Artificial Intelligence formulated this projection for compatibility purposes from the original article published at Global Journals. However, this technology is currently in beta. *Therefore, kindly ignore odd layouts, missed formulae, text, tables, or figures.*

Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on the Profitability of Multinational Companies in Nigeria

Adedayo Temitayo Faustina¹

¹ Ekiti state University

Received: 14 December 2016 Accepted: 4 January 2017 Published: 15 January 2017

7 Abstract

3

Δ

5

This study investigated the impact of corporate social responsibility (CSR) on profitability of 8 multinational companies in Nigeria. Specifically the study analyzed the relationship and impact of corporate social responsibility spending on profit after tax, as well as the causal 10 relationship between corporate social spending and profit after tax. Five multinational 11 companies were randomly selected in the study and data were collated from their respective 12 financial reports for a period of five years covering 2010 to 2014. The study employed 13 techniques including correlation analysis, pooled ols estimation, fixed effect and random effect 14 estimations, granger causality estimation and post estimation test such as restricted f-test and 15 Hausman test. Result revealed that there is weak negative correlation between corporate 16 social spending and profit after tax (-0.0648). Corporate social spending exerts negative 17 insignificant impact on profit after tax (?=-27.0860, P=0.704), while there is only evidence for 18 unidirectional causal relationship running from corporate social spending to profit after tax for 19 Oando plc, among all the selected multinational companies (f-stat=208.868, P=0.0440). 20 Hence, the study concluded that there is insignificant relationship between corporate social 21 responsibility and profitability of multinational companies, and that there is no substantial 22 evidence of causality between corporate social responsibility and profitability among 23 multinational companies in Nigeria. Thus the study recommended that multinational 24 companies should increase their dedication to giving back to the society, by formulating a 25 framework for CSR spending to boost the standard of living of Nigerians to the point that 26 their social reputation will engender positive and substantial increase in financial performance, 27 as this is essential for their going concern in the country. 28

29

30 Index terms— corporate social responsibility, profitability, multinational companies, csr spending.

31 **1** Introduction

orporate social responsibility (CSR) has become a deck in corporate policies of multinational corporations (MNCs) 32 33 in recent time, owing to the growing concern of government policy makers, agitation of host communities and 34 environmental degradation effect of operation of most of the multinational companies around the world. The 35 term Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as posited by Olaroyeke and Nasieku (2015) encompasses a variety of issues revolving around companies' interactions with society. It refers to sets of actions that appear to further 36 some social good, beyond the interests of the firm and that which is required by law (McWilliams & Siegel, 37 2000). Important in this definition is that CSR activities are on a voluntary basis, going beyond the firm's 38 legal and contractual obligations. As such it involves a wide range of activities such as being employee-friendly, 39 environment-friendly, and respectful of communities where the firms' plants are located, and even investorfriendly 40 (Bénabou & Tirole, 2010). 41

3 II. MULTINATIONAL CORPORATIONS (MNCS)

Globally, there is increased focus on corporate social responsibility not only by business organizations but also 42 by government, international institutions and other stakeholders. The proliferation of the practice and expansion 43 of corporate social responsibility around the world had led to a wide range of developed structures, principles, 44 standards and framework by which corporate social responsibility can be governed. Several indices over time had 45 been developed for evaluation of corporate social responsibility. Such rating include the Dow Jones Sustainability 46 Index (DJSI) and the Financial Times Stocks Exchange Index. These indices rate firms based on various criteria 47 including but not limited to human rights, environmental protection, worker's health and safety, labour standard, 48 and accountability ??Kashyap, Rajan & Stein 2008). 49

With increasing number of Multinational corporations in African continents such as those in oil and gas, airlines, beverages and pharmaceutical industries, CSR has become very relevant, especially in the new millennium. However, researches in these areas have received overwhelming dominance from the western-centric and these researches have been mostly within the developed countries of North America and Europe and of late focus on the transitional or emerging economies of China, Brazil, India, and Russia (Frederick, 1960); Friedman 1962; Davis and Blomstrom, 1966; ??ethi, 1975;Carroll, 1979;Jones, 1980; ??ood, 1991;Baker, 2003; ??arroll and Buchholtz, 2008; Marcia, Otgontsetseg & Hassan, 2013; Lorraine, 2009; Carmen-Pilar, Rosa and Lisa, 2013.

In Nigeria, investigations carried out to delineate the nexus between corporate social spending and corporate 57 58 financial performance had left much controversy than usual. Ohiokha, Odion and Akhalumeh (2016) in their 59 investigation of the impact of corporate social responsibility on corporate financial performance found that 60 corporate social spending has little influence on the financial performance of the sampled firms. On the other hand studies by Babatola (2012), Richard and Okoye (2013) revealed that there is notable relationship between 61 corporate social responsibility and financial performance of organizations in Nigeria. Divergence in discoveries 62 made by scholars has hither-to hindered dedication of organizations especially multinational corporations to 63 corporate social spending, as they are skeptical about the resultant effect increasing corporate social spending 64 could exert on their profitability. 65

Due to this unevenness of research findings in Nigeria, there is need to further investigate the connection 66 between corporate social responsibility and profitability especially in the context of multinational corporations 67 (MNCs). Gaps identified in the study include dearth of investigation into the dynamic impact of corporate social 68 responsibility on profitability of multinational corporations cutting across industries and the fact that previous 69 studies do not fully harness the strength of panel data analysis to cover both fixed effect and random effect 70 71 estimations. Thus this study set out to investigate the impact of corporate social responsibility on profitability 72 of multinational companies using full static panel data analysis including pooled OLS estimation, fixed effect estimation and random effect estimation for static investigation, as well as granger causality analysis. Specifically 73 the paper set put to: i. analyse the relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability of 74 multinational companies in Nigeria; ii. analyse the impact of corporate social responsibility on profitability 75 of multinational companies in Nigeria; and iii. ascertain the causal relationship between corporate social 76 responsibility and profitability of multinational companies in Nigeria. 77

⁷⁸ 2 II. Literature Review a) Conceptual Review i. Corporate ⁷⁹ Social Responsibility (CSR)

Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) as posited by Olaroveke and Nasieku (2015) encompasses a variety of 80 issues revolving around companies' interactions with society. It refers to sets of actions that appear to further 81 some social good, beyond the interests of the firm and that which is required by law (McWilliams & Siegel, 82 2000). Important in this definition is that CSR activities are on a voluntary basis, going beyond the firm's 83 legal and contractual obligations. As such it involves a wide range of activities such as being employee-friendly, 84 environment-friendly, and respectful of communities where the firms' plants are located, and even investor-friendly 85 (Bénabou & Tirole, 2010). According to Enahoro, Akinyomi, & Olutoye, (2013), Corporate social responsibility 86 (CSR) covers a wide range of issues such as plant closures, employee relations, human rights, corporate ethics, 87 community relations and the environment. 88

⁸⁹ 3 ii. Multinational Corporations (MNCs)

The term multinational corporation (MNC) can be defined and described from differing perspectives and on a 90 number of various levels including law, sociology, history and strategy as well as from the perspectives of business 91 ethics and society. Multinational corporations are companies which seek to operate strategically on a global scale. 92 93 A multinational corporation is a company, firm or enterprise that operates worldwide with its headquarters in 94 a metropolitan or developed country. Hill (2005) defines Multinational Enterprise as any business that has 95 productive activities in two or more countries. Certain characteristics of Multinational Corporations should be 96 identified at the start since they serve, in part, as their defining features. Often referred to as "multinational enterprises," and in some early documents of the United Nations they are called "transnational organizations," 97 Multinational Corporations are usually very large corporate entities that while having their base of operations 98 in one nation-the "home nation"-carry out and conduct business in at least one other, but usually many nations, 99 in what are called the "host nations." Multinational Corporations are usually very large entities having a global 100 presence and reach ??Kim, 2000). Multinational corporations (MNCs) can spur economic activities in developing 101

102 countries and provide an opportunity to improve the qualities of life, economic growth, and regional and global 103 commons.

¹⁰⁴ 4 iii. Concept of Profitability

Profitability is considered as one of the most important studied indicators of the strategic value of CSR (Ortlitzki, 105 Schmidt, & Rynes, 2003). Researchers have started the empirical study of CSR and profitability several decades 106 ago in western countries. Many firms have been faced with increasing pressure for corporate accountability 107 from their stakeholders (managers, employees, customer, government, shareholders, and so on) ??Waddock, 108 2004). This pressure includes aspects such as legal, social, moral, and financial aspects. Profitability in this 109 context implies financial performance. However result of existing researches on CSR and its relationship with 110 financial performance, are inconclusive. Results of some studies showed a positive relationship between CSR 111 and profitability, on the other hand some concluded that a negative relationship exists while some gave a non 112 significant relationship. 113

¹¹⁴ 5 b) Theoretical Review i. Stakeholder's Theory

Stakeholder's theory is a very basic theory to CSR. Freeman's stakeholder theory asserts that managers must 115 satisfy a variety of constituents (e.g., workers, customers, suppliers, local community organizations) who can 116 influence firms' outcomes. According to this view, it is not sufficient for managers to focus exclusively on the 117 needs of stockholders, or the owners of the corporation. Stakeholder theory implies that it can be beneficial for 118 the firm to engage in certain CSR activities that non-financial stakeholders perceive to be important; because 119 120 in the absence of this, these groups might withdraw their support for the firm (McWilliams & Siegel, 2000). A 121 fundamental aspect of stakeholder theory, in any of its aspects, is that it identifies numerous different factions within a society to whom an organization may have some responsibility. Stakeholder's theory is a theory of 122 organizational management and business ethics that addresses moral and values in managing organizations. In 123 the traditional view of the firm, the shareholder view, the shareholders or stockholders are the owners of the 124 company, and the firm has a binding financial obligation to put their needs first, to increase value for them. 125 However, stakeholder theory argue that there are other parties involved, including governmental bodies, political 126 groups, trade associations, trade unions, communities, financiers, suppliers, employees, and customers. Sometimes 127 even competitors are counted as stakeholders -their status being derived from their capacity to affect the firm 128 and its other stakeholders. 129

¹³⁰ 6 ii. Carroll's Model of Corporate Social Responsibility

One of the prominent models of corporate social responsibility is Carroll's pyramid model of corporate social 131 132 responsibility. According to Carroll (1991) corporate social responsibility constitutes four kinds of corporate 133 social responsibility namely: economic responsibility, legal responsibility ethical responsibility and philanthropic responsibility. As posited by Caroll (1991) these responsibilities are framed in a pyramid structure. In his 134 opinion the economic components of corporate social responsibility is about the responsibility for profit and this 135 responsibility serves as the base for the other components of the pyramid. With regard to the legal aspect, 136 society expects organizations to comply with the laws and regulations, Ethical responsibilities are about how 137 society expects organizations to embrace values and norms even if the values and norms might constitute a 138 higher standard of performance than required by law, while Philanthropic responsibilities are those actions that 139 society expect for a company to be a good corporate citizen. 140

iii. Empirical Review Scholtens (2008) investigated the relationship between CSR and financial performance of
a sample of 289 firms from the US for the period of 1991-2004 by using Ordinary least square OLS and Granger
Causation technics of analysis. It was concluded in the study there is significant correlation between corporate
social responsibility (CSR) and financial performance, though components of CSR like community involvement,
employee relations, diversity, environment does not have positive relationship with financial performance in
respect of return and risk.

Foote, Gaffney, and Evans, (2010) studied the impact of corporate social responsibility on performance of organization in the perspective of Malcolm Baldrige criteria of the USA and also compared this with the current academic thought. They had gone through various theories of firm's management, current academic thought and research to carry out the study in the criteria of Malcolm Baldrige. They concluded that there was a positive influence of corporate social responsibility on firm's performance.

Iqbal, Ahmad, Basheer, & Nadeem, (2012) examined the connectivity of CSR with financial performance, market value of share and financial leverage of 156 listed companies on Karachi Stock Exchange for the period of 2010-11. They adopted descriptive statistics, correlation and regression to conduct the study. This study showed a mixed result, that CSR negatively affected the market value of those companies and that CSR did not have any influence on those companies and also that there was no relationship between CSR and financial leverage.

¹⁵⁷ Mujahid and Abdullah (2014) studied the dependency of CSR on firm's financial performance as well as on ¹⁵⁸ shareholders' wealth in Pakistan. They had selected 10 firms which are highly rated as CSR firms and 10 non-CSR ¹⁵⁹ firms to see the differences in their financial performances and shareholders wealth as well. They selected the ¹⁶⁰ return on equity (ROE) and return on assets (ROA) ratios as financial performance indicators and stock prices and earnings per share (EPS) as representing shareholders' wealth. They adopted a mixed methodology in the
 study and concluded that there was a significant positive relationship between CSR and financial performance
 and shareholders' wealth.

Ohiokha, Odion, Akhalumeh (2016) analyzed corporate social responsibility and corporate financial performance in Nigeria. The study empirically demonstrated the impact of corporate social responsibility on firms financial performance. The study adopted pooled survey research design covering twenty nine (29) firms in Nigeria over a period covering 2005 to 2010. Data collected from the annual reports of the selected firms were analyzed using panel data regression analysis. Result revealed that corporate social responsibility (CSR) had little impact on the financial performance of the sampled companies.

Olaroyeke and Nasieku (2015) conducted an investigation of the effect of corporate social responsibility on 170 the performance of listed manufacturing companies in Nigeria. The population comprised of all the listed 171 manufacturing companies in the Nigerian Stock Exchange. Out of the total 74 quoted companies, 15 companies 172 were randomly selected from five difference sectors of the manufacturing sector. Descriptive techniques were 173 employed in this analysis based on primary data collated from responses of senior managers, chief accountants, and 174 chief auditors. Result revealed that corporate social responsibility activities have a moderate positive effect on the 175 performance of manufacturing companies listed on Nigeria Stock Exchange, and that manufacturing companies 176 177 engage in CSR not only for profitability but for other reasons such as better corporate image, marketing and 178 advertising strategy; employee satisfaction and fulfillment, improve competitive advantages, productivity and business opportunities; organizational values, among others. The study, therefore, recommended that companies 179 engage in CSR policies and strategies not only to improve their performance but also to strengthening its 180 legitimacy, reputation and building competitive advantage Onyewuchi and Obumeke (2013) studied multinational 181 corporations and the Nigeria economy. The study specifically analyzed how multinational corporations have 182 served as agent of imperialism in any country they operated. In the study it was established that the multinational 183 companies are exploitative as natural resources found in the country which is meant for the development of the 184 country are productively utilized due to de-capitalization of the economy in form of profit repatriation. However 185 the study emphasized that despite the negative activities of MNCs, they contribute positively in the areas of 186 technological development and creation of employment opportunities Richard and Okoye (2013) examined the 187 impact of corporate social responsibility on the deposit money banks of Nigeria. Descriptive survey research 188 design was adopted in the study with focus review of literatures on the subject matter of corporate social 189 responsibility and financial performance. The study reveals that Social responsibility has a great impact on the 190 society by adding to the infrastructures and development of the society. It was therefore concluded in the study 191 that a company has to give back to the society in which it operates, clean up all forms of pollution it has caused 192 in its course of operation and also provide infrastructural facilities to the society as a way of giving back and 193 developing the society. Hence the study recommended that CSR should be included in the law and enforced 194 on the firms accordingly and that Government should fix a minimum percentage of profit corporate firm should 195 expend on corporate social responsibility activities. 196

197 **7** III.

¹⁹⁸ 8 Research Method a) Model Specification

The model of this study is hinged on the theoretical framework of the stakeholder theory which states 199 that managers must satisfy a variety of constituents (e.g., workers, customers, suppliers, local community 200 organizations) who can influence firm outcomes. The theory implies that it can be beneficial for the firm to 201 engage in certain CSR activities that stakeholders perceive to be important, because in the absence of this, 202 stakeholder might withdraw their support for the firm, which will ultimately affect their performance. The 203 theory identified corporate social responsibility as a phenomenon of corporate performance. Thus the models of 204 205 ???? + ?? 3 ?????? ???? + ?? ?? (??)206

²⁰⁸ 9 b) Sources of Data and Methods of Estimation

Data used in this study were collected from the annual financial statements of five randomly selected multinational companies including Guinness Nigeria Plc, Oando Nigeria Plc, Breweries Nigeria Plc, Cadbury Nigeria Plc and Unilever Nigeria Plc. Data collated in the study covered a period of five years spanning from 2010 to 2014. In the quest to attain the objectives predetermined in the research work and to provide answers to research questions raised, the study employed panel data analysis such pooled ols estimation, fixed effect estimation, random effect estimation and granger causality analysis, alongside post estimation test such as restricted f-test, and hausman test.

IV. As shown in Table 1, the correlation between profit after tax and explanatory variables including corporate social responsibility (CSR) Total asset (TOA) and Total liability (TOL) stood at -0.0648, 0.0485, -0.2085 respectively. Reported correlation statistics revealed that there is negative relationship between profit after tax and corporate social responsibility, which connotes that profit and corporate social responsibility moves in opposite direction, consideration the strength of correlation statistics, it can be observed that the relationship

between profit after tax and corporate social responsibility is weak. The reported statistics also revealed that 221 profit after tax and total asset of the selected multinational companies moves in the same direction, while profit 222 after tax moves in opposite with total liability of the selected multinational companies. Correlation statistics 223 reported for pairs of explanatory variables stood at 0.7196, 0.7157, 0.9546 for CSS AND TOA, CSS AND TOL, 224 225 TOA AND TOL respectively, meaning corporate social responsibility of multinational companies selected in the study moves in the same direction as their total asset and total liability and also that both total asset 226 and total liability move in like direction. Result of pooled OLS estimation reported in Table 2 revealed that 227 corporate social responsibility has insignificant negative impact on profit after tax, with reported estimate of 228 -16.31206, and probability value of 0.827. the impact of total asset on profit after tax as revealed in the reported 229 estimate of 0.7720722 and corresponding probability value of 0.000 is said to be positive and significant, while 230 total liability exert negative significant impact on profit after tax based on the reported estimates of -1.175202 231 and probability values of 0.000. reported R-square for the pooled OLS estimation stood at 0.7339, meaning 232 about 73% of systematic variation in profit after tax of the selected multinational companies can be explained 233 by variation in corporate social responsibility, total asset and total liability combined, with justification for joint 234 significant impact of the explanatory variables on the profit after tax, based on the reported f-statistics of 19.31 235 and its corresponding probability value of 0.00000 c) Fixed Effect Analysis Reported in table 3 is the fixed effect 236 237 cross section specific estimation result, which account for the likely heterogeneity effect that might exist among 238 the selected multinational companies. Table 3 revealed that the impact corporate social responsibility on profit 239 after tax is negative and insignificant given reported coefficient estimates and probability values of -27.0860 and 0.704 respectively. The tables revealed that total asset exert significant impact on profit after tax of the selected 240 multinational companies with reported estimate and probability value of .5328433 and 0.000, while the impact 241 is negative and significant with estimate and probability values reported to be -.9743104 and 0.000 respectively. 242 Table 3 reported deviation of the intercept term corresponding to Oando, Breweries, Cadbury, and Unilever 243 from the reference intercept term (21279.08) representing intercept term for Guinness plc. Specifically table 244 reported deviation term to be -613.9566, -19024.75, 26181.18, and -7889.948 for Oando, Breweries, Cadbury, 245 and Unilever respectively. Reported probability values for the corresponding deviation terms revealed that the 246 intercept term for Breweries and Cadbury differ significantly from that of the reference firms (Guniness), which 247 reflects that there is presence of heterogeneity effect amidst the selected multinational companies. Reported 248 R-square at stood at 0.8566 which implies that about 86% of the systematic variation in profit after tax of the 249 selected multinational companies can be explained by corporate social responsibility spending, total asset and 250 251 total liability. F-statistics and probability values of 14.50 and 0.0000 confirmed the fitness of the model. Result of random effect estimation conducted in the study reported in table 4 revealed that corporate social responsibility 252 exerts negative insignificant impact on profit after tax. Specifically the reported estimates stood at -16.31206 253 alongside probability values of 0.825. The result on the other hand revealed that total asset exert significant 254 positive impact on profit after tax with estimates and probability values of 0.7720722, and 0.000 respectively, while 255 the impact of total liability on profit after tax is negative and significant with reported estimate and probability 256 values of -1.175202 and 0.000. R-square value reported in table 4 stood at 0.7339, alongside Wald statistics and 257 probability values of 57.92 and 0.0000 respectively. Table 5 reported the result of test conducted to ascertain 258 whether restriction on the heterogeneity effect among the selected multinational companies is valid. Fstatistics 259 value reported stood at 3.63 alongside probability value of 0.0258 respectively. The result revealed that there is 260 enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis that all differential intercept corresponding to the cross sectional 261 specific units are equal to zero. Therefore it can be concluded that there is crosssectional heterogeneity/uniqueness 262 among the selected multinational companies. Thus pooled OLS estimator restriction is not valid as cross-sectional 263 heterogeneity effect is too significant to be ignored. Result of Hausman test reported chi-square value of 12.85 264 alongside probability values of 0.0050, which implies that there is enough evidence to reject the null hypothesis 265 with differences in estimates of fixed effect and random is not systematic in favour of the alternative hypothesis 266 that difference in estimate of fixed effect and random is systematic. It thus stands that error component model 267 (random effect) estimator is not appropriate because the random effects are probably correlated with one or 268 more regressors. Thus the most consistent and efficient estimation for the study is the fixed effect cross-sectional 269 specific estimation presented in Table 3 above. Table 7 reported result of granger causality analysis conducted 270 in the study to ascertain the causal relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability of the 271 selected multinational companies. The reported statistics revealed that there is no evidence of causal relationship 272 between profit after tax and corporate social spending for all the selected multinational companies except Oando 273 which recorded the presence of unidirectional causality running from corporate social spending to profit after 274 tax, with specific f-statistics and probability values of 208.868 and 0.0440 respectively. 275

- ²⁷⁶ 10 Results and Discussion
- ²⁷⁷ 11 a) Correlation Analysis
- ²⁷⁸ 12 b) Pooled Regression Analysis
- ²⁷⁹ 13 d) Random Effect Estimation
- ²⁸⁰ 14 e) Post Estimation Test
- ²⁸¹ 15 f) Granger Causality Analysis

²⁸² 16 V. Conclusion and Recommendations

From the correlation statistics presented in Table 1, it can be observed that there is weak negative correlation 283 between corporate social spending and profit after tax (-0.0648) which suggests that corporate social spending of 284 selected multinational companies move in opposite direction, though with weak degree. The reported estimates 285 for the impact of corporate social spending in its most consistent and efficient presented in Table 3 stood at 286 -27.0860 alongside probability values of 0.704, meaning that profitability of the selected multinational companies 287 288 responds negatively and insignificantly to increase in corporate social spending. Specifically the result revealed 289 that profitability tends to decline in the same period by 27.0860 million Naira for every one million increase in the total corporate social spending of the selected multinational companies. Table 3 revealed that profitability 290 of multinational companies selected in the study respond positively and significantly to increase in total asset, 291 while increase in total liability dampens their profitability prospect on the other hand. As reported in the table 292 7 there is no evidence of causal relationship between profitability and corporate social responsibility spending 293 for all the selected multinational companies except Oando plc where a unidirectional causality running from 294 corporate social responsibility spending was recorded (f-statistics = 208.868, prob=0.0440). It thus implies that 295 past corporate social spending of multinational companies does not significantly influence their present level of 296 profitability except in the case of Oando plc. From the foregoing, the study underscored the fact that most of the 297 multinational do not consider corporate social responsibility spending as an important factor that can boost their 298 performance, as such they invest meager amount that could not trigger positive social interest and boost their 299 reputation to the point that increase profitability will be guaranteed. In a nutshell, the study established that 300 CSR spending by multinational companies in Nigeria over time had removed from their profitability prospect 301 than it has added to it. Observably, the insignificant relationship/impact of corporate social responsibility and/on 302 profitability substantiate the findings of previous studies including Ohiokha, Odion, and Akhalumeh (2016) where 303 it was established that corporate social responsibility has insignificant impact on financial performance of firms 304 in Nigeria, as well as Igbal et al ??2012) where it was established that CSR spending has negative impact on 305 firms value and performance. Contrariwise discoveries made in the study does not agree with the discoveries and 306 submissions of Olaroyeke and nasieku (2015), ??nyewuchi and Olameke (2013) and ??densi (2015). 307

From the discoveries made in the study, it becomes evident that there is insignificant negative relationship 308 between corporate social responsibility and profitability of multinational companies in Nigeria. Corporate social 309 responsibility exerts negative insignificant impact on profitability of multinational companies. The study also 310 established that there is no causal relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability for most 311 of the multinational companies sampled in the study, save for the case of Oando Plc (an oil company) that 312 reflect unidirectional causal relationship running from corporate social responsibility to profitability. The study 313 thus recommended that multinational companies should increase their dedication to giving back to the society, 314 by formulating a framework for CSR spending to boost the standard of live of Nigerians to the point that their 315 social reputation will engender positive and substantial increase in their financial performance, as this is essential 316 for their going concern in the country.

	PAT	\mathbf{CSS}	ТОА	TOL
PAT	1.0000			
CSS	-0.0648	1.0000		
ТОА	0.0485	0.7196	1.0000	
TOL	-0.2085	0.7157	0.9546	1.0000
Source: Author's Computation	on, (2016)			

1

Figure 1: Table 1 :

$\mathbf{2}$

Variable Coefficient		Standard	T-Test	Probability
		Error	Values	
\mathbf{C}	6205.231	5059.199	1.23	0.234
CSS	-16.31206	73.62828	-0.22	0.827
ТОА	0.7720722	0.105713	7.30	0.000^{*}
TOL	-1.175202	0.156886	-7.49	0.000^{*}
R-square=0.7339				
Adjusted R-square=0.6959				
F-statistics=19.31				
Prob (F-stat) $= 0.0000$				
Source: Author's Computation, (2016)				

Figure 2: Table 2 :

3

	Series: PAT CSS 7	ΓΟΑ TOL		
Variable	Coefficient	Standard Er-	T-Test	Probability
		ror	Values	
С	21279.08	8245.878	2.58	0.019
CSS	-27.0860	69.98992	-0.39	0.704
ТОА	.5328433	.1195442	4.46	0.000*
TOL	9743104	.1518247	-6.42	0.000*
Cross-sectional effects				
OANDO	-613.9566	10200.71	-0.06	0.953
BREWERIES	-19024.75	8957.705	-2.12	0.049^{*}
CADBURY	26181.18	10743.31	2.44	0.026^{*}
UNILEVER	-7889.948	8706.926	-0.91	0.378
R-square= 0.8566 Adjusted R 2 =	=0.7975, F-statistics	=14.50, Prob(F-	(stat) = 0.0000	
Source: Author's Computation,	(2016)			

Figure 3: Table 3 :

$\mathbf{4}$

	Series: PAT CS	SS TOA TOL			
Variable Coefficient		Standard Error	Z-Test	Probability	
			Values		
С	6205.231	5059.199	1.23	0.220	
CSS	-16.31206	73.62828	-0.22	0.825	
ТОА	0.7720722	0.105713	7.30	0.000*	
TOL	-1.175202	0.156886	-7.49	0.000*	
R-square=0.7339,		Wald	chi2=57.92,	Prob	>
chi2=0.0000					
Source: Author's Comput	ation, (2016)				

Figure 4: Table 4 :

 $\mathbf{5}$

Null hypothesis	F-statistics	F-statistics Probability	
all differential intercept			
are not significantly	3.63	0.0258	
different from zero			
Source: Author's Computation, (2016)			

Figure 5: Table 5 :

6

Null hypothesis	Chi-square stat Probability	
Difference in estimate		
of fixed effect and random is not	12.85	0.0050
systematic		
Source: Author's Computation, (2016)		

Figure 6: Table 6 :

 $\mathbf{7}$

Null HypothesesF-StatisticsProbabilityPAT does not Granger Cause CSS95.03280.0651CGC have to Granger Cause CSS0.0014
0
CSS does not Granger Cause PAT 0.00018 0.9914
OANDO
Null Hypotheses F-Statistics Probability
PAT does not Granger Cause CSS 2.4E-06 0.9990
CSS does not Granger Cause PAT 208.868 0.0440*
BREWERIES
Null Hypotheses F-Statistics Probability
PAT does not Granger Cause CSS 29.5813 0.1158
CSS does not Granger Cause PAT 6.83862 0.2325
CADBURY
Null Hypotheses F-Statistics Probability
PAT does not Granger Cause CSS 0.23134 0.7146
CSS does not Granger Cause PAT 0.40991 0.6375
UNILEVER
Null Hypotheses F-Statistics Probability
PAT does not Granger Cause CSS 0.26720 0.6963
CSS does not Granger Cause PAT 1.13774 0.4795
(*) significant at 5% level of significant
Source: Author's Computation, (2016)

Figure 7: Table 7 :

 ¹() 2017 © 2017 Global Journals Inc. (US) 1
 ²© 2017 Global Journals Inc. (US)
 ³() 2017 D Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on the Profitability of Multinational Companies in Nigeria

- [Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business] , Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary
 Research in Business 3 (9) p. .
- 319 [Ortlitzki et al. ()], M Ortlitzki, F Schmidt, S Rynes. 2003.
- 320 [Bénabou and Tirole ()], R Bénabou, J Tirole. 2010. p. .
- Scholtens ()] 'A Note on the interaction between corporate social responsibility and financial performance'. B
 Scholtens . *Ecological Economics* 2008. 68 (1-2) p. .
- ³²³ [Ohiokha] 'B (2016) corporate social responsibility and corporate financial performance: the Nigerian Experi ³²⁴ ence'. F I Ohiokha , OdionO A , Akhalumeh , P . International journal of accounting research 2 (10) p.
 ³²⁵ .
- [Davis and Blomstrom ()] Business and its environment, K Davis , R L Blomstrom . 1966. New York, NY:
 McGraw Hill.
- 328 [Carroll ()] Business and society: Ethics and stakeholder management, A B Carroll . 1979. Cincinnati, OH:
 329 South-Western.
- [Corporate Social and Financial Performance: A meta Analysis Organization Studies] 'Corporate Social and Financial Performance: A meta Analysis'. Organization Studies 46 (9) p. .
- Baker (2003)] Corporate social responsibility What does it mean?, M Baker . http://www.mallenbaker.
 net/csr/CSRfiles/definition.html 2003. December 27. 2003.
- [Enahoro et al. ()] 'Corporate Social Responsibility and Financial Performance: Evidence from Nigerian Manu facturing Sector'. J A Enahoro , O J Akinyomi , A Olutoye . Asian Journal of Management Research 2013.
 4 (1) p. .
- ³³⁷ [Jones ()] 'Corporate social responsibility revisited, redefined'. T M Jones . 10.2307/41164877. California
 ³³⁸ Management Review 1980. 22 (3) p. .
- [Korkchi and Rombaut ()] Corporate Social Responsibility. A case of private and public corporations, S Korkchi
 A Rombaut . 2006. 1 p. .
- ³⁴¹ [Foote et al. ()] 'CorporateSocial Responsibility: Implication for Performance Excellence'. J Foote, N Gaffney,
 ³⁴² J R Evans. Total Quality Management 2010. 21 (8) p. .
- ³⁴³ [Olaroyeke and Nasieku ()] 'Effect of corporate social responsibility on performance of manufacturing companies
 ³⁴⁴ in Nigeria'. R Olaroyeke , T Nasieku . International journal of current advanced research 2015. 4 (8) p. .
- ³⁴⁵ [Hossein ()] Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility Activities on Company Performance Interdisciplinary
 ³⁴⁶ Journal of Contemporary, K H N K E M A S Hossein . 2012. (Research in Business)
- ³⁴⁷ [Mujahid ()] 'Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Firms Financial Performance and Shareholders
 ³⁴⁸ Wealth'. Mubeen Mujahid , Abdullah , Arooj . *European Journal of Business and Management* 2014. 6
 ³⁴⁹ (31) p. .
- [Richard and Okoye ()] impact of corporate social responsibility on the deposit money banks in Nigeria. Global
 business and economics research journal, E Richard , V Okoye . 2013. p. .
- Iqbal et al. ()] 'Impact of Corporate Social Responsibilityon Financial Performance of Corporations: Evidence
 from Pakistan'. N Iqbal , N Ahmad , N A Basheer , M Nadeem . International Journal of Learning &
 Development 2012. 2 (6) p. .
- [Onyewuchi and Obumneke ()] 'Multinational Corporations and the Nigerian Economy'. O Onyewuchi , E
 Obumneke . International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences 2013. 3 (1) p.
 .
- [Mcwilliams and Siegel ()] 'social responsibility and Financial Performance: Correlation or Misspecification?'. A
 Mcwilliams , D Siegel . Strategic Management Journal 2000. 21 p. .
- ³⁶⁰ [Frederick ()] 'The growing concern over business responsibility'. W C Frederick . 10.2307/41165405. California
 ³⁶¹ Management Review 1960. 2 p. .
- Babalola ()] 'The Impact of Corporate Social Responsibility on Firms' Profitability in Nigeria'. Y A Babalola .
 Finance and Administrative Sciences 2012. 45 p. . (European Journal of Economics)
- [Carroll ()] 'The pyramid of corporate social responsibility: Towards the moral management of organisational
 stakeholders'. A B Carroll . Business Horizons 1991. 34 p. .