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**ABSTRACT**

Corporate social responsibility and its revelations in an essential factor leads to companies’ continuity, because all companies have some relations with the society; therefore, the society provides long-term survival of the company.

In this way, companies in addition to economic responsibility must take responsibility of social issues. Therefore, with respect to corporate social responsibility and its revelations, the current paper examines the relationship between social responsibility and disclosure of remuneration paid to board of directors within the years 1388 to 1392. The study sample consists of 55 companies that were selected by systematic removal, that, there are a total of 275 years of companies. In this study, for examining the hypothesis, the person's correlation coefficient and t test were used. In order to analyzing data and testing study hypothesis EVIEWS software was used, after designing and testing hypothesis which has done by dividing each sub-hypothesis, it was concluded that there is a reasonable relationship between the factors social responsibility (employed relations and social participation) and Board Bonus.

1. Introduction

Moving across the responsibilities is a crucial and necessary factor which leads to continuation of organizations activity in long-term. Wide studies and examinations at late 2002 by price water house Institute at the international level showed that, nearly 70% of senior managers believed that showing the social responsibilities of the company plays an important role in profitability of company’s activity [6].

Proposed theories about company’s social responsibilities (the theory of legitimacy, the theory of interest groups, the theory of political economy) all indicate this fact manager for various reasons such as organizational legitimacy or social pressure of interest groups are selling to disclose the company’s
social information. However, all there above theories assert that if the optional disclosure of information about the social impact of the company’s activities, managers are only willing to provide information that shows the positive aspects of the organization’s activities, so that they can draw a good image of the company in the public mind, so they impact on investor’s decisions and are able to achieve their interests.

Since each business unit is part of the community in which it operates and continually interact with other community members and according to the unwritten social contract between community members who have been enacted to protect the interests of all, is essential, entity be aware of their obligations and responsibilities and does not limit them to protect the interests of shareholders, but also feel other obligations and responsibilities toward other social groups such as creditors, employees, customers, vendors and groups in the community as well as environment.

The importance of research is due to show to the investment manager, shareholders and financial analysts that, due to the role of social responsibility disclosure can have in maintaining communication between business and their interest, increase the awareness of stakeholders on corporate responsibility and moral obligations to society, and will be considered in financial and investment decisions, and consequently encourages investors which should support the right to legislate corporative social responsibility and are required to meet a company’s commitment and their performance against the community.

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is a form of corporate self-regulation integrated in to a business model. The aim is to increase long-term profits and shareholder trust through positive public relations and high ethical standards to reduce business and legal risk by taking responsibility for corporate actions. CSR strategies encourage the company to make appositive impact on the environment and shake holders including consumers' employees, investors, communities and others. The ordinary members of the board of directors receive a fixed base fee as consideration for their board duties. The chairman of the board of directors receives a fixed fee equaling up to three times the base fee received by the ordinary board members. In addition, the board members may receive a fixed fee for their work on committees established by the board of directors. The remuneration of the board of directors is determined on the basis of standards in the market and reflects demands to competencies and efforts in light of the scope of their work and the number of board meetings. As from 2010 members of the board of directors no longer receive warrants as a part of their remuneration. Each year the general meeting approves the fees to the board of directors. CSR becomes more important in the context of the global financial and economic crises because public confidence in the social and environmental responsibility of businesses has been effected [16]. The overriding principle in respect of board remuneration is that of openness. Sharing holders are entitled to a full and clear statement of directories present and future benefits, and of how they have been determined [15]. Good corporate governance system requires certain mechanisms in the process of improving firm performance and monitoring management incentives. Such schemes include the presence of independent directors or remuneration committees on the board, separation of responsibilities between the board director and the CEO [16].
2. Research history

The relationship between corporate social responsibility disclosure and institutional ownership of none of the four dimensions and social responsibility disclosure had not a significant impact on institutional ownership [8].

The relationship between social responsibility disclosure and percentage of institutional ownership in the wood and paper industry, there is a positive significant relationship between percentage of institutional ownership with social responsibility disclosure and employee relations. There is no meaningful relationship between the percentage of institutional ownership and society and environment participation and there is a significant and negative relationship between percentages of institutional ownership with production [12].

The use of social reporting of companies listed on the Icelandic stock showed the exchange result, but important increase in the level and quality of social information disclosure during the period under review [11].

Charts used in social reporting showed that organizations use charts in order to increase effective communication of social and environmental disclosure and their employees [9].

The impact of corporate social disclosure of information on the behavior investors in us Japan, France, Sweden using stakeholder’s theory; the findings show that there is a significant difference in the reaction of investors toward the company’s social information disclosure among the above countries [7].

The relationship between company’s social responsibility disclosure and its aspects with institutional ownership is significant negative relationship between social responsibility disclosures, the disclosure of information related to employee relations, production and environment with institutional ownership [1].

The impact of Denison organizational culture components on different aspects of corporate social responsibility in the Saipa Company; The results indicate company’s corporate culture is above average Saipa company and estimate its corporate culture's profound impact on social responsibility of the company [3].

Assess the quantity and nature of social accounting information disclosure in Tehran stock exchange research findings show, Iranian companies prefer environmental and social information in the report of the Board to disclose news information. Most of the revealing has been in the human resources and then in the products and services [5].

The effect of non-executive board members and the institutional ownership and the social responsibility during the study there is no relationship between the percentage of non-executive board and institutional ownership on company’s social responsibility [4].

The attitude of managers to social accounting information disclosure; Iranian managers are willing to disclose information about social benefits and welfare of their employee, but not willing to disclose information about the social costs of their organization [6].

The effect of social accounting information on manager's decision making managers tend to increase their profit to manage company’s profit in terms of profit and loss, and in terms of the profit to pay income smoothing [2].

The appointments remuneration and corporate governance committee reviews indri's policies regulations, procedures and practices in this area and presents relevant proposals to the board of directors which holds final responsibility for approving them and superusing their application.
The statement on the remuneration of the company's chief executive officer (CEO) and other members of the coprolite management board has been prepaid in accordance with the provisions of the Norwegian public limited companies Act, the woryeayn Accounting act and the Norwegian code of practice for corporate governance.

The committee functions as an advisory body for the Board of directors and the CEO and is responsible primarily for making recommendations to the board of directors based on the committee's evaluation of the principals and systems underlying the remuneration of the CEO and other members of the corporate management board.

Making recommendations to the board of directors based on the committee's evaluation of the overall remuneration of the CEO, including the annual basis for bonus payment and bonus payments actually made.

Assisting the CEO by consulting on the remuneration of the other members of the corporate management board.

Advising the board of directors and the CEO in compensation matters which the committee finds to be of material of principal importunes for Hydro.

2. Research hypothesis

The hypothesis of the present study provides as follows:

The main hypothesis: There is a relationship between social responsibility disclosure and board bonus in companies listed (accepted) on Tehran stock exchange.

The first sub-hypothesis: There is a significant relationship between the disclosure of information related to employee relations and board bonus.

The second sub-hypothesis: There is a relationship between disclosure of information related to social participation and board bonus.

4. Research method

The present study in terms of the goal is an applied research. In terms of method and nature it is and solidarity research. The method of data collection in this research is library method. The theoretical arguments of research were collected form studying resources, publications: Internal and external sources in books and using internet. The population in this study is, all companies listed on Tehran stock exchange, of which 55 companies were selected as systematic sample, the research period is from the beginning of the year 1388 to 1392. For analyzing the data EVIEWS software was used and finally with the help of t test the calculated probability proceed to judge and assess the likelihood of any statistical hypothesis. Regression models of study are as follows:

The main hypothesis of the study:

$$PHM = \beta_0 + \beta_1EMPD + \beta_2COMD + \beta_3SIZE + \beta_4GROWTH + \beta_5BETA + \epsilon_{i,t}$$ (1)

The first sub-hypothesis
\[ PHM = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{EMPD} + \beta_2 \text{SIZE} + \beta_3 \text{GROWTH} + \beta_4 \text{BETA} + \epsilon_{i,t} \]  

(2)

The second sub-hypothesis

\[ PHM = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{COMD} + \beta_2 \text{SIZE} + \beta_3 \text{GROWTH} + \beta_4 \text{BETA} + \epsilon_{i,t} \]  

(3)

Where in:

PHM: Board bonus
EMPD: Disclosure standards of social partnership (participation)
COMD: Disclosure standards related to employee relations
Size: size of the company
GROWTH: growth opportunity
Beta: Beta (Systematic Risk)

the dependent variable: Board bonus
achieved by the company’s financial statements as well as notes to the financial statements.

Independent variables:

The disclosure of information related to the level information disclosure related to employee relations, is the level of information disclosure to social participation. In this study the content analysis was used in order to evaluate independent variables. Content analysis are classified on the classification of sentences in the text notes attached financial statement.

The disclosure of company’s social responsibility:
achieved by the total value of the part of corporate social responsibility and is calculate by the following formula [12, 13].

\[ \text{CSRD} = \text{EMPD} + \text{COMD} + \text{PROD} + \text{ENVD} \]  

(4)

Total score of disclosure of corporate social responsibility

\[ \text{CSRD}_J = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n_j} X_{ij}}{n_j} \]  

(5)

CSRD: Disclosure score of CSR
n = the number of estimated cases for company

\( X_{ij} = \) If disclosure cases quantitative and its details numerically, a detailed description of activities and, if possible, pictures, charts, tables, the disclosure score is 3. If none quantitative information and explanations provided in clause, the disclosure score is 2. If qualitative disclosure and the explanations be in the format of sentence of paragraph, the disclosure score is 1. If nothing disclosed, the disclosure score is zero.

The disclosure of information related to employee relations: For showing the disclosure of information related to employee relations we need six criterions:

- Environmental health of staff
- Staff training
- Employee benefits
- Employee specifications
- Employee share ownership
- Employee health and safety ISO 18000
The next disclosure score of employee relation is obtained by the below formula:

\[ EMPD = \frac{\sum A}{6} \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

\( EMPD \): The score of employee relations disclosure
\( A \): The disclosure score of each of the employee relations, criteria in the company

The six in the denominator represents the six criteria related to the disclosure of employee relations.

Disclosure of information related to the community involvement:

For showing the disclosure of information related to the community involvement we six criterions:

- Cash donation program
- Charity program
- Scholarship program
- Sponsors for sports programs
- Supporters of national prides
- Public projects

Community involvement disclosure score calculate by the following formula:

\[ COMD = \frac{\sum B}{6} \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

\( COMD \): The disclosure of social relations
\( B \): The disclosure score of each of social relations criteria in the company

The six in the denominator represents the six criteria related to the disclosure of social relations.

Control variables:

1) Accounting beta (Systematic risk): That part of the total portfolio risk that cannot be removed and created because of the factors that affect the total price of securities. For calculating the systematic risk the index of stock price (which is indicative of the general level of prices in the stock market) was used. Beta coefficient for a particular share is determined by company the degree of systematic risk contribution with systematic risk of stock price index.

\[ \beta = \frac{COV (Rm, Ri)}{\sigma^2 Rm} \]  \hspace{1cm} (8)

\( Ri \) = Stock returns \hspace{1cm} \( Rm \) = Stock market (index) returns
\( \sigma^2 Rm \) = Variance Rm

2) Growth opportunity: that measured by the rate of market value to book value of assets:

\[ GROWOP = \frac{P_{ij}}{BV_{ij}} \]  \hspace{1cm} (9)

\( GROWOP \): growth opportunity
\( P_{ij} \) = The market value of the company’s capital
\( BV_{ij} \) = The book value of the company’s capital

3) Size of the company: Which is equal to the logarithm of the book value of assets at the beginning of the period.

\[ Size = \log (V_E) \]  \hspace{1cm} (10)
Table 1. F Limer and Hausman test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theories</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Statistic Quantity</th>
<th>P-Value</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>main Hypo Thesis</td>
<td>PHM₀</td>
<td>F. Limer</td>
<td>16.850408</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houseman</td>
<td>14.728052</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frist Sub - Hypo Thesis</td>
<td>PHM₀</td>
<td>F. Limer</td>
<td>55.4750657</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houseman</td>
<td>4.771433</td>
<td>0.3116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Hypo Thesis</td>
<td>PHM₀</td>
<td>F. Limer</td>
<td>47.825396</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Houseman</td>
<td>10.684781</td>
<td>0.0303</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Results and analysis of the research

5.1. Limer F test and Hausman test

The results from Limer F test and Hausman test were conducted for models. The results are as follows:
As it is shown in the Table 1, the probability of Limer F test is less than 5% for all the assumption; Thus assuming H₀ (integrated model) is not confirmed and inorder to estimate the model panel data should be used, in the next step, according to show and Hausman test results for parameter estimation and first main assumption and second sub-assumption test, the second model of fixed effects was used, and for other assumptions, become the probability value of the test is more than 0/05, so for parameter estimation and hypothesis testing, random effect model was used.

5.2. Summary analysis for each hypothesis

After performing Limer F and Hausman tests and determining the estimation method (sign and Combined), the models are estimated. The results of the estimation model used in the study is described and presented in the following.

5.2.1. Testing and analyzing the main assumption

There is a relation between social responsibility disclosure and Board bonus at Tehran stock exchange.

Table 2. Main Hypothesis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basis from latitude</th>
<th>Estimate Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Possibility of t-statistic</th>
<th>Probability Value of Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure standards related</td>
<td>-250.3053</td>
<td>381.8693</td>
<td>-0.655474</td>
<td>0.5127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to employee relations</td>
<td>COMD</td>
<td>152.4557</td>
<td>76.75785</td>
<td>1.986190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure standards of</td>
<td>-739.7774</td>
<td>146.7492</td>
<td>-5.041100</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social partnership</td>
<td>EMPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the company</td>
<td>111.7112</td>
<td>24.34265</td>
<td>4.589116</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth opportunity</td>
<td>1.852041</td>
<td>4.329983</td>
<td>0.427725</td>
<td>0.6692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Risk</td>
<td>31.96625</td>
<td>41.65881</td>
<td>0.767335</td>
<td>0.4436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Coefficient</td>
<td>0.380749</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>8.415340</td>
<td>D.W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Coefficient of</td>
<td>0.364463</td>
<td>Probability F</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>2.153752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>determination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 2 shows, the results of estimation that the possibility of t-statistics for the coefficients of information disclosure variables related to employee relations, the information disclosure of social participation and the size of company to board bonus is less than 5%. The estimate coefficient of the
above variable, in terms of statistics is significant and the possibility of t-statistics of information disclosure variables related to growth opportunity and systematic risk to board bonus is more than 5%; so, the above relationship is not statistically meaningful. Therefore, the first assumption with 95% certainty is rejected. Adjusted coefficient of determination shows the explanatory power of the independent variables that can explain 36% of dependent variable changes. There is a relationship between disclosure of social responsibility and board bonus in companies listed on the Tehran stock exchange. The regression equation is as follows:

\[ PHM = -250/3053 + 152.4557 \text{COMD} - 739.7774 \text{EMPD} + 111.7112 \text{SIZE} \]  

(11)

5.2.2. Testing and analyzing the first sub-assumption

According to this assumption it is expected that there is a significant relationship between the information disclosure of employee relations and board bonus.

Table 3. First Sub – Hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Possibility of t-statistic</th>
<th>Probability Value of Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis from latitude</td>
<td>1293.144</td>
<td>670.3037</td>
<td>1.929191</td>
<td>1.929191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure standards related to employee relations</td>
<td>COMD</td>
<td>254.1749</td>
<td>102.1693</td>
<td>2.487781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of the company</td>
<td>SIZE</td>
<td>-37.69999</td>
<td>47.94893</td>
<td>-0.786253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth opportunity</td>
<td>GROWTH</td>
<td>-1.247759</td>
<td>2.050937</td>
<td>-0.608385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic Risk</td>
<td>BETA</td>
<td>22.80498</td>
<td>15.40238</td>
<td>1.480614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Coefficient</td>
<td>0.938189</td>
<td>56.52593</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Coefficient of determination</td>
<td>0.921591</td>
<td>Probability F</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 3 shows, the possibility of t-statistics for the coefficients of information disclosure variables related to employee relations to board bonus is less than 5%; so the estimated coefficient of the above variable, in terms of statistics is meaningful and the t-statistics of the size of the company, growth opportunity and systematic risk variables to board bonus is more than 5%; so the above relationship is not statistically meaningful. Therefore, the first assumption is rejected, and there is a significant relationship between the level of information disclosure related to employee relations and board bonus. The regression equation is as follows:

\[ PHM = 1293.144 + 254.1749 \text{COMD} - 37.69999 \text{SIZE} \]  

(12)

5.2.3. Testing and analyzing the second sub-assumption

According to this assumption it is expected that there is a significant relationship between the information disclosure of social participation and board bonus.

Table 4. Second Sub – Hypothesis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Estimate Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>Possibility of t-statistic</th>
<th>Probability Value of Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basis from latitude</td>
<td>-354.0156</td>
<td>338.4355</td>
<td>-1.046036</td>
<td>0.2965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disclosure standards related to employee relations</td>
<td>EMPD</td>
<td>-764.0034</td>
<td>148.3024</td>
<td>-5.151660</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As Table 4 shows, the possibility of t-statistics for the coefficient of information disclosure variable related to the social participation and the size of the company to board bonus is less than 5%; so the estimated coefficient of the above variable, in terms of statistics is meaningful and the t-statistics of the growth opportunity and systematic risk variables to board bonus is more than 5%; so, the above relationship is not statistically meaningful. Therefore, the first assumption with 95% certainty is rejected. Adjusted coefficient of determination shows the explanatory power of the independent variables that can explain 34% dependent variable changes.

There is a relationship between the level of information disclosure related so social responsibility and board bonus. The regression equation is as follows:

\[
PHM = -354.0156 - 764.0034 EMPD + 107.7352 SIZE
\]

(13)

6. Conclusion

The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between social responsibility disclosure and board bonus during the years 1388 to 1392 in Tehran stock exchange. The results indicate that there is meaningful relationship between the factor of information disclosure related to social responsibility and board bonus and also there is a significant relationship between information disclosure related to employee relations and board bonus. In previous studies Rahimi [4] showed that during the study period, there is no relationship between the percentage of non-executive board and institutional ownership on company’s social responsibility, that are not computable with the results of current study. Monitoring and ensuring the proper implementation of laws related to disclosure of corporate social responsibility in this regard is required to publish separate annual report. Suggestion for futures work it is suggested that, ways to strengthen the enforcement of such reports be investigated. It can be expected that with increased awareness of managers about the organization’s social responsibility and its fields as well as train them in the management of social issue on one hand and do comprehensive auditing an evaluating on the other hand, the performance of the organizations participating in solving social problems be better than the past and present.

Companies consider corporate social responsibility as a business strategy; in order to their contribution is added in the highly competitive reputation in the market intensifies.
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