed as the p-value is 0.0000. Consequently, all variables were transformed. The Breusch-Pagan/ Cook-

Weisberg test was employed to determine heteroskedasticity in this study. This establishes the significance of a model's independent variables. If the test statistics are not significant, then the residual is homoscedastic; otherwise, it is heteroskedastic.

The results showed heteroskedasticity, with a chi-square of 17.58 and a p-value of 0.0000. The Durbin-Watson test was used to determine the presence of autocorrelation in the data distribution. The model has a positive serial correlation with a d-statistic of 1.3236, which is below the threshold of 2. The f-test results showed an f-statistic of 1.39 and a p-value of 0.1293 for fixed effects and OLS, demonstrating that the OLS model is effective. The Breusch and Pagan Lagrange multiplier test was performed to determine the accuracy of the estimate between the random effect model and the pooled OLS. The test statistic is 0.67, and the p-value is 0.2068, indicating an insignificant finding. This suggested that the random effect influence was more powerful. However, generalized least-squares regression was utilised to assess the information because of autocorrelation and heteroskedasticity.

4.3 Environmental Disclosure and Financial Performance

Table 8 presents the results of a generalized least square model, which examines the relationship between the independent variables and the dependent variable. The value of the Wald chi² (4) is 75.89 while the p-value is 0.0000. The Wald chi-squared test evaluates whether the coefficients of the independent variables in the model are jointly equal to zero. The null

hypothesis is that all coefficients are zero. Since the p-value is 0.0000, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that ENPD, EPCD, EWMD, and ERDD have a statistically significant effect on Tobin's Q. Based on this, the environmental disclosure variables, as a group, significantly explain variations in Tobin's Q. Moreover, the coefficient of ENPD is 0.9535 with a p-value of 0.000. this implies that a one-unit increase in ENPD is associated with a 0.9535 increase in Tobin's Q, holding other variables constant. This suggests that firms with better disclosure of environmental protection costs tend to have higher market valuations relative to their assets.

Again, the EPCD coefficient is -4.5766 with a p-value of 0.000. this denotes that a one-unit increase in EPCD is associated with a 4.5766 decrease in Tobin's Q, holding other variables constant. This negative relationship suggests that firms with more comprehensive disclosures on pollution control may be penalized in the market. Also, the EWMD Coefficient is 0.3993 with a p-value of 0.278. EWMD has a positive but insignificant coefficient. This means that there is insufficient evidence to conclude that EWMD has a meaningful effect on Tobin's Q. Furthermore, the ERDD Coefficient is 2.0629 with a p-value of 0.000. this implies that a one-unit increase in the ERDD is associated with a 2.0629 increase in Tobin's Q, holding other variables constant. This implies that firms with higher ERDD tend to have significantly higher market valuations. Generally, ENPD and ERDD are positively associated with Tobin's Q, suggesting that better environmental transparency tends to increase firm market performance. EPCD has a negative effect on Tobin's Q while EWMD has no statistically significant effect on Tobin's Q.

Table 7. Regression analysis

Variable	OLS Model		Fixed Effect Model		Random Effect Model	
	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value	Coef.	P-value
EWMD	1.2215	0.846	2.953	0.68	1.3384	0.833
EPCD	5.0846	0.491	-4.6551	0.61	3.6618	0.628
ENPD	-2.939	0.682	1.5852	0.832	-2.1905	0.76
ERDD	-4.0048	0.474	-1.2644	0.843	-3.5223	0.532
_cons	11.0343	0.008	10.776	0.103	10.9408	0.014
Number of observations	252					
F (3, 206)	0.3		0.08		0.81	
P-value	0.8769		0.9872		0.9386	
R-squared	0.0049					
Adj R-squared	-0.0113					

Source: Researchers' Computation, (2024)

Table 8. Generalized least-squares regression analysis

TobinQ	Coef.	p-value
ENPD	0.9535	0.0000
EPCD	-4.5766	0.0000
EWMD	0.3993	0.2780
ERDD	2.0629	0.0000
_cons	7.4717	0.0130
Wald chi ² (4)	75.89	
p-value	0.0000	

Source: Researchers' Computation, (2024)

4.4 Discussion of Findings

This regression analysis conducted revealed that both environmental protections cost disclosure, and environmental research and development cost disclosure had positive and significant effect on the market performance of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria. This means that when firms disclose costs related to environmental protection efforts (e.g., pollution control, conservation measures), their market performance improves. The significance indicates that this positive effect is statistically strong and not due to chance. Disclosing costs associated with environmental R&D (e.g., developing eco-friendly products or technologies) also boosts market performance. The significance suggests that investors or stakeholders may view such efforts positively, seeing potential long-term benefits. The results align with the findings of Chen and Wu [33] which revealed a consistent positive relationship between the transparency of environmental R&D expenditures and firm financial performance across different industries and geographic regions. Furthermore, Zhang et al. [24] found that firms with strong corporate governance structures derived greater financial benefits from transparent environmental R&D expenditure reporting. Meanwhile, Kolawole et al. [2] explored the impact of environmental accounting practices on the financial performance of Nigerian aviation companies, revealing a negative and insignificant relationship between environmental initiatives and financial performance within the aviation industry in Nigeria.

While environmental pollution cost disclosure had a negative but significant effect on market performance. This implies that disclosing costs related to pollution (e.g., penalties, fines, or costs to mitigate damage) negatively impacts market performance, but the effect is statistically significant. Investors might perceive such disclosures as risks or liabilities, negatively

affecting their confidence in the firm's profitability. Whereas environmental waste management control cost disclosure had positive and insignificant effect on market performance. Although waste management disclosures have a positive relationship with market performance, the effect is not statistically significant. This suggests that waste management efforts, while beneficial, do not strongly influence investor perception or market performance. The findings are consistent with the findings of Igbekoyi et al. [30] who found profit after tax significantly influenced environmental sustainability reporting practices among manufacturing firms, while earnings per share exhibited a positive but statistically insignificant effect, and liquidity ratio showed a negative and statistically insignificant relationship. In contrast, Gerged et al. [14] found that environmental management accounting (EMA) improved firm performance, particularly in SMEs in Pakistan. Through primary data collection via questionnaire surveys, they found a significant direct link between EMA and firm performance, with stakeholder integration enhancing its impact.

The policy implication of the findings required the regulatory bodies like the Financial Reporting Council of Nigeria (FRCN) and the Securities and Exchange Commission (SEC) to mandate the disclosure of environmental protection and environmental research and development (R&D) costs. Since these disclosures positively impact market performance, making them a requirement will encourage more firms to invest in eco-friendly initiatives, thus improving environmental sustainability and corporate market value. The positive and significant effect of environmental R&D cost disclosure on market performance suggests that policymakers should introduce incentives for firms engaging in environmental research. Tax credits, grants, or subsidies for firms investing in the development of eco-friendly products or technologies can encourage more investments in this area, aligning corporate

activities with national sustainability goals. The negative but significant impact of pollution cost disclosures indicates that investor's view pollution-related expenditures as liabilities. Therefore, policies should focus on transparency in reporting pollution costs to ensure accountability. Regulatory agencies could require firms to report pollution-related penalties, fines, and mitigation costs, fostering a culture of environmental responsibility and encouraging firms to adopt pollution-reduction strategies.

Even though waste management cost disclosures had an insignificant effect on market performance, policymakers should encourage firms to improve waste management practices. Public awareness campaigns and partnerships between firms and environmental agencies could highlight the long-term benefits of waste management, potentially shifting investor perception. Additionally, introducing stricter regulations for waste management reporting could ensure that firms prioritize these efforts more effectively. The findings underline the need for standardization in sustainability reporting, particularly in the consumer goods sector. Government bodies could develop specific guidelines for environmental cost disclosures that go beyond voluntary reporting. This would ensure that all listed firms consistently report on environmental protection, R&D, pollution, and waste management, facilitating better investor assessment of firm sustainability efforts. Lastly, regulatory authorities and industry bodies should educate investors on the long-term benefits of environmental sustainability initiatives, particularly in the areas of pollution control and waste management. By promoting a deeper understanding of how such initiatives enhance long-term firm viability, investors may develop a more favorable view of environmental cost disclosures. By integrating these policy recommendations, the Nigerian consumer goods sector can enhance its contribution to environmental sustainability while strengthening market performance.

5. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study investigates the impact of various environmental cost disclosures on the market performance of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria. This study employed descriptive statistics (mean, median, variance, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis) and inferential statistics (panel regression analysis, correlational

analysis etc.) to conduct data analysis. This regression analysis conducted revealed that both environmental protections cost disclosure, and environmental research and development cost disclosure had positive and significant effect on the market performance of listed consumer goods firms in Nigeria. While environmental pollution cost disclosure had a negative but significant effect on market performance. Whereas environmental waste management control cost disclosure had positive and insignificant effect on market performance. The findings indicate that environmental cost disclosures play a significant role in shaping the market performance of consumer goods firms in Nigeria. Specifically, disclosures related to environmental protection and R&D have a positive impact, as they reflect a firm's commitment to sustainability and innovation. In contrast, pollution-related disclosures are viewed negatively, likely due to their association with risk and potential financial burden. Waste management cost disclosures, while positive, do not significantly affect market performance.

The following recommendations were suggested: Firstly, firms should prioritize and continue to disclose their investments in environmental protection and R&D, as these are positively viewed by investors and enhance market performance. Secondly, firms should work towards reducing pollution-related costs and develop strategies to minimize negative disclosures related to environmental liabilities. This could improve investor confidence and market performance. While waste management does not significantly influence market performance, firms should still focus on improving these practices. Increasing transparency and demonstrating efficiency in waste management could eventually strengthen investor trust. Lastly, firms and regulators should work to improve investor understanding of the long-term benefits of environmental efforts, including waste management, to better align investor perceptions with sustainability goals.

This study contributes to the growing body of knowledge on the intersection of environmental sustainability and corporate performance. It highlights the varying impacts of different types of environmental cost disclosures on market performance, offering insights into how firms can strategically manage their environmental responsibilities while enhancing investor confidence. The findings provide empirical evidence from the Nigerian market, contributing

to the global discourse on sustainability and financial performance, particularly in developing economies.

DISCLAIMER (ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE)

Author(s) hereby declares that NO generative AI technologies such as Large Language Models (ChatGPT, COPILOT, etc.) and text-to-image generators have been used during the writing or editing of this manuscript.

COMPETING INTERESTS

Authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

REFERENCES

1. Dagunduro ME, Falana GA, Ajayi JO, Boluwaji OD. Non-financial disclosure and firm performance: insights from listed consumer goods manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *Economy, Business & Development*2024;5(1):14-27. Available:<https://doi.org/10.47063/ebd.00015>
2. Kolawole JS, Igbekoyi OE, Ogungbade OI, Dagunduro ME. Environmental accounting practice and financial performance of listed aviation firms in Nigeria. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*. 2023;23(13):70-80. Available:<https://doi.org/10.9734/ajebea/2023/v23i13996>
3. Adewuyi TO, Emmanuel K. The impact of ESG disclosure on corporate financial performance: A study of listed firms in Nigeria. *African Journal of Business Management*. 2022;16(5):45-60.
4. National Bureau of Statistics (NBS). Nigeria inflation report; 2023. Available:<https://nigerianstat.gov.ng>
5. Dada SA, Igbekoyi OE, Dagunduro ME. Effects of forensic accounting techniques and corporate governance on financial performance of listed deposit money banks in Nigeria. *International Journal of Professional Business Review*. 2023;8(10):1-26. Available:<https://doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i10.3547>
6. Liu Y, Wang L. Environmental waste management disclosures and financial performance in Chinese industrial firms: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Environmental Accounting*. 2023;15(1):45-63.
7. Lawal AM, Igbekoyi OE, Dagunduro ME. Sustainability reporting and value creation in selected listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria. *International Journal of Accounting, Finance and Social Science Research*. 2024;2(1):39-56.
8. Okoye N, Ebe G. The role of corporate governance in enhancing environmental sustainability disclosure: Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Corporate Responsibility and Leadership*. 2021;8(4):47-61.
9. Oba VC, Fodio MI. Environmental disclosure, corporate governance and market performance of listed firms in sub-Saharan Africa. *International Journal of Accounting and Financial Reporting*. 2022;12(1):98-112.
10. Dagunduro M, Boluwaji O, Ajayi J, Falana G. Exploring the influence of forensic accounting techniques on the market value of selected deposit money banks in Nigeria. *The Journal of Accounting and Management*. 2024;14(1):115–131.
11. Nigeria Electricity Regulatory Commission (NERC). Electricity tariff review report; 2022.
12. Central Bank of Nigeria (CBN). Monetary policy review: Lending rates and business financing in Nigeria. Central Bank of Nigeria; 2023.
13. Adekoya O, Ojo A. Sustainability practices and financial performance in emerging markets: Evidence from Nigeria. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment*. 2023;12(2):131-150.
14. Gerged AM, Zahoor N, Cowton CJ. Understanding the relationship between environmental management accounting and firm performance: The role of environmental innovation and stakeholder integration—Evidence from a developing country. *Management Accounting Research*. 2024;62:100865.
15. Boluwaji OD, Igbekoyi OE, Dagunduro ME, Busayo TO, Osatuyi OA. Sustainable business practice and going concern of selected listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria. *International Journal of Emerging Trends in Social Sciences*. 2024;16(1):1-12. Available:<https://doi.org/10.55217/103.v16i1.724>
16. Egbunike FC, Odum I. Environmental reporting and market valuation of Nigerian

- listed firms. *Accounting and Finance Research*. 2023;12(3):22-35.
17. Awotomilusi NS, Adewara YM, Dagunduro ME, Falana GA. Evaluation of board characteristics and financial performance of listed multinational firms in Nigeria. *FUOYE Journal of Accounting and Management*. 2023;6(1):14-36.
 18. Odugbemi OM, Igbekoyi OE. Environmental disclosure practices and economic performance of quoted oil and gas firms in Nigeria. *African Journal of Accounting, Finance & Marketing*. 2021;5(1):109-128.
 19. Aluko AF, Igbekoyi OE, Dagunduro ME, Falana GA, Oke OE. Tax incentives and liquidity performance of quoted industrial good's firms in Nigeria. *European Journal of Business Management*. 2022;14(23):11-22.
Available:<https://doi.org/10.7176/RJFA/13-22-06>
 20. Dagunduro ME, Dada SA, Asubiojo AO. Corporate governance, board attributes, and financial performance: A study of listed insurance companies in Nigeria. *Journal of Harbin Engineering University*. 2023;44(11):1160-1170.
 21. Asubiojo AO, Dagunduro ME, Falana GA. Environmental conservation cost and corporate performance of quarry companies in Nigeria: An empirical analysis. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS)*. 2023;7(8):49-63.
Available:<https://dx.doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS S.2023.7804>
 22. Akinadewo IS, Al-Amen S, Dagunduro ME, Akinadewo JO. Empirical assessment of the effect of financial reporting components on investment decisions of small and medium enterprises in Nigeria. *Archives of Business Research*. 2023;11(9):30-49.
Available:<https://dx.doi.org/10.14738/abr.119.15449>
 23. Khan A, Yu P, Wu L. Impact of environmental research and development (R&D) cost disclosure on firm performance: A study in the manufacturing sector. *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management*. 2019;45(3):321-335.
 24. Zhang L, Chen Z, Wang Y. Moderating effect of corporate governance mechanisms on the relationship between environmental R&D cost disclosure and firm performance: A study of Chinese firms. *Journal of Corporate Finance*. 2020;25(4):412-429.
 25. Nurshabrina A, Gurendrawati E, Muliastari I. Analysis of sustainability report disclosures based on financial performance at PT Jamkrindo. *Research Trend in Technology and Management*. 2024;2(1):1-12.
Available:<https://doi.org/10.56442/rttm.v2i1.44>
 26. Kurawa JM, Shuaibu K. Environmental disclosure and financial performance of listed non-financial companies in Nigeria. *European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance Research*. 2022;10(2):31-52.
 27. Kim S, Lee J. Environmental waste management reporting and market performance: Evidence from South Korea. *Asian Business Review*. 2023;35(2):78-95.
 28. Luo X, Jaidi J, Nipo DT. Firm size, firm performance, and environmental information disclosure quality: Evidence from listed A-shares companies in China's Shanghai and Shenzhen Stock Exchanges. In *Digital Technology and Changing Roles in Managerial and Financial Accounting: Theoretical Knowledge and Practical Application*. 2024;36:193-201.
Available:<https://doi.org/10.1108/S1479-351220240000036018>
 29. Jafari M, Nikbakht N. The impact of environmental waste management disclosure on the financial performance of manufacturing firms in Iran. *Journal of Sustainable Business Practices*. 2023;28(4):112-129.
 30. Igbekoyi OE, Ogungbade OI, Olaleye AG. Financial performance and environmental sustainability reporting practices of listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *Global Journal of Accounting*. 2021;7(1):15-24.
Available:<http://gja.unilag.edu.ng/article/view/1203>
 31. Etim JA, Akpan DC. Sustainability disclosure and financial performance of oil and gas companies in Nigeria. *IIARD Journal of Business and African Economy*. 2023;9(3):39-55.
Available:<https://doi.org/10.56201/jbae.v9.no3.2023.pg39.55>
 32. Adhania L, Nurdiana D. Influence of financial performance, company size and company age on disclosure of sustainability reports in non-financial companies on IDX 2019-2021. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary*

- Approach Research and Science. 2024;2(02):575-585.
33. Chen Z, Wu L. Meta-analysis of environmental R&D cost disclosure and firm performance: A synthesis of findings across industries and regions. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2021;38(2):210-225.
34. Dagunduro ME, Igbekoyi OE, Ogungbade OI, Aluko AF, Osaloni BO. Corporate social responsibility and financial performance of macro, small, and medium-scale enterprises (MSMEs) in Ekiti State, Nigeria. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*. 2022;13(22):61-75. Available:<https://doi.org/10.7176/RJFA/13-22-06>
35. Freeman RE. *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Cambridge University Press; 1984.
36. Clarkson MBE, Li Y, Richardson GD, Vasvari FP. Does it really pay to be green? Determinants and consequences of proactive environmental strategies. *Journal of Accounting and Public Policy*. 2011;30(2):122-144.
37. Donaldson T, Preston LE. The stakeholder theory of the corporation: Concepts, evidence, and implications. *Academy of Management Review*. 1995;20(1):65-91.
38. Reverte C. The impact of better corporate social responsibility disclosure on the cost of equity capital. *Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Management*. 2012;19(5):253-272.
39. Michelon G, Pilonato S, Ricceri F. CSR reporting practices and the quality of disclosure: An empirical analysis. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*. 2015;33:59-78.
40. Jensen MC. Value maximization, stakeholder theory, and the corporate objective function. *Business Ethics Quarterly*. 2002;12(2):235-256.
41. Sundaram AK, Inkpen AC. The corporate objective revisited. *Organization Science*. 2004;15(3):350-363.
42. Margolis JD, Walsh JP. Misery loves companies: Rethinking social initiatives by business. *Administrative Science Quarterly*. 2003;48(2):268-305.
43. Heath J, Norman W. Stakeholder theory, corporate governance, and public management: What can the history of state-run enterprises teach us in the post-Enron era? *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2004;53(3):247-265.
44. Oluwagbade OI, Dagunduro ME, Awotomilusi NS, Dada SA. Evaluation of financial risk disclosure and financial performance of listed financial institutions in Nigeria. *Journal of Harbin Engineering University*. 2023;44(11):855-869.
45. Mohammad SD, Bala A, Hassan. Determinants of corporate social and environmental disclosure in the Nigerian oil and gas industry: An empirical investigation. *International Journal of Auditing and Accounting Studies*. 2020;2(2):129-153.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of the publisher and/or the editor(s). This publisher and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.

© Copyright (2024): Author(s). The licensee is the journal publisher. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Peer-review history:

The peer review history for this paper can be accessed here:

<https://www.sdiarticle5.com/review-history/124293>