

Firm Attributes and Environmental Disclosures: A Double-Hurdle Regression Approach

Godspower Anthony EKPULU^{1*} Agbonrha-Oghoye Imas IYOHA²

¹Department of Accounting, Niger Delta University, Yenagoa, Bayelsa State, Nigeria

²Department of Accounting, Edo State University Uzairue, Edo State, Nigeria

*Corresponding Email: godspower.ekpulu@ndu.edu.ng

Abstract

The study examines firm attributes and environmental reporting disclosures. The study employs an ex post facto design. As of 2020, the Nigerian Exchange Group (NGX) listed 110 non-financial companies. ESI and non-ESI companies were divided. ESI firms are oil and gas, and industrial goods companies, while non-ESI firms are other non-financial firms listed in the NGX from 2011 to 2020. The study purposively samples 23 ESI and 23 non-ESI firms. The Double-Hurdle technique can determine whether a set of factors affects the extent of disclosures, eliminating the need for Probit and Tobit (Binary) regression's restrictions. From the study findings, Firm size and profit are significant determinant of both the decision to disclose and the extent of disclosure; financial leverage is a significant determinant of disclosure, but does not determine the intensity of disclosure. The study recommends that the government of Nigeria should make environmental disclosure mandatory for firms operating mostly in the environmentally sensitive industries in Nigeria.

Keywords: Double-Hurdle regression, environmental disclosures, firm attributes, stakeholder theory, environmental sensitive firms.

JEL Classification: M40 M48 F64 Q56

Introduction

Environmental devastation caused by business activities should compel corporate organizations to demonstrate a commitment to the environmental consequences of their operations. Instances of documented environmental disasters include the Exxon Valdez disaster (1989), the Union Carbide India Limited (UCIL) pesticide plant gas leak (1984), and the Deepwater Horizon oil spill (2010) (Okpala, 2019). The adverse effect of these environmental disasters, specifically the Bhopal and Alaska tragedies, led to the Earth Summit by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development UNCED in 1992) in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil (www.un.org). The submissions at the conference necessitated a paradigm shift from economic performance to other perspectives, such as environmental and social issues.

In Nigeria, the primary operational happenings of the oil and gas companies have triggered extensive environmental hazards that have caused many health and economic problems for the inhabitants. In 2008 and 2009, an Ogoni-speaking Bodo community in Rivers State, Nigeria, experienced environmental disasters. Two major oil spills were recorded from the activities of Shell Company and Eni, leading to a lawsuit filed against them. With the legal support of Amnesty International leading to an out-of-court settlement, Shell paid the sum of \$55 million as compensation to Bodo people (Amnesty International, 2018; Morgan, 2017). Sadly, no tangible clean-up of the Bodo environment has been done as promised by Shell, even after more than a decade.

A more recent court order would justify the degree of environmental negligence by these oil and gas exploration entities in the Niger Delta region. A report from Olisah (2021), captioned "Court orders Mobil, NNPC to pay N81.9 billion to communities over oil spillage," buttresses the claims that the people in the region suffer more significant economic losses and a failed compensation plan that would have mitigated such losses. Ideally, these companies should be highly environmentally sensitive, considering their vast production capacity and the consequence of the usable raw materials on the environment. Moreover, the companies' specific attributes, such as firm age, earnings, size, leverage, and liquidity, are considered influential in shaping the operations and behavioral patterns of the firms as it relates to the environment. Such attributes should also allow them to disclose all disclosable information to maintain their legitimacy.

Nevertheless, the observed reported litigation and non-litigation cases would convince one to infer that these companies are environmentally insensitive. According to Egbunike and Tarilaye (2017), the adverse effect firms' activities have on their environment has spurred stakeholders' demands for and the corporate entities to be environmentally and socially inclined. This has also led to the establishment of several international organizations not excluding the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI) in 1997, the Integrated Reporting Council (IIRC) in 2010, both aimed at promoting environmental sustainability. In Nigeria, we have had ethical regulatory laws such as the National Environmental Standards and Regulations Enforcement Agency (NESREA) and the National Oil Spill Detection and Response Agency (NOSDRA). Stakeholder clamor for corporate entities to be environmentally responsible has shifted from ethical regulatory laws to making such disclosures in their annual reports. As a result, corporate environmental disclosures have become a medium through which companies report on their environmental efforts to stakeholders (Hendri & Puteri, 2015).

In Nigeria, despite the plethora of environmental regulations, such as the National Environmental Protection (Management of Solid and Hazardous Waste) Regulations 1991, the Petroleum Decree of 1969, and the Oil in Navigable Waters Decree of 1968, among others (Nabegu et al., 2017; Oladejo, Adegbe & Oladejo, 2019), there is no specific reporting framework on Corporate Environmental Disclosure (CED) practices. However, general remarks were made on sustainability issues contained in the corporate governance code, with less emphasis on CED practices with which firms should comply and report (FRCN, 2018). Consequently, environmental disclosure in Nigerian firms' annual reports is voluntary. So, what are the deciding factors for businesses to report their ecological stewardship? Could the firm's industrial attributes stimulate their level of reporting? This study examines those factors that could determine the disclosure of environmental practices among selected Nigerian listed firms in both environmentally sensitive industries (ESI) and non-environmentally sensitive industries (Non-ESI).

However, several studies have been done on factors that could determine the choice of firms to disclose their environmental practices, specifically firm attributes (Baalouch et al., 2019; Egbunike & Tarilaye, 2017; Omoye & Wilson-Oshilim, 2018; Kipngetich et al., 2019). Most of these studies adopted a single-hurdle approach. Therefore, owing to the restrictiveness of the one-step approach that most studies adopted, there is a need to overcome this problem using the Double-Hurdle technique, hence this study examines firm attributes and environmental disclosures using a double hurdle regression approach.

Literature Review

2.1 Conceptual Review

This study reviewed and adopted the above concepts in line with the position of the

cited authors; Environmental disclosure; Alok, Nikhil and Bhagaban (2008), Firm size: Yahaya (2017), Firm Leverage Egbunike & Tarilaye, (2017), Firm Earnings: Ogoun and Ekpulu, (2020). There has been conflicting evidence about whether a company's size influences its level of environmental disclosure. A particular line of studies found a positive nexus (Ahmad, 2017; Egbunike & Tarilaye, 2017; Onyali & Okafor, 2018), while another found an inverse relationship (Ofoegbu et al., 2018). Onyali and Okafor (2018) found a significant impact, while Ahmad (2017) found an insignificant impact.

The association between firm leverage and corporate ecological disclosure has been mixed. A particular line of studies found a positive connection (Benjamin et al., 2017; Egbunike & Tarilaye, 2017; Juhmani, 2014), while another found an inverse relationship (Ahmad, 2017; Yousra, 2017). The studies of Benjamine et al. (2017) and Kabiru (2020) found a significant impact, while Ahmad (2017), Ohidoa et al. (2016), and Yousra (2017) found an insignificant impact. There has been a tenuous connection between a company's bottom line and its level of environmental transparency. Umoren, Isiavwe-Ogbari, and Atolagbe (2016) showed no significant effect, while the other studies in this line of research all did (Kiswanto, Agus, Woro & Gusti, 2020; Moshud, 2020; Ogoun, & Ekpulu, 2020).

For decades, researchers have examined the impact of firm attributes on environmental disclosure. However, the estimation techniques used in these studies is the single-step approach. For instance, some studies adopted the multiple regression technique (Ahmad, 2017; Akbaş, 2014; Benjamin et al., 2017; Egolum, Amahalu & Obi, 2019; Egbunike & Tarilaye, 2017; Juhmani, 2014; Kabiru, 2020; Ogoun & Ekpulu, 2020; Onyali & Okafor, 2018; Umoren et al., 2016; Yousra, 2017) while others used the binary logistic regression approach (Moshud, 2020; Ndukwe & Onwucheka, 2015; Moshud, 2020). The problem with this approach is that a variable might have a variety of effects on the choice to disclose as well as the extent of disclosures. In order to circumvent the restrictiveness, the double-hurdle technique is best suited. Once firms have agreed to disclose, the Double-Hurdle technique has the advantage of establishing whether a collection of factors impacts the intensity of disclosures or not.

The Double-Hurdle Model

The double-hurdle model, coined by Cragg (1971), has two stages. The first stage determines if an individual is a "zero type." The second stage determines how engaged a person is in an activity, regardless of this category. The double-hurdle estimation method is used in many situations. Jones (1989) used the hurdle model to study individual cigarette consumption. Burton et al. (1994) used the model to analyze meat consumption in single-adult households. Tesfay (2020) used the model to examine factors affecting adoption probability and extent. The model has also been used to study loan default (Dionne et al., 1996; Moffatt, 2005), which assumes that some borrowers will never default. Adeyemo and Salman (2016) used the hurdle model to study family planning in Nigeria. The model is employed to evaluate the decision to use family planning and the amount of its use.

In corporate financial reporting, environmental disclosure decisions and disclosure intensity have not been specifically addressed by this model. Ekundayo et al (2021) study was the only one we could find on environmental reporting that have applied this hurdle model in Nigeria. The Cragg hurdle model is used in the above study to model environmental disclosure in a developing country, adjusting for corporate governance. Three models are used in the hurdle model. The Heckman model (Heckman, 1979), Tobit model (Tobin, 1958), and Cragg hurdle model (Cragg, 1971).

2.2. Underpinning Theories

2.2.1. Stakeholders Theory

Stakeholder theory was established by R. Edward Freeman in 1984 (Freeman, 1983) to address questions of morals and values in business management. Stakeholders, such as host communities, have a vested interest in seeing companies act responsibly toward the environment and disclose their commitment to sustainability to a wider audience than just shareholders. This is where stakeholder theory finds its relevance in this study.

2.2.2. Legitimacy Theory

The social compact that should exist between corporations and society is at the heart of the Legitimacy Theory proposed by Dowling and Pfeffer (1975). Deegan (2002) argues that businesses have unspoken responsibilities to the communities in which they operate, and this theory supports this idea. As a result, it's important to make sure everything is above board. Firms are expected to operate within the confines of what the community deems tolerable (ChakrounRaid et al., 2017), which is based on the concept that stakeholders decide on acceptable activities within the community. The need for this notion is grounded in the expectation of the community in which the corporation operates that it will justify and disclose all of its operations that may have an impact on the environment.

3. Methodology

The research employs *ex post facto* design. The population consists of the total of 110 non-financial firms listed on the NGX as at December 31, 2020. The population was dichotomized into ESI and non-ESI firms. The ESI firms consist of the oil and gas and industrial goods companies, while the non-ESI firm covers other non-finance firms listed in the Nigerian Exchange Group from 2011 to 2020. The ESI was chosen due to the sensitivity of their activities in relation to their host environment and the environment, whereas the non-ESI was considered to determine how responsible they are to their operational environment despite not being considered an environmental threat. The study purposefully sampled the entire twenty-three (23) ESI firms in the Oil & Gas and Industrial Goods sectors. Also, twenty-three (23) non-ESI firms were purposefully selected from the non-financial sector firms other than the ESI firms, such as those in the agriculture, conglomerate, construction, and consumer goods sectors. Therefore, the research sample size consists of an aggregate of 46 non-financial quoted firms. The purposive sampling technique was chosen because the target sample is well known and to avoid the possibility of not selecting environmentally sensitive firms. The type of data for the study is secondary data. These figures were derived from the audited yearly reports of the sampled firms.

3.1. Model Specification

Prior studies formed the justification for the model below, however, with modifications, specifically in respect to the estimation method used (Baalouch et al., 2019; Ekundayo et al., 2021).

The model is thus identified as:

Environmental disclosure = $f(\text{Firm size, firm leverage, and financial performance})$ -----(i)

These variables are expressed in functional form while controlling for managerial ownership:

$EVD = f(FSIZE, LEV, ROA, MANAG,)$ -----(ii)

Model (ii) is presented in the econometric form:

$EVD_{it} = \lambda_{it} + \lambda_1 FSIZE_{it} + \lambda_2 LEV_{it} + \lambda_3 ROA_{it} + \lambda_4 MANAG_{it} + \varepsilon_{it}$ -----(iii)

Hurdle Command: Hurdle linear evd fsize lev roa manag, select(fsize lev roa manag) ll(0)
 Where: EVD = Environmental report/disclosure; FSIZE = Firm size; LEV = Firm leverage;
 ROA = Return on Assets; MANAG = Managerial ownership; λ_{it} = Intercept of each cross-section; λ_1 to λ_5 = Unknown coefficient; i= Firm (1-46);t= time (1-10 years) ;and ε_{it} = error term.

3.2. Measurement of Variables

The measurements of the variables of the studies and evidence of application in prior studies is shown in Table 1:

Table 1
Measurement of Variables

S/n	Variable	Measurement	Used by prior studies
1	Environmental disclosure	(i) For the first hurdle, environmental disclosure is proxy by dummy variable measure of 1 if firm discloses and 0 if otherwise (ii) for the second hurdle, it is proxy by generating an index score (either in ratio or integer form) based on the GRI benchmark.	Ezhilarasi and Kabra (2017)
2	Firm size	The natural log of total assets is used to calculate this.	Egbunike and Tarilaye, (2017)
3	Leverage	The total debt-to-total-asset ratio is used to determine this.	Abdullah et al., (2011)
4	Financial performance	The profit after tax to total assets ratio is used to determine this.	Omoye and Wilson-Oshilim (2018)
5	Managerial ownership	The number of shares owned by management within the company is the proportion of managerial ownership	Dian et al. (2018)

Source: Authors' Compilation (2023)

3.3. Data Analyses Technique

Data was analysed using panel double-hurdle regression in STATA 16.0. The Hurdle model, a parametric extension of the P-Tobit model, is driven by two stochastic processes. The double-hurdle model with panel data requires two conditions: I the outcome of the first hurdle—whether a respondent (the firm) is of the zero types—must apply to that respondent for every period; and (ii) the amount consumed or contributed (disclosed) in any period must be determined at the level of individual observations. The double-hurdle method surpasses Tobit and P-Tobit models, according to studies (Ekundayo et al., 2021; Moffat, 2003; Martnez-Espieira, 2006).

4. Data Analysis and Discussion of Findings

4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics

	ESI					
	Regressand		Regressors			
	ENV	FSIZE	LEV	ROA	MANAG	
Mean	0.198	16.544	0.645	0.048	23.001	
Max.	0.882	21.428	2.994	1.763	97.030	
Min.	0.000	8.459	0.023	-1.799	0.000	
Std.	0.205	2.610	0.402	0.227	25.518	
Obs.	230	230	230	230	230	
	NON-ESI					
Mean	0.183	17.0019	0.599	0.029	18.294	
Max.	0.882	19.995	1.504	0.641	76.776	
Min.	0.000	11.3130	0.041	-0.549	0.007	
Std.	0.255	1.812	0.256	0.107	25.919	
Obs.	230	230	230	230	230	
	Combined					
Mean	0.190	16.773	0.622	0.038	20.642	
Max.	0.882	21.428	2.994	1.763	97.030	
Min.	0.000	8.459	0.023	-1.799	0.000	
Std.	0.231	2.255	0.337	0.177	25.710	
Obs.	460	460	460	460	460	

Source: Authors' Computation (2023)

The descriptive statistics for the variables in the research are shown in Table 2 above. The results show that the statistics for environmentally sensitive firms (ESI) are first seen, followed by the statistics for non-ESI firms, and then the total sample of both ESI and non-ESI firms. The mean ENV for ESI firms stood at approximately 20%, indicating that ESI firms disclose below the average of the environmental disclosure checklist used in the study. This is slightly higher than the 18.20% for non-ESI firms. The outcomes thus suggest no substantial difference in the extent of environmental disclosure in the annual reports of ESI firms and those of non-ESI firms. The average for the total sample stood at 19.01%, with maximum and minimum values of 88.23% and 0%, respectively, indicating that some firms do not disclose environmental issues in their annual reports.

The mean company size was 16.5458 for ESI enterprises with maximum and minimum values of 21.428 and 8.46, respectively, and 17.000 for non-ESI firms with maximum and minimum values of 19.99471 and 11.31330, respectively. The combined sample's average company size was 16.773, with maximum and minimum values of 21.428 and 8.4585, respectively. The mean LEV for ESI enterprises was 0.645, with maximum and minimum values of 2.994 and 0.0229, respectively, whereas for non-ESI firms it was 0.5993, with maximum and lowest values of 1.5044 and 0.042, respectively. The overall LEV was 0.622, with maximum and minimum values of 2.9941 and 0.0229, respectively. The average return on assets for ESI was 0.0475, indicating a 4.75 percent average return on assets, with the highest and lowest values of 1.7627 and -1.7992, respectively.

Non-ESI businesses, on the other hand, have a lower rate of 2.86 percent, with maximum and minimum values of 64.05 percent and -54.89 percent, respectively. The combined sample's mean ROA was 3.805, with maximum and minimum values of 176.27 and -197.92 percent, respectively. The average management ownership in ESI enterprises was 23.001 percent, with maximum and minimum values of 97.030 percent and 0.00

percent, respectively. The rate for NON-ESI businesses was 18.294 percent, with maximum and minimum values of 76.776 percent and 0.0065 percent, respectively. The combined sample's mean MANAG was 20.642 percent, with maximum and minimum values of 97.030 and 0.00 percent, respectively. Most of the variables in both the ESI and non-ESI businesses had Jacque-Beera p-values less than 0.05, indicating that the series may not be free of outliers.

4.2 Correlation Statistics

Table 3
Correlation Statistics

COMBINED					
ENV	1				
FSIZE	0.445***	1			
(Prob)	(0.000)				
LEV	-0.084*	-0.103**	1		
(Prob)	(0.071)	(0.028)			
MANAG	-0.181***	-0.250***	0.102**	1	
(Prob)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.029)		
ROA	0.156***	0.097**	-0.286***	-0.023	1
(Prob)	(0.001)	(0.037)	(0.000)	(0.618)	

10.0* @1%, ** sig@5% and * sig@10%**

Source: Authors' Computation (2023)

Correlation data for the variables is shown in Table 3, with an emphasis on the correlations between environmental disclosures (ENV) as well as between the dependent and independent variables being examined. For the combined sample of ESI and non-ESI, ENV and FSIZE have a positive relationship ($r = 0.444$) and are statistically significant ($p = 0.000$) at 1%, indicating that increases in company size are associated with an increase in ENV for non-ESI businesses. while ENV and LEV have a negative association ($r = -0.084$) and are significant ($p = 0.071$) at 10%. At 1%, a statistically significant association ($r = -0.1806$) exists between ENV and MANAG, whereas the correlation between ROA and ENV is likewise statistically significant ($r = 0.1562$) and positive ($p = 0.000$). The inferential power of the correlation analysis is restricted since it does not suggest causation between the variables, even if it provides some insight into the nature of the link between independent and dependent variables. Regression analysis is better suited for this purpose and will be presented later, but in a hurdle approach.

4.3 Firm Attributes and Environmental Disclosures: Double Hurdle Approach

Table 4
Hurdle Regression Result for Firm Attributes and Environmental Disclosures

Variable	Probit Model	Tobit Model	Double Hurdle Model	
			Ist Hurdle	2nd Hurdle
C	-2.1098*** (2.1854) {0.334}	-53.131*** (15.953) {0.000}	-22.3756*** (5.2658) {0.000}	-81.4006** (13.9156) {0.000}
FSIZE	0.1997* (0.1058) {0.059}	3.9885*** (0.9903) {0.000}	2.7895*** (0.6512) {0.000}	5.1568*** (0.7762) {0.000}
LEV	-0.1942 (0.8119) {0.811}	0.3193 (1.8484) {0.863}	-1.9868* (1.1520) {0.0846}	5.6091 (4.7865) {0.241}
ROA	-1.0909 (1.3582) {0.422}	-4.4745 (3.6432) {0.219}	-8.8878*** (2.5698) {0.000}	57.965*** (11.873) {0.000}
MANAG	-0.0066 (0.0075) {0.381}	-0.01325 (0.03599) {0.713}	0.0276** (0.0132) {0.0372}	-0.05401 (0.0612) {0.377}
Log Likelihood	-24.57	-1089.1		-1471.033
LR chi2(6)	8.94	42.57	110.29	127.188
Prob> chi2	0.177	0.000	0.000	0.000
Pseudo R2	0.155	0.031		
LR chi 2(6)[overall]			87.713 (0.000)	

10.0* @1%, ** sig@5% and * sig@10%**
Source: Authors' Computation (2023)

A positive and significant coefficient of FSIZE (2.7895, $p = 0.000$) indicates that the size of the company has an effect on whether or not environmental information is disclosed in annual reports, as shown by the first hurdle calculation. A positive coefficient shows that FSIZE is an important factor in both the choice to reveal and the extent and quality of disclosure. However, in the second hurdle estimation, the coefficient of LEV is positive but not significant (5.6091, $p=0.241$), despite having a negative coefficient (-1.9868) and being significant at 10% (0.0846) in the first hurdle. This suggests that the likelihood of corporations participating in environmental disclosure decreases as corporate leverage grows. Firms are more likely to publish environmental information in their annual reports if they are concerned about ROA, according to the first hurdle estimation result (-8.8878, $p=0.000$). There is a positive correlation between the ROA impact ($p = 0.000$) and the amount and quality of disclosure in annual reports, both of which are significant at 1 percent in the second hurdle calculation ($p = 0.000$). There is a positive and statistically significant correlation between the coefficient of MANAG (0.0276, $p=0.0372$) and the choice of enterprises to publish environmental information in their annual reports (0.0276, $p=0.0372$). It is, however, non-significant ($p = 0.377$) in the second hurdle calculation.

4.4. Discussion of Findings

4.4.1 Firm size and corporate environmental disclosure

From Table 6, the first hurdle estimation result shows that the coefficient of FSIZE is positive and significant at 1% (2.7895, $p = 0.000$), which implies that firm size influences the probability of firms disclosing environmental information in annual reports. The FSIZE

effect is also significant at 1% in the second hurdle estimation ($p = 0.000$) with a positive coefficient, which indicates that FSIZE is a significant determinant of both the decision to disclose and the extent or quality of disclosure. Therefore, the null hypothesis that H_{01} : *Firm size does not influence corporate environmental disclosure of firms listed in the NGX is rejected*. Over the past decades, several studies have tested the influence of firm size on the level of environmental disclosure. Although using an entirely different analytical procedure, a number of studies reports in consonance with our findings that firm size is a significant driver of environmental disclosures in both developing and developed countries (Ahmad, 2017; Egbunike & Tarilaye, 2017; Onyali & Okafor, 2018).

4.4.2. Firm Financial Leverage and Corporate Environmental Disclosure

Based on the combined estimation result in table 6, the result of the first hurdle estimation shows that the coefficient of LEV is negative and significant at 10% (-1.9868, $p=0.0846$) but not significant in the second hurdle estimation ($p=0.241$), though with a positive coefficient (5.6091). Therefore, the null hypothesis that H_{02} : *Firm financial leverage does not influence corporate environmental disclosure of firms listed in the NGX is accepted*. Although using an entirely different analytical procedure, a number of studies reports in consonance with our findings that firm leverage is not a significant driver of environmental disclosures (Ahmad, 2017; Ohioda et al., 2016; Yousra, 2017).

4.4.3. Firm Earnings and Corporate Environmental Disclosure

Based on the combined estimation result in Table 6, the first hurdle estimation result shows that the coefficient of ROA is negative and significant at 1% (-8.8878, $p=0.000$), which implies that ROA influences the decision of firms to disclose environmental information in annual reports. The ROA effect is also significant at 1% in the second hurdle estimation ($p = 0.000$) with a positive coefficient, which indicates that ROA is a significant determinant of both the decision to disclose and the extent and quality of disclosure in annual reports. Therefore, the null hypothesis that H_{03} : *Firm earnings do not influence corporate environmental disclosure of firms listed in the NGX is rejected*. Although using an entirely different analytical procedure, a number of studies reports in consonance with our findings that firm profit is a significant driver of environmental disclosures (Kiswanto et al., 2020; Moshud, 2020; Ogoun & Ekpulu, 2020).

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

This study investigates how some firm-specific characteristics influence their level of environmental disclosure. From the findings, the study conclude that firm size and firm profitability are good predictors of firm's decision to engage in environmental disclosure and the extent to which it discloses its environmental operations. However, firms with more debt in their total capital structure are more influenced in their decision to participate in environmental disclosure but are less likely to engage in the extent of environmental disclosure practices. This outcome could result from the trade-off between debt and equity and the need for an optimal capital structure. Also, firms with more debt are less likely to finance an environmental project, hence the poor environmental disclosure practices.

On the policy implications of the findings, the study would be of greater importance in developing policies that will enhance the operation of sustainability practices among firms in Nigeria. In line with this view, the government should make environmental disclosure mandatory for firms in Nigeria. It should also be part of the requirements for firms to be

listed or maintain their listing. This will help promote green accounting practices.

References

- Adeyemo, T. A., & Salman, K. K. (2016). Dynamics of observable use of family planning methods in rural Nigeria: A double hurdle model approach. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 21(12), 33-43.
- Ahmad, A. A. (2017). Influence of firm's attributes on environmental disclosure in listed brewery companies in Nigeria. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 8(21), 31-35
- Akbaş, H. E. (2014). Company characteristics and environmental disclosure: An empirical investigation on companies listed on Borsa Istanbul. *The Journal of Accounting and Finance*, 146-164. Retrieved 18 June, 2021 from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/download/article-file/427507>
- Alok, K. P., Nikhil, C. S., & Bhagaban, D. (2008). Corporate environmental reporting: An emerging issue in the corporate world. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 3(12), 146-156.
- Amnesty International (2018). Niger Delta negligence: The Niger Delta is one of the most polluted places on earth. Retrieved May 30, 2021 from <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2018/03/niger-delta-oil-spills-decoders/>
- Benjamin, U. D., Okpanachi, J., Nyor, T., & Muhammad, M. L. (2017). Effect of firm characteristics on environmental reporting practices of listed manufacturing firms in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Management Sciences*, 6(1), 139-148.
- Burton, M., Tomlinson, M., & Young, T. (1994). Consumers' decisions whether or not to purchase meat: A double hurdle analysis of single adult households. *Journal of Agricultural Economics*, 45(2), 202-212.
- ChakrounRaida, R. C., MatoussiHamadi, H. M., & MbirkiSarrah, S. M. (2017). Determinants of CSR disclosure of Tunisian listed banks: A multi-support analysis. *Social Responsibility Journal*, 13(3), 552-584.
- Cragg, J. (1971). Some statistical models for limited dependent variables with application to the demand for durable goods. *Econometrica*, 39(5), 829-844.
- Deegan, C. (2002). Introduction: the legitimizing effect of social and environmental disclosures – a theoretical foundation. *Accounting, auditing and Accountability Journal*, 15(3), 282-311.
- Dionne, G., Arts, M., & Guillèn, M. (1996). Count data models for a credit scoring system. *Journal of Empirical Finance*, 3, 303-325.
- Dowling, J., & Pfeffer, J. (1975). Organizational legitimacy: Social values and organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 18, 122-136. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1388226>
- Egbunike, A. P. & Tarilaye, N. (2017). Firm's specific attributes and voluntary environmental disclosure in Nigeria: Evidence from listed manufacturing companies. *Academy of Accounting and Financial Studies Journal*, 21(3), 1-9.
- Egolum, P. U., Amahalu, N. N., & Obi, J. C. (2019). Effect of firm characteristics on environmental performance of quoted industrial goods firms in Nigeria. *International Journal of Research in Business, Economics and Management*, 3(6), 1-13.
- Ekundayo, G., Jamani, N. J., & Odhigu, F. (2021). Environmental disclosure modelling in a developing economy: Does corporate governance matter? A double hurdle regression approach. *International Journal of Financial Research*, 12(4), 111-124. <https://doi.org/10.5430/ijfr.v12n4p111>
- Freeman, A. B. (1983). Towards an Epistemology for radical accounting: Beyond objectivism and relativism. *Critical Perspective on Accounting*
- Freeman, R. E. (2001). A stakeholder theory of the modern corporation. *Perspectives in Business Ethics* Sie, 3, 144
- Heckman, J. J. (1979). Sample selection bias as specification error. *Econometrica* 47, 153-161
- Hendri, S., & Puteri, K. (2015). Impact of corporate governance on corporate environmental disclosure: Indonesian evidence, *International Conference on Trends in Economics, Humanities and Management (ICTEH'15)*, August 12 –13, Pattaya (Thailand).
- Jones, A. M. (1989). A double-hurdle model of cigarette consumption. *Journal of Applied Economics*, 4(1), 23-39. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jae.3950040103>
- Juhmani, O. (2014). Determinants of corporate social and environmental disclosure on websites: The case of Bahrain. *Universal Journal of Accounting and Finance*, 2(4), 77 - 87. DOI:

- 10.13189/ujaf.2014.020402.
- Kabiru, S. (2020). Firm characteristics and environmental disclosure quality of listed cement companies in Nigeria. *African Scholar Journal of Mgt. Science and Entrepreneurship*, 18(7), 105-118.
- Kiswanto, K., Agus, W., Woro, S. H. T. P., & Gusti, K. A. U. (2020). Effect of financial performance on sustainable report disclosure with the board of commissioners as the moderating variable. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 13(4), 39-52.
- Martinez-Espineira, R. (2006). A box-cox double-hurdle model of wildlife valuation: The citizen's perspective. *Ecological Economics*, 58, 192-208. 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2005.07.006.
- Moffatt, P. (2005). Hurdle models of loan default. *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, 56, 1063–1071. Doi: 10.1057/palgrave.jors.2601922
- Morgan, A. D. (2017, July 28). Long-term effects of oil spills in Bodo, Nigeria. *Aljazeera*. <https://www.aljazeera.com>
- Moshud, N. M. (2020). The Impact of Profitability on Environmental Disclosure of Quoted Firms in Nigeria. *The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational & Social Sciences*, 17, 39-49
- Nabegu, Mustapha, A.B., & Naibbi, A. (2017). Environmental regulations in Nigeria: A mini review. *Int J Environ Sci Nat Res.*, 1(5), 0142-0144. DOI: 10.19080/IJESNR.2017.01.555573
- Ndukwe, O. D., & Onwuchekwa, J. C. (2015). Determinants of environmental disclosures in Nigeria: A case study of oil and gas companies. *International Journal of Finance and Accounting*, 4(3), 145-152.
- Ogoun, S., & Ekpulu, G. A. (2020). Environmental reporting and operational performance: A study of listed manufacturing. *International Journal of Intellectual Discourse*, 3(1), 381-396.
- Ohioda, T., Omokhudu, O. O., & Oserogho, I. A. F. (2016). Determinants of environmental disclosure. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research/Social and Management Sciences*, 2(8), 49-58.
- Okpala, O. P. (2019). An exploratory study of the level of social and environmental disclosures by listed firms in Nigeria. *ACTA Universitatis Danubius*, 5(2), 160-172.
- Oladejo, O. F., Adegbe, F. F., & Oladejo, M. J. (2019). Mandatory environmental disclosures by companies complying with IAS/IFRS: A case of Nigeria. *European Journal of Accounting, Auditing and Finance Research*, 7(9), 63-70.
- Olisah, C. (2021, June 21). Court orders Mobil, NNPC to pay N81.9 billion to communities over oil spillage. *Nairametrics*. Retrieved from <https://nairametrics.com>
- Onyali, C. I. & Okafor, T. G. (2018). Firm attributes and corporate environmental performance: Evidence from quoted industrial firms on Nigerian Exchange Group. *Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 5(9), 854-863
- Saz-Salazar, S., & Rausell-Köster, P. (2008). A double-hurdle model of urban green areas valuation: Dealing with zero responses. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 241-251. 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2007.08.008.
- Tesfay, M. G. (2020). Does fertilizer adoption enhance smallholders' commercialization? An endogenous switching regression model from northern Ethiopia. *Agric & Food Security*, 9(3), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40066-020-0256-y>
- Tobin, J. (1958). Estimation of relationships for limited dependent variables. *Econometrica*, 31, 24-36. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/1907382>
- Turban, D. B. & Greening, D. W. (1997). Corporate social performance and organisational attractiveness to prospective employees. *Academic Management Journal*, 40(3), 658-672.
- Umoren, A. O., Isiavwe-Ogbari, M. E., & Atolagbe, T. M. (2016). Corporate social responsibility and firm performance: A study of listed firms in Nigeria. A paper to be presented at ICAN 2nd Annual International Academic Conference on Accounting and Finance, at Lagos Airport Hotel, Ikeja on 18th to 20th May, 2016
- Wissink, R. B. A. (2012). *A test of the virtuous cycle of corporate social responsibility: Testing the relation between corporate social performance and corporate financial performance* (Unpublished Master's thesis). University of Twente. Enschede, Netherlands.
- Yahaya, O. A. (2017). Firm performance and dividend policy: A panel data analysis of listed consumer-goods companies in Nigeria. *Nigerian Journal of Management Technology and Development*, 8(1), 306-322.
- Yousra, N. E. (2017). The impact of corporate characteristics on environmental information disclosure: an empirical study on the listed firms in Egypt. *The Business and Management Review*, 8(5), 181-191.