ENVIRONMENTAL SUSTAINABILITY AND STAKEHOLDER'S VALUE OF LISTED MANUFACTURING COMPANIES IN NIGERIA

Odewole Olabisi Bolarinwa (Ph.D)[1], Professor Akintoye Rufus Ishola (Ph.D)[2], Professor Salawu Rafiu Oyesola (Ph.D)[3] and Dr. Adegbie Folajimi Festus (Ph.D)[4]

[1]College of Medicine, University of Lagos, Idi-Araba, Lagos. Nigeria.
[2]Professor of Accounting, Department of Accounting, Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo, Ogun-State. Nigeria.
[3]Professor of Accounting, Department of Accounting, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Osun-State. Nigeria.
[4]Associate Professor of Accounting, Department of Accounting, Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo, Ogun-State. Nigeria.

ABSTRACT: *The paper addressed a major gap in the environmental sustainability literature, as pointed out by the dearth of studies examining stakeholders' interest particularly in the developing countries. Presently, there is a high demand in the environmental accounting literature emphasizing the importance of paying attention to the stakeholder group. This paper investigates the effect of environmental sustainability on stakeholders' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria. The study employed survey research method. The instrument used in gathering the primary data was the questionnaire, which was designed in a five-point Likert scale format. 40 listed manufacturing companies were selected for this study; Four hundred (400) copies of questionnaires were purposively administered on the respondents, three hundred and twenty-six (326) copies of questionnaires were completed and returned. The theoretical framework was hinged on stakeholder theory and accountability theory which talked about the relationship between stakeholders and organisations and the need to be accountable. Results gotten from the statistical analysis showed that environmental sustainability has negative non-significant effect on management & employees' value, negative and significant effect on shareholders' value, community residents' value and government/ regulatory agencies' value. The study recommended that organisations should incorporate stakeholders' interest in their day to day activities. Furthermore, financial statements should go beyond monetary environmental information to include non-monetary environmental information.*

KEYWORDS: Environmental Sustainability, Stakeholders' Value, Stakeholders' Interest, Accountability Theory, Stakeholder Theory, Nigeria

INTRODUCTION

Global warming and environmental management have taken the central stage in global debates on issues concerning the environment most especially agitations resulting from ecological degradation as industrialization which led to economic growth and development does not come without its environmental challenges which takes the form of greenhouse effect, acid rain, ozone depletion, pollution of land, water and noise, deforestation, radioactive and chemical wastes dumped into the seas and oceans and health challenges (Seetharaman, Mohammed &

Saravanan, 2007) which threatened the environment and make environmental sustainability seem impossible. The attention of organisations and that of the stakeholders have been continuously drawn to issues of the environment. The search for environmental sustainability has made global thinking concentrate more on monitoring the interaction between man and its' environment. Stakeholders' interest has grown to follow up on how organisations account for their impact on the environment and the plans they have in sustaining environmental resources for future generation.

Sustainable development according to Woods (2000) is the maintenance of important ecological processes and systems that support life generally. It is the maintenance of important ecological processes and life support systems, preservation of genetic differences, sustainable use of resources with the general aim of achieving sustainable development by conserving living resources (Barbier 1987).

Environmental sustainability according to Daly (1990) is the rates of pollution creation, renewable resources saved and non-renewable resources depletion that can go on continuously indefinitely. It deals with meeting the needs of the present generation while having the interest of the upcoming generation at the back of ones' mind (Grayson and Kjelleren, 2015). Oti and Mbu-Ogar (2018) pointed out that organisation are now working towards environmental sustainability, their environmental consciousness has improved as they have in place policies and environmental management systems (EMS) focusing particularly on remediation and the reduction of the negative effects of economic activities on the natural environment.

In a developing economy such as Nigeria, where petroleum resources is the main source of economic income, a resource which cannot be enjoyed alone without its detrimental environmental effects as experienced by the people in the Niger Delta region, together with some other natural resources which also have their own negative impact on the environment. The citizens want the government to ensure that while improving the standard of living of the people and creating a niche for the country in the world economy the interest of the future generations is also considered.

The Triple Bottom Line approach with its three major objectives of economic, social and environmental plans is meant to create awareness, make the organisations more sensitive and make them demonstrate their contributions to the society particularly in relation to this study, issue of environmental sustainability. Ensuring sustainability on the part of the corporations is not limited only to providing financial information but also include making available non-financial information about social and environmental issues to their stakeholders (Suttipun, 2012). With the increase in the rate of acceptance on issues of the environment among the developed economies and the number of publications to support this level of acceptance, the developing countries are still behind particularly on issues of environmental sustainability; this is evidenced in the level of research in this area (Uwuigbe, 2011). Organisations in the developing countries are still battling with the inclusion of both financial and non-financial environmental information in their financial statements and the importance of stakeholders' contribution to this is yet to be appreciated.

Objective of the Study

The main objective of this paper is to investigate the effect of environmental sustainability on stakeholders' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

While the specific objectives are to:

i. Determine the effect of environmental sustainability on management & employees' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria;

ii. Examine the effect of environmental sustainability on shareholders' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria;

iii. Analyse the effect of environmental sustainability on community residents' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria;

iv. Assess the effect of environmental sustainability on government/regulatory agencies value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

Research Hypothesis

i. There is no significant relationship between environmental sustainability and management & employees' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria;

ii. There is no significant relationship between environmental sustainability and shareholders' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria;

iii. There is no significant relationship between environmental sustainability and community residents' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria;

iv. There is no significant relationship between environmental sustainability and government/regulatory agencies value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Sustainability is derived from the word sustain that is to withstand, to improve, maintain, nourish (Encarta Dictionaries, 2009). According to the Brundtland Report; it is seen as fulfilling the present demand without neglecting the needs of future generations (Bossel, 1987; Gower, 1992; Howarth, 1992; United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development UNWED 1987). Environmental Sustainability makes corporation conscious of their environment, it enables them incorporate the triple bottom line objective of economic, social and environmental sustainability (Jang, Zheng and Bosselman, 2017). Organisations are encouraged to ensure that they imbibe the environmental sustainability measures into their business activities such that while they work towards profit maximisation, the environment does not suffer and the stakeholders' interests are neglected (Dyllick and Hockerts, 2002; Perez and del Bosque, 2015). The definition of environmental sustainability adopted for this paper as it relates to corporation is: the organisational application of adequate wisdom in the use of resources, how it protect and preserve nature in the course of meeting its economic and social demands without neglecting the interest of the present and future stakeholders (Odewole, 2018)

Stakeholders' Value

The Cambridge dictionary (2017) sees value as a significant belief system experienced together by people of the same background concerning issues of good or bad, or the importance of something. Giving value to stakeholders is not an easy task as they sometimes experience similarity in their area of interest (Gregory and Keeney, 1994). Organisations' activities may end up creating or destroying stakeholders' value, which may lead to stakeholders' agitation and unrest and this may affect the business activities of the organisation as this may be disrupted by the progressive flow of events and subsequently lead to loss of profits (Lankoski, Smith & Wassenhove, 2011). A proper understanding of the stakeholders' strength and weaknesses will help organisations recognise the importance of social responsibilities, as it is the responsibility of the organisations to ensure its continuous economic, social, and environmental existence (Du, Bhattacharya & Sen, 2011).

The relationship between the stakeholder and the organisation is usually profitable as stakeholders look forward to benefitting from the symbiosis (Alexander, Sharpe & Bailey, 1993). In order to protect their stakes, stakeholders behave as interest groups towards the organisations, while working towards increasing the distributable value added of the organisation or ensuring that they get a better share of this value added (Mintzberg 1983; Pfeffer, 1992), this thereby make it difficult for organisations to handle as they are faced with measuring the conflicting interests while giving enough room for maneuvering.

Theoretical Framework

Accountability theory

The theory is concerned with the responsibility of making available detail list of actions, to which people or organisations can be held accountable (Gray, Owen & Maunders, 1991). According to Cooper and Owen (2007), it is the obligation of corporations or accounting entities to make available in detailed form and justify activities, events and actions. Accountability ensure corporate social responsibility, it enables the organisations take responsibility for their actions particularly on issues concerning environmental, economic and social effects, while rendering stewardship to stakeholders (Adams 2002; Cormier & Gordon 2001; Gray Kouhy & Lavers, 1995, Gray, Owen & Maunders, 1987, 1988).

Stakeholder Theory

Stakeholders are groups or individuals who are influenced by or can influence corporate activities; the continuous survival of the organisations depends on the kind of relationship it has with the stakeholders (Bassey, Effiok & Eton, 2013). The theory according to Phillips (2003) provides a means of connecting ethics and strategy which can help organisations who have the intention of serving the interests of all the stakeholders create value over time (Campbell, 1997; Freeman, 1984; Freeman, Harrison & Wicks, 2007). The theory creates the awareness that there are other interested parties outside the normal shareholder mentality that organisations need to incorporate into their decision-making system. Therefore, the specific interest of these stakeholders must be considered.

Empirical Review

Prior study viewed environmental sustainability in organisations Agbiogwu, Ihendinihu and Okafor (2016) examined the impact of environmental costs and social costs on performance of Nigerian manufacturing organisations and discovered that environmental costs and social costs have significant effect on Net profit margin, returns on capital employed and earning per share. The study, however, recommended that government should ensure that manufacturing firms in Nigeria confirm with environmental laws. Jang, Zheng and Bosselman (2017) in their study use web-based survey to collect data from top-level restaurant managers in the United States. The sample was gotten from panels recruited by a market research company in the U.S. 218 were retained. Both descriptive and inferential statistical tools were used in the analysis.

The study discovered the mechanisms underlying the links between managers' values and restaurants' environmental sustainability as managers' environmental values were seen to indirectly influence environmental sustainability through leadership and stakeholder engagement. The study incorporated nonfinancial measures such as stakeholder (customer/employee) satisfaction which according to the authors are probably more important and longer-term indicators because previous studies have been limited to utilising financial variables for measuring performance outcomes from environmental sustainability.

Collins (2009) identified that sustainable practices of organisations that are tagged responsible have significant relationship with firm performance while sustainable practices are inversely related to fines and penalties. The study concluded that sustainability has effect on corporate performance and it may also serve as an instrument for corporate conflict resolution. Adekanmi, Adedoyin, & Adewole (2015) examined the level of environmental accounting practices of listed companies in Nigeria, using secondary data and purposive sampling technique discovered that the level of environmental accounting among the companies is not high and identified that it may be as a result of weak regulations, or the absence of pressure group, the study however, recommended that both organisations and government should ensure that corrective measures are taken where activities impact negatively on the environment and effort should be geared towards enhancing environmental sustainability. In summary the findings from previous study have identified that the level of environmental sustainability is low and there is a need for both government and the organisations to consolidate on effort to ensure that environmental sustainability is ensured.

Environmental Accounting and Stakeholders' Value

The study conducted by Ijeoma (2015) to determine the role environmental cost accounting play in environmental sustainability in Nigeria. The findings showed that there is not enough knowledge of environmental policies on the part of the management and employees of the organisation. There is a need for organisations to adopt environmental cost techniques so as to enable them effectively manage negative effects of the waste discharge into the environment as they work towards environmental sustainability. Yusof, Zainul, Zailani, Govindan and Iranmanesh (2016) investigated the environmental practice of organisations on practitioners' behaviour during the implementation stage, administering questionnaire on 375 architects, engineers, companies, result was analysed with partial least squares technique. The finding was that a positive effect exists between efficiency of energy and waste management practices of organisations, the environmental behaviours of practitioners at the level of implementing projects.

Research Methodology

The sample size of this study comprises of 40 manufacturing companies listed on the Nigerian Stock Exchange as at 31st of December, 2017; these were selected on the criterion that they have been continuously in existence for a period of ten years that is (2008 – 2017) while the stakeholder group for this study are management and employee group, shareholders group, community residents group, government/regulatory agencies group who were selected on the criterion that they are directly affected by the activities of the organisation. Purposive sampling technique was adopted in distributing the questionnaire. This study adopts questionnaire approach as a five-point Likert scale format was designed Strongly Agree (SA); Agree (A); Undecided (U); Disagree (D); Strongly Disagree (SD) with the attached weights of 5, 4, 3, 2 and 1 respectively. The questionnaire was divided into two sections A and B where section A is basically to elicit bio-data information, while section B was to elicit information on the opinion of the respondents on the issues under contention. Copies of the questionnaires were separately and independently administered among the stakeholders.

Model Specification

The stated model explains the effect of environmental sustainability on stakeholders' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

$MEV = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ES + \mu$

$SHV = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ES + \mu$

$CRV = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ES + \mu$

$GRAV = \beta_0 + \beta_1 ES + \mu$

Where ES = Environmental sustainability

MEV = Management & Employees' Value

SHV = Shareholders' Value

CRV = Community Residents' Value

GRAV = Government/Regulatory Agencies' Value

β_0 = Unknown constant to be estimated

β_1 = Unknown coefficient to be estimated

μ = Error term

STAKEHOLDERS QUESTIONNAIRE DISTRIBUTION

Table 1: Analysis of Administered Questionnaire

Stakeholder Groups	Number of Respondents	No of Questionnaire Administered	No. of Questionnaire Retrieved and Used	No. of Questionnaire not Retrievable
Management & Employees	120	120	106	14
Shareholders	120	120	89	31
Community Residents	120	120	102	18
Government/ Regulatory Agencies	40	40	29	11
Total	**400**	**400**	**326**	**74**
		100%	**81.5%**	**18.5%**

Source: Researchers' Field Survey (2018)

FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTION OF QUESTIONNAIRE

Environmental Sustainability

Table 2.: Responses to Questions on Environmental Sustainability

S/N	Question Description	SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	S.D
		Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)		
1	Incorporating environmental accounting information in the annual reports and account is a means of ensuring environmental sustainability	206 (63.2)	90 (27.6)	8 (2.5)	9 (2.8)	13 (4)	4.433	0.970
2	Companies should regularly review current standards and practices with regards to disclosure of environmental accounting information in corporate financial statement	273 (83.7)	53 (16.3)	0	0	0	4.837	0.370
3	A well-defined environmental management practices will ensure environmental sustainability.	235 (72.1)	87 (26.7)	0	4 (1.2)	0	4.670	0.535
4	For sustainability to be achieved there is a need to review the present environmental regulations.	217 (66.6)	65 (19.9)	9 (2.8)	15 (4.6)	20 (6.1)	4.362	1.141

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2018

Table 3: Management & Employees Responses to Questionnaire

S/N	Question Description	SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	S.D
		Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)		
1	Employees believed they do not deserve fair compensation for their effort in the organisation.	0	0	0	27 (25.5)	79 (74.5)	1.255	0.438
2	Proper planning & control mechanisms have been put into place by my organisation as it regards the environment.	31 (30.2)	16 (15.1)	12 (11.3)	17 (16)	30 (28.3)	3.009	1.624
3	For credibility and responsibility to be improved, employees do not need training	3 (2.8)	5 (4.7)	0	14 (13.2)	84 (79.2)	1.387	0.932
4	The introduction of environmental accounting to manufacturing companies has not contributed to improved level of environmental protection.	5 (4.7)	4 (3.8)	9 (8.5)	19 (17.9)	69 (65.1)	1.651	1.096

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2018

Table 4: Shareholders Responses to Questionnaire

S/N	Statement	SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	S.D
		Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)		
1	Shareholders do not believe that getting better returns on their investment as they believed is a way of demanding justice for their involvement in the organisation.	66 (74.2)	19 (21.3)	4 (4.5)	0	0	1.562	0.852
2	Business investment is risky and as such there is no way to enjoy good returns without affecting the environment.	15 (16.9)	18 (20.2)	6 (6.7)	13 (14.6)	37 (41.6)	3.438	1.588
3	Environmental accounting information has not been adequately incorporated into business decision making.	45 (50.6)	17 (19.1)	12 (13.4)	7 (7.9)	8 (9.0)	3.944	1.335
4	Environmental accounting information does not empower shareholders' decision-making ability.	0	0	0	18 (20.2)	71 (79.8)	1.202	0.404

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2018

African Journal of Accounting and Financial Research
ISSN: 2682-6690
Volume 3, Issue 1, 2020 (pp. 25-43)
www.abjournals.org

Table 5: Community Residents Responses to Questionnaire

S/N	Statement	SA (5) Freq (%)	A (4) Freq (%)	U (3) Freq (%)	D (2) Freq (%)	SD (1) Freq (%)	Mean	S.D
1	Conducting corporate social responsibility cannot serve as a way to remediate the effect of organisations' activities on the residents.	3 (2.9)	1 (1.0)	0	14 (13.7)	84 (82.4)	1.284	0.788
2	Patronising locally made materials from the community will not play any role in encouraging stakeholder support.	9 (8.8)	5 (4.9)	6 (5.9)	25 (24.5)	57 (55.9)	1.863	1.267
3	Community residents have not been well represented in the plans of government and manufacturing companies as it regards environmental issues.	39 (38.2)	32 (31.4)	11 (10.8)	8 (7.8)	12 (11.8)	3.765	1.351
4	Communication between manufacturing companies and host communities has not improved lately.	28 (27.5)	36 (35.3)	0	14 (13.7)	24 (23.5)	3.294	1.571

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2018

Table 6: Government/Regulatory Agencies Responses to Questionnaire

S/N	Statement	SA (5)	A (4)	U (3)	D (2)	SD (1)	Mean	S.D
		Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)	Freq (%)		
1	Tax is not a means of controlling environmental pollution.	2 (6.9)	5 (17.2)	0	7 (24.1)	15 (51.7)	2.035	1.375
2	The present environmental regulations is not adequate, there is a need to promulgate new ones.	13 (44.8)	7 (24.1)	3 (10.3)	3 (10.4)	3 (10.3)	3.828	1.391
3	Manufacturing organisations have strictly adhere and complied with legislative rules.	6 (27.6)	4 (13.8)	5 (17.2)	9 (31)	3 (10.3)	3.172	1.416
4	Monitoring mechanisms should not be put in place to regularly follow up on the effectiveness, efficiency, adequacy and relevancy of the regulations.	0	0	0	8 (27.6)	21 (72.4)	1.276	0.455
5	Accounting standards that serves to unify environmental reporting systems should not be put into place in Nigeria as this will encourage comparisons among organisations.	0	0	0	15 (51.7)	14 (48.3)	1.517	0.509

Source: Researcher's Field Survey, 2018

Test of Hypotheses

Hypothesis One

Environmental sustainability information does not have significant effect on management/employees' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

African Journal of Accounting and Financial Research
ISSN: 2682-6690
Volume 3, Issue 1, 2020 (pp. 25-43)

Table 8: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.164	0.027	0.018	0.49346

Predictors: (Constant), ES

The model summary in Table 8 was carried out to determine the effect of environmental sustainability information on management & employees' value. The data analysis showed that R^2 is 0.027 (about 3%). This indicates that the independent variable environmental sustainability explains 3% of variation in the dependent variable management & employees' value.

Table 9: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	3.086	0.343		9.010	0.000
	ES	-0.135	0.079	-0.164	-1.699	0.092

Dependent Variable: MEV
****, **, * Correlation is significant at the 0.01, 0.05 and 0.10level (2-tailed).*
Source: Researcher's Computation, 2018 SPSS Ver.20

The coefficient of the model pointed out significantly the specific effect the independent variable has on the dependent variable. The regression unstandardized coefficient of management & employees' value result shows that a percentage (%) increase in environmental sustainability will decreased management & employees' value by -0.135%. This shows that a non-significant effect exists between environmental sustainability and management & employees' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

Table 10: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	0.703	1	0.703	2.887	0.092
	Residual	25.324	104	0.244		
	Total	26.027	105			

Predictors: (Constant), ES
Dependent Variable: MEV

The result in Table 10 shows a statistically significant F –ratio statistic has a $p>0.05$ at 95% level of confidence. The result shows that environmental sustainability has no significant effect. This means that the effect sustaining the environment has on the management & employees of organisation is not strong enough to have a detrimental effect on their value.

Hypothesis Two

Environmental sustainability does not have significant effect on shareholders' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

Table 11: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.370	0.137	0.127	0.31809

Predictors: (Constant), ES

The result in Table 11 shows the model summary which sought to establish the explanatory power of the independent variable (Environmental Sustainability) for explaining and predicting the dependent variable shareholders' value (SHV), R squared of the regression model showed 0.137 that is approximately (14%) of the variation in the dependent variable shareholders' value.

Table 12: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	3.205	0.358		8.961	0.000
	ES	-0.284	0.076	-0.370	-3.720	0.000

Dependent Variable: SHV

The coefficient of the model pointed out significantly the specific effect the independent variable has on the dependent variable. The regression unstandardized coefficient of shareholders' value result shows that a percentage (%) increase in environmental sustainability will decreased shareholders' value by -0.284%. This shows that a significant effect exists between environmental sustainability and shareholders' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

Table 13: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1.400	1	1.400	13.835	0.000
	Residual	8.803	87	0.101		
	Total	10.203	88			

Predictors: (Constant), ES
Dependent Variable: SHV

The result in Table 13 shows a statistically significant F –ratio statistic has a *p<0.05* at 95% level of confidence. The result shows that the dependent variable (Shareholders' value) is significant. The result shows that environmental sustainability has significant effect. This means that the effect environmental sustainability has on the shareholders' value of organisation is not strong enough to have a detrimental effect on their value.

Hypothesis Three

Environmental sustainability does not have significant effect on local residents' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

Table 14: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.480	0.231	-0.223	0.25982

Predictors: (Constant), ES

The result in Table 14 shows the model summary which sought to establish the explanatory power of the independent variable (Environmental Sustainability) for explaining and predicting the dependent variable community residents' value (CRV), R squared of the regression model showed 0.231 that is approximately (23%) of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model.

Table 15: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	3.773	0.380		9.922	0.000
	ES	-0.436	0.080	-0.480	-5.474	0.000

Dependent Variable: CRV

The coefficient of the model pointed out significantly the specific effect the independent variable has on the dependent variable. The regression unstandardized coefficient of community residents' value result shows that a percentage (%) increase in environmental sustainability will decreased community residents' value by -0.436%. This shows that a significant effect exists between environmental sustainability and community residents' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

Table 16: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.023	1	2.023	29.966	0.000
	Residual	6.751	100	0.068		
	Total	8.773	101			

Predictors: (Constant), ES

Dependent Variable: CRV

The result in Table 16 shows a statistically significant F statistic ($p<0.05$) at 95% level of confidence. The result shows that environmental sustainability has significant effect. This means that the effect environmental sustainability has on the community residents of organisation is not strong enough to have a detrimental effect on their value.

Hypothesis Four

Environmental sustainability does not have significant effect on government/regulatory agencies' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

Table 17: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	0.381	0.145	-0.113	0.26840

Predictors: (Constant), ES

The result in Table 17 shows the model summary which sought to establish the explanatory power of the independent variable (Environmental Sustainability) for explaining and predicting the dependent variable shareholders' value (GRAV), R squared of the regression model showed 0.145 that is approximately (15%) of the variation in the dependent variable is explained by the model

Table 18: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
		B	Std. Error	Beta	T	Sig.
1	(Constant)	3.914	1.055		3.712	0.001
	ES	-0.467	0.218	-0.381	-2.141	0.041

Dependent Variable: GRAV

The coefficient of the model pointed out significantly the specific effect the independent variable has on the dependent variable. The regression unstandardized coefficient of government & regulatory agencies' value result shows that a percentage (%) increase in environmental sustainability will decreased shareholders' value by -0.467%. This shows that a significant effect exists between environmental sustainability and government/regulatory agencies' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

Table 19: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	0.330	1	.0330	4.585	0.041
	Residual	1.945	27	0.072		
	Total	2.275	28			

Predictors: (Constant), ES
Dependent Variable: GRAV

The result in Table 19 shows a statistically significant F –ratio statistic $p<0.05$ at 95% level of confidence. The result shows that the dependent variable (government/regulatory agencies' value) is significant. The result shows that environmental sustainability has significant effect. This means that the effect environmental sustainability has on the government/regulatory agencies of organisation is not strong enough to have a detrimental effect on their value.

Summary of findings

MEV = 3.086 – 0.135ES

SH = 3.205 – 0.284ES

CRV = 3.773 – 0.436ES

GRAV = 3.914 – 0.467ES

DISCUSSION OF FINDINGS

This paper has investigated the effect environmental sustainability has on stakeholders' value. The level of degradation of the environment as a result of the activities of organisations particularly the manufacturing sector of the economy has made for the need to find a lasting solution to the issue of sustaining environmental natural resources. The regression analysis shows that environmental sustainability has significant effect on management and employees' value, shareholders' value, community residents' value and government /regulatory agencies value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria.

The result revealed that an increase in environmental sustainability will reduce management & employees' value, shareholders value, community residents' value and government/regulatory agencies' value by 0.135, 0.284, 0.436, and 0.467 respectively. This shows that environmental sustainability has significant, negative and very weak effect on shareholders' value, community residents' value, government/regulatory agencies' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria. The study therefore made it known that having in place sustainability plans though have negative effects on individual stakeholders' value but this effect is not strong enough to have detrimental impact on the organisations as well as the value stakeholders are protecting.

This, therefore, shows that organisations should have in place environmental sustainability plans and ensure that these plans are actualised especially when they realise that their business activities have detrimental impact on the environment. It is important that stakeholders are included in this environmental sustainability plans as the disclosure of environmental sustainability information in the financial statements and other communication medium used by the organisations will not be detrimental to both the organisations and the stakeholders.

The findings is consistent with the findings of Faboyede (2011) where it was stated that organisations that identify with its statutory responsibilities and also work towards being on the edge by making use of environmentally friendly technologies would enjoy benefits such as increase in employees commitment; reduction in operating costs and wastes disposal costs; lower or elimination of taxes, levies and fines.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The paper concludes that organisations should be involved in environmental sustainability; it should include this information as part of the information made available to its stakeholders. Organisation should also make available information on the effects its business activities have on the environment and vice-versa, while also incorporating stakeholders' demands into business activities. The paper calls on organisations to be accountable to the presently identified stakeholders and those yet to be identified but who may be captured by the Integrated Reporting System. The paper therefore recommends that:

1. Organisations should ensure that the interests of stakeholders are incorporated into their day to day activities.
2. The financial statements should be put together in such a way that both financial and non-financial information are contained within it.
3. The environment needs sustenance so as to continually support eco-existence, this, the organisation is not excluded.

REFERENCES

Adams, C.A. (2002). Internal organisational factors influencing corporate social and ethical reporting: Beyond current theorising. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal, 17*(5), 731-751.

Adekanmi, A.D., Adedoyin, R.A., & Adewole, J.A. (2015). Determinants of socio-environmental reporting of quoted companies in Nigeria. *Journal of Research in Business Economic and Management, 4*(4), 459 -471.

Agbiogwu, A.A., Ihendinihu, J.U., & Okafor, M.C. (2016). Impact of environmental and social costs on performance of Nigerian manufacturing companies. *International Journal of Economics and Finance, 8*(9), 173 – 180.

Alexander, G., Sharpe, W., & Bailey, J. (1993). *Fundamentals of investments* (2nd ed.). New Jersey, NJ: Englewood Cliffs.

Barbier, E. B. (1987). The concept of sustainable economic development. *Environmental Conservation*, *14*(2), 101 – 110.

Bassey, E.B., Effiok, S.O., & Eton, O.E. (2013). The impact of environmental accounting and reporting on organisational performance of selected oil and gas companies in Niger Delta Region of Nigeria. *Research Journal of Finance and Accounting, 4*(3), 57 – 73.

Bossel, H. (1987, April 15). Viability and sustainability. *Futures*, 114 – 128.

Cambridge Dictionary online (2017). Meaning of value. Cambridge advanced learner's dictionary & thesaurus. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from www.dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/value on 10/5/17.

Campbell, A. (1997). Stakeholders: The case in favour. *Long Range Planning, 30*(3), 446 – 449.

Collins, C. N. (2009). Environment responsibility and firm performance: Evidence from Nigeria. *International Journal of Human and Social Sciences, 4*(6), 2 – 7.

Cooper, S.M., & Owen, D.L. (2007). Corporate social reporting and stakeholder accountability: The missing link. *Accounting, Organisations and Society, 32*(7), 649 - 667.

Cormier, D., & Gordon, I. M. (2001). An examination of social and environmental reporting strategies. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal*, *14*(5), 587 -616.

Daly, H. E. (1990). *Toward some operational principles of sustainable development*. Ecological Economics 2:1–6.

Du, S., Bhattacharya, C.B., & Sen, S. (2011). Corporate social responsibility and competitive advantage: Overcoming the trust barrier. *Management Science, 57*(9), 1528-1545.

Dyllick, T., & Hockerts, K. (2002). Beyong the business case for corporate sustainability. Freeman, R.E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach* (1st ed.). Boston, IL: Pitman.

Faboyede, O. S. (2011). Environmental Protection and sustainability reporting: Extensible business reporting language (XBRL) interactive data to the rescue. *Journal of Sustainable Development and Environment Protection, 1*(2), 1 -16.

Freeman, R.E., Harrison, J.S., & Wicks, A.C. (2007). *Managing for stakeholders: Survival, reputation and success* (1st ed.). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Gower, B. S. (1992). *What do we owe future generations*? In D. E. Cooper, & J. A. Palmer (Eds.). The environment in question (pp. 1 – 12). London, U.K: Routledge

Gray, R. Kouhy, R., & Lavers, S. (1995). Constructing a research database of social and environmental reporting by UK companies. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability Journal, 8*(2), 78-101.

Gray, R., Owen, D., & Maunders, K. (1988). Corporate social reporting: Emerging trends in accountability and the social contract. *Accounting, Auditing and Accountability, 1*(1), 6-20.

Gray, R.H., Owen, D., Maunders, K. (1987). *Corporate social reporting: Accounting and accountability* (1st ed.). London, UK: Prentice-Hall International.

Gray, R.H., Owen, D.L., & Maunders, K.T. (1991). Accountability, corporate social reporting and the external social audits. *Advances in Public Interest Accountability, 4*, 1-21.

Grayson, E. L., & Kjelleren, G. P. (2015). The business case for environmental sustainability. Business Law Today. BLT January. Retrieved from https://www.americanbar.org/publications/blt/2015/01/03_grayson.html

Gregory, R., & Keeney, R.L. (1994). Creating policy alternatives using stakeholder values. *Management Science, 40*(8), 1035-1048. doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.40.8.1035.

Howarth, R. B. (1992). Intergenerational justice and the chain of obligation. *Environmental Values, 1*, 133 – 140.

Ijeoma, N. (2015). Evaluation of companies' environmental practices in Nigeria. *Social and Basic Science Research Review, 3*(7), 349-364.

Jang, Y. J., Zheng, T., & Bosselman, R. (2017). Top managers' environmental values, leadership and stakeholder engagement in promoting environmental sustainability in the restaurant industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management, 63,* 101 -111.

Lankoski, L., Smith, C., & Wassenhove, L.V. (2011). Stakeholder judgments of value: Advancing stakeholder theory through prospect theory. *Business Ethics Quarterly 26*(2), 227-256.

Mintzberg, H. (1983). *Power in and around organisations* (1st ed.) New Jersey, NJ: Englewood Cliffs.

Odewole, O.B. (2018). *Environmental accounting and stakeholders' value of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria*. (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation), Babcock University, Ilisan-Remo, Ogun State.

Oti, P.A., and Mbu-Ogar, G. A. (2018). Analysis of environmental and social disclosure and finance performance of selected quoted oil and gas companies in Nigeria (2012-2016). Journal of Accounting and Financial Management, 4(2), 1-12.

Perez, A., del Bosque, I. R. (2015). An integrative framework to understand how CSR affects customer loyalty through identification, emotion and satisfaction. Journal of Business Ethics, 129(3), 571 – 584.

Pfeffer, J. (1992). *Managing with power, politics and influence in organisations* (1st ed.). Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Phillips, R.A. (2003). *Stakeholder theory and organisational ethics* (1st ed.). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Seetharaman, A., Mohammed, I., & Saravanan, A.S. (2007). Environmental accounting as a tool for environmental management system. *Journal of Applied Science, Environmental and Management, 2*(2), 137 – 145.

Suttipun, M. (2012). Triple bottom line reporting in annual reports: A case study of companies listed on the stock exchange of Thailand (SET). Asian Journal of Finance & Accounting, 4(1). doi:10.5296/1jfa.v4i1.1289

United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development (UNWED). (1987). *Our common future* (The Brundtland Report). Oxford, London: Oxford University Press.

Uwuigbe, U. (2011). Corporate social environmental sustainability reporting and firms' performance: A study of selected firms in Nigeria. Retrieved from www.bvimsr.com

Woods, C. (2000). *Communication and writing: Footprints on a territory* (1st ed.). Australia, SA: Hawke Institute, University of South Australia

Yusof, N.A., Zainul, A. N., Zailani, S. H. M., Govindan, K., & Iranmanesh, M. (2016). Linking the environmental practice of construction firms and the environmental behavior of practitioners in construction. *Journal of Cleaner Production, 1-8.*