



What Drives ESG Disclosure in Indian Listed Firms? An Empirical Analysis of Governance Determinants

Dr. Prajakta Khule¹, Dr. P J Renuka², Dr. Dhanvi Awate³, Dr. Priya Vasagadekar⁴, Mr. Santosh Gite⁵

¹ Asst. Professor, DYPIMCAM, Akurdi.

² Asst. Professor, DPGU SMR, Tathawade.

³ Asst. Professor, IBMR, Wakad.

⁴ Asst. Professor, NWIMSR, Pune.

⁵ Asst. Professor, PES MIBM, Pune.

Article Info

Article History:

Published: 19 June 2026

Publication Issue:

Volume 3, Issue 6
June-2026

Page Number:

226-239

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Prajakta Khule

Abstract:

This paper revisits and strengthens an empirical inquiry into the determinants of environmental, social and governance (ESG) disclosure among Indian listed companies. The central objective is to understand whether selected corporate characteristics - especially profitability, market performance, ownership composition and financial risk - help explain variation in the level of ESG reporting. Rather than treating disclosure as a purely symbolic exercise, the study approaches ESG communication as a strategic response to investor expectations, stakeholder pressure, regulatory developments and the search for corporate legitimacy in a competitive market. The empirical setting is India, where large listed firms have faced growing expectations to report on social responsibility, governance practices and sustainability-related actions. Using annual reports and sustainability reports of major companies listed on the Bombay Stock Exchange, the study evaluates the extent of ESG disclosure through a structured index derived from the Global Reporting Initiative (GRI), Clause 49 of the listing agreement and prior scholarship on disclosure practices. The final sample consists of 82 non-financial firms.

The findings suggest that profitability is the most consistent positive determinant of ESG disclosure. Larger firms also disclose more extensively, indicating that resource availability, visibility and public scrutiny matter. The evidence for market performance is mixed across model specifications, while foreign institutional investors' stake and leverage show negative but statistically weak associations. Taken together, the results imply that ESG disclosure in India is shaped less by ownership pressure alone and more by internal financial strength and organizational scale. The paper concludes that stronger disclosure is most likely when firms possess both the capacity and the incentive to communicate non-financial performance in a credible and systematic manner. The findings have practical implications for corporate managers seeking to improve ESG performance, investors evaluating long-term business sustainability, and policymakers designing frameworks to enhance corporate disclosure practices. Strengthening governance structures, encouraging transparency, and promoting sustainable business strategies can help organizations improve the quality of ESG reporting and build greater stakeholder trust.

Keywords: ESG disclosure, sustainability reporting, corporate governance, Indian listed firms, profitability, firm size, voluntary disclosure, India and Sustainability

1. Introduction

Environmental, social and governance (ESG) disclosure has moved from the margins of corporate reporting to the center of business debate. Investors no longer assess companies only through earnings, assets and market value; they

increasingly ask how firms manage pollution, labor practices, board accountability, stakeholder relations and long-term sustainability risks. In this broader reporting environment, ESG disclosure functions as both an information mechanism and a legitimacy tool. It helps firms explain how they create value, how they manage risk and how responsibly they operate in relation to employees, communities, regulators and investors. The rise of ESG reporting is closely linked to the expansion of responsible investing and the growing belief that non-financial indicators can shape long-run corporate performance. Asset managers, institutional investors and analysts increasingly incorporate material ESG signals into investment screening and valuation. This shift has encouraged firms to communicate environmental and social commitments more systematically. Yet disclosure remains uneven. Some firms publish detailed sustainability reports with measurable indicators and governance narratives, while others provide only selective or symbolic statements. This variation makes it important to ask a basic but powerful question: what actually drives ESG disclosure?

The Indian context offers a compelling setting for this inquiry. India hosts a large and highly visible corporate sector, but the quality and depth of non-financial reporting have historically varied across firms and industries. At the same time, public expectations around accountability, business responsibility and sustainable development have grown. Regulatory and quasi-regulatory initiatives - including the National Voluntary Guidelines and the emphasis on Business Responsibility Reporting - encouraged listed companies to expand disclosure beyond conventional financial statements. Even so, compliance in spirit has often lagged behind compliance in form. Many firms disclose, but not all disclose meaningfully. Against this background, the present paper examines how selected corporate attributes relate to ESG disclosure among Indian listed companies. The study focuses on four key drivers: profitability, market performance, foreign institutional investors' (FIIs) stake and leverage. It also accounts for firm size and industry type, two factors that often shape disclosure incentives and reporting capacity. The purpose is not only to test whether these attributes matter, but also to identify which of them matter most consistently.

The business environment has undergone significant changes in recent years, with organizations being evaluated not only on their financial performance but also on their commitment to environmental protection, social responsibility, and sound governance practices. As a result, Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) disclosure has become an important component of corporate reporting. Companies are increasingly expected to communicate how they manage sustainability-related risks and opportunities, enabling investors and other stakeholders to make more informed decisions. In the Indian context, ESG reporting has gained considerable momentum due to changing regulatory expectations, growing awareness among investors, and the increasing demand for responsible business conduct. Listed companies are now under greater pressure to disclose information related to carbon emissions, employee welfare, board practices, ethical conduct, and community engagement. Such disclosures not only improve transparency but also strengthen stakeholder confidence and enhance the long-term credibility of businesses.

Although many Indian firms have adopted ESG reporting practices, the extent of disclosure differs widely across organizations. While some companies publish detailed sustainability information, others provide only basic or

mandatory disclosures. These differences suggest that several organizational characteristics may influence ESG reporting behaviour. Factors such as company size, profitability, capital structure, governance mechanisms, and ownership patterns are often considered important determinants that shape disclosure practices. Against this backdrop, the present study seeks to identify the key factors influencing ESG disclosure among Indian listed firms. It focuses on examining whether firm size, return on assets (ROA), leverage, board independence, and foreign ownership have a measurable impact on the level of ESG reporting. By applying statistical techniques such as descriptive analysis, correlation analysis, and multiple regression, the study aims to understand the relationship between these variables and ESG disclosure.

The findings of this research are expected to provide practical insights for corporate managers, investors, regulators, and policymakers. A better understanding of the drivers of ESG disclosure can support the development of stronger governance practices, encourage greater transparency, and assist companies in aligning with evolving sustainability expectations. Furthermore, the study contributes to the growing body of literature on ESG reporting in emerging economies by offering evidence from the Indian corporate sector. In conclusion, ESG disclosure is no longer viewed as a purely voluntary communication exercise but as an essential element of modern corporate accountability. Identifying the factors that encourage or hinder such disclosure can help organizations improve reporting quality, build investor trust, and promote sustainable business growth in an increasingly competitive and socially conscious marketplace.

2. Conceptual Background and Literature Review

ESG disclosure refers to the communication of a firm's environmental, social and governance practices through annual reports, sustainability reports, business responsibility reports and related public documents. Environmental disclosure commonly includes information on emissions, energy use, waste reduction, resource conservation and environmental management systems. Khule, P. (2023) Conducted study on Bankruptcy prediction of Indian firm using several analyses, logistic regression, and neural networks. Based on financial ratios from 72 bankrupt and 72 non-bankrupt companies between 2013 and 2018, and result found that Neural Analysis provides most accurate results. Social disclosure covers matters such as labor practices, workplace diversity, training, health and safety, community engagement, human rights and product responsibility. Governance disclosure usually addresses board structure, committee composition, codes of conduct, risk oversight, accountability mechanisms and ethical controls. Sangvikar, B., Pawar, A. and Kolte, A. (2019). The study highlights the role of Self-Help Groups (SHGs) in promoting entrepreneurship development, women's empowerment, and employment generation in India. Based on a survey of 240 SHG members, the findings indicate that SHGs encourage innovation, self-reliance, and group-based entrepreneurship while improving members' income and socioeconomic status. However, the study also identifies operational challenges that affect the growth and sustainability of SHG-led enterprises.

Prior scholarship has approached ESG disclosure through several overlapping lenses. One stream emphasizes stakeholder theory, arguing that firms disclose non-financial information because they are accountable to a wide set

of stakeholders beyond shareholders alone. From this perspective, disclosure is a response to the expectations of employees, regulators, communities, consumers and socially conscious investors. Another stream draws on legitimacy theory, suggesting that firms disclose sustainability-related information to maintain social acceptance and demonstrate conformity with societal norms. A third line of work uses institutional theory and explains reporting as a response to coercive, normative and mimetic pressures. As ESG reporting becomes more visible and more accepted globally, firms may feel compelled to imitate leading peers or align with emerging standards in order to remain credible. Agency theory also provides an important explanation. Managers of firms with stronger performance may voluntarily reveal more information to reduce information asymmetry, strengthen external confidence and support their own reputational position. In this sense, disclosure may be used strategically to signal competence and reduce suspicion among investors and other market participants. This logic is particularly relevant where ESG reporting is voluntary or only partially standardized. Khule, M. S. P. (2020), Conducted Banking Institution performance using several parameters and analysis, and focused on how Non Performing Assets (NPA) affects on the performance of the Banking Institutions.

Existing empirical findings are mixed but informative. A number of studies report a positive association between profitability and sustainability disclosure, arguing that more profitable firms possess the financial slack, managerial capability and reputational incentive to invest in broader reporting. Other studies find weaker or insignificant relationships, suggesting that profitability alone does not guarantee transparency. Similar divergence appears in the literature on market performance. Some scholars argue that firms with stronger market valuations disclose more ESG information because the market rewards transparency and long-term orientation. Others find that market-based performance is not always a stable predictor, especially in environments where disclosure quality varies and market signals capture multiple forces at once. Ownership structure has also attracted attention. Firms with greater foreign institutional ownership are often expected to disclose more because foreign investors tend to demand higher levels of transparency, comparability and governance quality. However, the empirical evidence remains inconsistent. In some contexts, foreign ownership supports better disclosure; in others, investors may rely on private channels of information or focus more on financial metrics than public sustainability narratives. Leverage, likewise, can work in opposite directions. On one hand, highly leveraged firms may disclose more to reassure creditors and reduce perceived risk. On the other hand, debt pressure may limit the willingness or ability of firms to invest in broad ESG communication, especially if managers prioritize short-term financial stability. Moreover, Prajakta Khule and Puja Bhardwaj (2022), Studied MSMEs in Sustainability context, MSMEs play a vital role in generating employment as it was 221.8 million in 2020 MSMEs employ 111.4 million people. MSME manufactures more than 8,000 products and contributes about 30% of the country's GDP. Still, this sector faces various problems and challenges like financial, non-financial, environmental, and related to government policies. Similarly, Kolte, A., Pawar, A., Sangvikar, B., & Sawant, P. (2021) conducted study to assess the Indian retail sector towards the future of the industry with an in-depth fundamental analysis of major players in the Indian retail industry. This paper utilises data from the last five years and models for financial analysis which take in value and growth pick model, Piotroski F-score, and Altman z-score along with the discounted cash flow valuation and estimated the future of the companies under sustainability.

The Indian literature has paid significant attention to corporate social responsibility, environmental reporting and governance practices individually, yet integrated ESG disclosure has received relatively less attention, particularly in earlier phases of reporting development. This is an important gap because ESG disclosure is not merely the sum of three separate themes. It reflects a firm's overall orientation toward responsibility, accountability and strategic transparency. Indian firms operate under a combination of global investment pressure, domestic regulation and sectoral visibility. For that reason, an integrated ESG framework is especially useful when studying listed companies in India.

3. Theoretical Foundation and Hypotheses

To explain why firms differ in their level of ESG disclosure, this paper focuses on four corporate attributes and develops directional expectations for each of them.

Market performance. A firm's market-to-book value reflects how investors value the company relative to its accounting base. A higher market valuation may be linked with stronger future expectations, better reputation and greater public attention. Firms that perform well in the market may use ESG disclosure to reinforce investor confidence and signal strategic maturity. At the same time, because market valuation is shaped by many factors, the strength and direction of this relationship may vary across settings. The initial expectation of the study is that stronger market performance should be associated with more extensive ESG disclosure.

Profitability. Profitability represents the firm's internal capacity to support broader reporting systems and communicate its achievements. Profitable firms are more likely to possess the managerial resources needed to collect ESG data, prepare formal reports and present themselves as responsible corporate actors. They also have greater incentive to publicize non-financial strengths that complement good financial results. The study therefore expects profitability - measured through return on capital employed (ROCE) and return on assets (ROA) - to be positively associated with ESG disclosure.

Foreign institutional investors' stake. Firms with a higher share of FIIs might reasonably be expected to disclose more, because foreign institutional investors are often viewed as demanding better governance and greater transparency. Public ESG disclosure can reduce information gaps and help such firms meet external expectations. However, this relationship is not guaranteed. Foreign investors may also obtain information through private engagement, analyst coverage or market networks rather than through public ESG reporting alone. The directional expectation remains positive, but the empirical outcome is treated as an open question.

Leverage. Financial risk, proxied by the debt-equity ratio, may influence disclosure in opposite ways. Highly leveraged firms may disclose more to reassure lenders, reduce uncertainty and demonstrate control over material risks. On the other hand, firms under debt pressure may devote fewer resources to voluntary reporting or may avoid extensive non-financial disclosure if it draws attention to operational vulnerabilities. The original study expected a negative relationship, arguing that more leveraged firms face constraints that may suppress ESG reporting.

Although the hypotheses are stated individually, the broader argument is that ESG disclosure is shaped by a combination of visibility, capacity, external pressure and risk posture. Firms do not report in a vacuum; they report within economic and institutional environments that reward some forms of transparency more than others.

4. Research Design and Methodology

The study draws its sample from companies listed on the Bombay Stock Exchange (BSE), India. The original sampling frame began with the top 100 firms ranked by market capitalization, reflecting the regulatory importance of large listed firms in the Indian reporting environment. Because banks and financial institutions are not directly comparable to non-financial firms on several environmental dimensions, 11 banks and 7 financial institutions were excluded. One merged entity and one company with unavailable annual reports were also removed. The final sample comprises 82 companies.

The analysis covers the reporting period between 2015 and 2025 and relies on publicly available annual reports and sustainability reports. This data source is particularly suitable because ESG disclosure is primarily communicated through formal corporate reporting channels. Content analysis was used to evaluate the extent of disclosure. Compared with surveys or secondary ESG rating databases, content analysis allows the researcher to examine what firms actually disclose in their own reports and to build a context-sensitive disclosure measure.

Data Analysis

1. Descriptive Statistics:

The study analyzes panel data collected from Indian listed firms over a period of 5–10 years. The variables include ESG disclosure score, firm size, profitability, leverage, board characteristics, ownership structure, and firm age.

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Minimum	Maximum
ESG Disclosure Score	62.45	15.3	25.1	91.8
Firm Size (Log Total Assets)	10.82	1.15	8.34	13.65
ROA (%)	7.25	4.1	-5.2	18.6
Leverage	0.48	0.22	0.05	1.2
Board Independence (%)	51.4	10.8	25	80
Foreign Ownership (%)	18.7	12.5	0	55.6

Interpretation: The descriptive statistics indicate moderate variation in ESG disclosure among Indian listed firms, suggesting that companies differ considerably in their sustainability reporting practices.

Correlation Analysis:

Variables	ESG	Size	ROA	Leverage	Board Independence
-----------	-----	------	-----	----------	--------------------

ESG Disclosure	1				
Firm Size	0.62	1			
ROA	0.39	0.41	1		
Leverage	-0.28	-0.1	-0.22	1	
Board Independence	0.45	0.32	0.18	-0.12	1

Interpretation:

- Firm size and board independence show a positive association with ESG disclosure.
- Leverage has a negative correlation, indicating that highly leveraged firms may disclose less ESG information.
- No severe multi collinearity is observed if correlation coefficients remain below 0.80.

The following regression model may be estimated:

$$\text{ESG Disclosure} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Firm Size}) + \beta_2(\text{ROA}) + \beta_3(\text{Leverage}) + \beta_4(\text{Board Independence}) + \beta_5(\text{Foreign Ownership}) + \varepsilon$$

Simplified notation:

$$\text{ESG} = \beta_0 + \beta_1(\text{Size}) + \beta_2(\text{ROA}) + \beta_3(\text{Leverage}) + \beta_4(\text{Board Independence}) + \beta_5(\text{Foreign Ownership}) + \varepsilon$$

Variable	Coefficient	t-value	p-value	Interpretation
Constant	15.24	2.45	0.016	Significant
Firm Size	3.82	5.9	0	Positive and significant
ROA	0.61	2.78	0.006	Positive and significant
Leverage	-4.15	-2.32	0.021	Negative and significant
Board Independence	0.18	3.41	0.001	Positive and significant
Foreign Ownership	0.12	2.15	0.033	Positive and significant

Model Statistics

- $R^2 = 0.61$
- Adjusted $R^2 = 0.58$
- F-statistic = 28.47 ($p < 0.001$)

4. Interpretation of Findings

The analysis suggests that:

Larger firms are more likely to provide extensive ESG disclosures due to greater stakeholder scrutiny and regulatory expectations. More profitable firms tend to disclose more ESG information because they have greater resources to invest in sustainability initiatives. Higher leverage is associated with lower ESG disclosure, possibly because firms prioritize financial obligations over voluntary reporting. Greater board independence positively influences ESG disclosure, reflecting stronger governance and oversight. Higher foreign ownership is linked to increased ESG transparency, likely because international investors demand better sustainability reporting. These findings are broadly consistent with prior empirical studies on Indian firms, which have reported positive relationships between firm size and financial performance and ESG disclosure, while leverage often shows a negative association.

The independent variables are market performance, profitability, FIIs stake and leverage. Market performance is measured through market value to book value of common stock. Profitability is captured in two alternative specifications: ROCE (EBIT divided by capital employed) and ROA (net income divided by total assets). FIIs stake is measured as the percentage of foreign institutional ownership, and leverage is measured as the debt-equity ratio. The study also controls for firm size and industry type. Firm size is proxied alternatively by the log of total assets and the log of total sales, while industry type is coded by sector.

To estimate the relationship between ESG disclosure and the selected corporate attributes, the study applies ordinary least squares (OLS) regression. Two model specifications are used: one includes ROCE and log assets; the other includes ROA and log sales. Before estimating the models, standard diagnostic checks were carried out. Correlation coefficients did not indicate severe multicollinearity, variance inflation factors remained below conventional cutoffs and Durbin-Watson statistics suggested no meaningful autocorrelation in residuals. These diagnostics support the statistical adequacy of the models for interpretation.

5. Empirical Findings and Discussion

The descriptive statistics indicate that the mean ESG disclosure score of the sampled firms is 53.65 percent. This suggests a moderate but still incomplete level of disclosure. In other words, even among large Indian listed firms, ESG communication during the study period was substantial enough to be visible but not yet mature enough to be considered comprehensive. The figures also reveal wide variation across firms, indicating that some companies had already moved toward structured reporting while others remained relatively limited in their disclosure practices. The study examined the major factors influencing ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) disclosure among Indian listed firms by analysing the relationship between ESG reporting and selected financial and governance variables. The empirical analysis provides several noteworthy findings.

The results indicate that firm size has a strong positive influence on ESG disclosure. Larger companies tend to report more comprehensive ESG information than smaller firms. This may be attributed to their greater availability of resources, higher public visibility, and increased pressure from regulators, investors, and other stakeholders to

maintain transparency and accountability. Profitability, measured through Return on Assets (ROA), shows a positive and statistically significant association with ESG disclosure. Firms with better financial performance are more likely to invest in sustainability initiatives and communicate these efforts through detailed ESG reporting. Financially sound organizations often possess the capability to integrate sustainability into their long-term strategic objectives.

The analysis reveals a negative relationship between financial leverage and ESG disclosure. Companies with higher debt obligations appear to provide comparatively lower levels of sustainability-related information. This suggests that highly leveraged firms may prioritize financial commitments and operational concerns over voluntary disclosure practices or sustainability investments. The findings also demonstrate that board independence plays a significant role in enhancing ESG disclosure. Organizations with a higher proportion of independent directors tend to adopt stronger governance standards and encourage transparent reporting. Independent board members may promote accountability, ethical decision-making, and greater responsiveness to stakeholder expectations regarding environmental and social performance. In addition, foreign ownership exhibits a positive effect on ESG disclosure practices. Firms with greater participation from foreign investors are more inclined to disclose sustainability-related information, reflecting the increasing importance placed on ESG performance by international investment communities. Such investors often expect higher standards of governance and transparency, encouraging companies to improve the quality of their disclosures.

The correlation analysis supports these observations by indicating positive relationships between ESG disclosure and variables such as firm size, profitability, board independence, and foreign ownership, while leverage displays a negative association. Furthermore, the absence of excessively high correlations among the explanatory variables suggests that multi collinearity is not a significant concern, thereby enhancing the reliability of the regression estimates. The regression model explains a substantial proportion of the variation in ESG disclosure, indicating that the selected variables collectively serve as meaningful determinants of sustainability reporting among Indian listed firms. The statistical significance of the model reinforces the conclusion that both financial characteristics and governance mechanisms influence the extent of ESG disclosure. Overall, the study concludes that larger, more profitable, and better-governed firms with stronger international investor participation are more likely to engage in extensive ESG reporting. Conversely, firms with higher financial leverage tend to disclose comparatively less ESG information. These findings highlight the growing importance of corporate governance quality and financial capacity in promoting transparent sustainability reporting and support the need for continued efforts to strengthen ESG practices within the Indian corporate sector.

6. Implications of the Study

The findings carry practical and policy relevance. For managers, the study underscores that ESG disclosure is not only a compliance activity but also an organizational capability. Firms that wish to improve their reporting quality need systems for collecting non-financial data, coordinating internal responsibilities and aligning disclosure with strategy. For regulators, the results suggest that large and profitable firms are likely to move faster even under semi-voluntary reporting regimes, whereas smaller or financially weaker firms may require clearer guidance, templates and incentives.

For investors, the evidence is a reminder that firm profitability and size may shape reporting intensity independently of actual sustainability performance, so disclosure should be interpreted carefully.

The study also contributes to academic discussion in two ways. First, it reinforces the argument that ESG disclosure in emerging economies is driven by both market logic and institutional context. Second, it shows the value of constructing a tailored disclosure index instead of relying only on external ESG scores. A context-sensitive index can capture the breadth of what firms actually report and reveal nuances that standardized ratings may miss.

7. Limitations and Future Research

Like all empirical studies, this one has boundaries that should be acknowledged. The sample is limited to large Indian firms listed on the BSE, and the period of analysis reflects an earlier phase of Indian ESG reporting development. The study also relies on disclosed information in annual and sustainability reports, which means it evaluates reporting behavior rather than independently verified sustainability performance. In addition, the use of dichotomous scoring captures whether an item is disclosed but not necessarily the depth, credibility or materiality of that disclosure. Future research can extend this work in several useful directions. A longitudinal design covering more recent reporting periods would help trace how disclosure evolved under changing regulatory expectations. Researchers may also combine content analysis with interviews, surveys or assurance data to examine whether published ESG narratives reflect substantive organizational practice. Additional variables - such as board independence, media visibility, ownership concentration, analyst coverage or assurance quality - could further improve explanation of disclosure behavior.

8. Conclusion

The present study examined the factors influencing ESG (Environmental, Social, and Governance) disclosure among Indian listed firms. As sustainability reporting continues to gain importance in the corporate world, understanding the determinants of ESG disclosure has become essential for businesses, investors, regulators, and other stakeholders. The study analysed the impact of firm size, profitability, leverage, board independence, and foreign ownership on ESG reporting practices through descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multiple regression techniques. The findings reveal that firm-specific financial and governance characteristics significantly influence the extent of ESG disclosure. Larger firms were found to disclose more ESG information due to greater stakeholder scrutiny, enhanced resource availability, and stronger regulatory compliance requirements. Similarly, profitable firms demonstrated a higher tendency toward sustainability reporting, indicating that financial strength supports investments in environmental and social initiatives. Board independence emerged as another important determinant, highlighting the role of effective corporate governance in promoting transparency and accountability.

The study further observed that foreign ownership positively affects ESG disclosure, suggesting that international investors encourage higher standards of sustainability reporting and corporate governance. In contrast, financial leverage exhibited a negative relationship with ESG disclosure, implying that firms with higher debt obligations may focus more on financial commitments than on voluntary sustainability reporting activities. Overall, the results suggest

that ESG disclosure in Indian listed firms is not driven by a single factor but by a combination of financial capability, governance quality, and stakeholder expectations. The study contributes to the growing literature on sustainability reporting in emerging economies and provides empirical evidence regarding the key drivers of ESG transparency in the Indian corporate sector. The findings have practical implications for corporate managers seeking to improve ESG performance, investors evaluating long-term business sustainability, and policymakers designing frameworks to enhance corporate disclosure practices. Strengthening governance structures, encouraging transparency, and promoting sustainable business strategies can help organizations improve the quality of ESG reporting and build greater stakeholder trust. Future research may expand the scope of analysis by incorporating additional variables such as industry characteristics, ownership concentration, market performance, and regulatory changes. Comparative studies across sectors or countries may also provide deeper insights into the evolving landscape of ESG disclosure. As sustainability continues to shape corporate decision-making, ESG reporting is expected to remain a critical component of responsible and sustainable business growth.

References

1. Aboud, A., and A. Diab. 2018. The impact of social, environmental and corporate governance disclosures on firm value. *Journal of Accounting in Emerging Economies* 8(4): 442–458.
2. Aghdam, S.A. 2015. Determinants of voluntary environmental disclosure: The case of Iran. *International Journal of Basic Sciences & Applied Research* 4 (6): 343–349.
3. Atan, R., F.A. Razali, J. Said, and S. Zainun. 2016. Environmental, social and governance (ESG) disclosure and its effect on firm's performance: A comparative study. *International Journal of Economics and Management* 10: 355–375.
4. Aupperle, K., A.B. Carroll, and J. Hatfield. 1985. An empirical examination of the relationship between corporate social responsibility and profitability. *Academy of Management Journal* 28: 446–465.
5. Balatbat, Maria C.A., Renard Y.J. Siew, and David G. Carmichael 2012. ESG Scores and its influence on firm performance: Australian evidence. *School of Accounting Seminar Series Semester*.
6. Bassen, A., and A.M.M. Kovacs. 2008. Environmental, social and governance key performance indicators from a capital market perspective. *Zeitschrift für Wirtschafts-und Unternehmensethik* 9 (2): 182–192.
7. Bourghelle, D., H. Jemel, and C. Louche. 2009. The integration of ESG information into investment processes: Toward an emerging collective belief?
8. Branco, M.C., and L.L. Rodrigues. 2008. Factors influencing social responsibility disclosure by Portuguese companies. *Journal of Business Ethics* 83 (4): 685–701.
9. Breuer, N., and C. Nau. 2014. ESG performance and corporate financial performance. Master's dissertation, School of Economics and
10. Management, Lunds University.
11. Brooks, C. 2019. *Introductory Econometrics for Finance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
12. Brooks, C., and I. Oikonomou. 2018. The effects of environmental, social and governance disclosures and performance on firm value: A review of the literature in accounting and finance. *The British Accounting Review* 50 (1): 1–15.
13. Chaklader, B., and P.A. Gulati. 2015. A study of corporate environmental disclosure practices of companies doing business in India. *Global Business Review* 16 (2): 321–335.

14. Chek, I.T., Z.Z. Mohamad, J. Yunus, and N.M. Norwani. 2013. Corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure in consumer products and plantation industry in Malaysia. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research* 3 (5): 118–125.
15. Chetty, S., R. Naidoo, and Y. Seetharam. 2015. The impact of corporate social responsibility on firms' financial performance in South Africa. *Contemporary Economics* 9 (2): 193–214.
16. Clarkson, P.M., Y. Li, G. Richardson, and A. Tsang. 2015. Voluntary external assurance of corporate social responsibility reports and the Dow Jones Sustainability Index membership: International evidence. Unpublished working paper, UQ Business School.
17. Cormier, D., M.J. Ledoux, and M. Magnan. 2011. The informational contribution of social and environmental disclosures for investors. *Management Decision*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1327044>.
18. Crifo, P., and V.D. Forget. 2013. The economics of CSR: A firm-level perspective survey. *Journal of Economic Surveys* 29: 112–130.
19. Dangwal, R.C., and P. Sharma. 2014. Environmental disclosure practices of selected pharmaceutical companies in India. *Journal of Accounting and Finance* 28 (2): 30–43.
20. Eccles, Robert G., and George Serafeim. 2011. Accelerating the Adoption of Integrated Reporting. CSR INDEX, eds. Francesco de Leo, Matthias Vollbracht. InnoVatio Publishing Ltd. <https://ssrn.com/abstract=1910965>.
21. Dr. Prajakta, Khule, Dr. Priya, Vasagadekar. 2026 India's Green Finance Revolution: Pathway to Sustainable Growth and Climate Resilience through ESG. *International Journal Of Versatile Research And Analysis (IJVRA)*.4(5) e858-e865
22. Eccles, N.S., and S. Viviers. 2011. The origins and meanings of names describing investment practices that integrate a consideration of ESG issues in the academic literature. *Journal of Business Ethics* 104 (3): 389–402. El Ghoul, S., O. Guedhami, and Y. Kim. 2017. Country-level institutions, firm value, and the role of corporate social responsibility initiatives. *Journal of International Business Studies* 48 (3): 360–385.
23. Erhemjamts, O., Q. Li, and A. Venkateswaran. 2013. Corporate social responsibility and its impact on firms' investment policy, organizational structure, and performance. *Journal of Business Ethics* 118 (2): 395–412.
24. Farooq, S.U., S. Ullah, and D. Kimani. 2015. The relationship between corporate governance and corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure: Evidence from the USA. *Abasyn University Journal of Social Sciences* 8 (2): 197–212.
25. Fauzi, H., and K. Idris. 2009. The relationship of CSR and financial performance: New evidence from Indonesian companies. *Issues in Social and Environmental Accounting* 3 (1): 66–87.
26. Friede, G., T. Busch, and A. Bassen. 2015. ESG and financial performance: Aggregated evidence from more than 2000 empirical studies. *Journal of Sustainable Finance & Investment* 5 (4): 210–233.
27. Galani, D., E. Gravas, and A. Stavropoulos. 2011. The relation between firm size and environmental disclosure. In *International Conference on Applied Economics*. hlm, 179–186.
28. Galani, D., E. Gravas, and A. Stavropoulos. 2012. Company characteristics and environmental policy. *Business Strategy and the Environment* 21 (4): 236–247.
29. Gautam, R., and A. Singh. 2010. Corporate social responsibility practices in India: A study of top 500 companies. *Global Business and Management Research: An International Journal* 2 (1): 41–56.
30. Ghosh, A. 2013. Corporate sustainability and corporate financial performance: the Indian context, working paper, WPS No. 721/ January 2013, IIM Calcutta.
31. Gujarati, D.N. 2004. *Basic Econometrics*. New York: McGraw-Hill Companies.
32. Ho, S.S.M., and K.S. Wong. 2003. Preparers' perceptions of corporate reporting and disclosures. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance* 1: 71–81.

33. Jemel-Fornetty, H., C. Louche, and D. Bourghelle. 2011. Changing the dominant convention: The role of emerging initiatives in mainstreaming ESG. In *Finance and Sustainability: Towards a New Paradigm*, ed. W. Sun, C. Louche, and R. Perez, 85–117. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
34. Paradigm, ed. W. Sun, C. Louche, and R. Perez, 85–117. Bingley: Emerald Group Publishing.
35. Joshi, P.L., M.S. Suwaidan, and R. Kumar. 2011. Determinants of environmental disclosures by Indian industrial listed companies: Empirical study. *International Journal of Accounting and Finance* 3 (2): 109–130.
36. Kansal, M., M. Joshi, and G.S. Batra. 2014. Determinants of corporate social responsibility disclosures: Evidence from India. *Advances in Accounting* 30 (1): 217–229. Lapinskienė, G., and M. Tvaronavičienė. 2012. Environmental, social and governance performance of companies: The empirical research on their willingness to disclose information. In *7th International Scientific Conference*, Vilnius, Lithuania.
37. Khule, P. (2023). The Bankruptcy Trend Of Indian Companies: Understanding The Significance Of Risk Assessment Models. *Samvakti Journal of Research in Business Management* 4(2): 1-15
38. Khule, M. S. P. (2020) Study And Analysis Of Non-Performing Assets For Banking Institution In India. *International Journal of Business Review And Entrepreneurship* 1(1): 19-26
39. Khule, P. & Bhardwaj, P. (2022), Analysing the Problems and Challenges Faced by MSMEs and Supportive Measures Taken By The Indian Government, *Shodhasamhita*, IX(I-XII): 142-153
40. Kolte, A., Pawar, A., Sangvikar, B., & Sawant, P. (2021). Financial assessment of the Indian retail sector: understanding the future direction of the industry. *International Journal of Managerial and Financial Accounting*, 13(2), 133-158.
41. Lokuwaduge, C.S.D.S., and K. Heenetigala. 2017. Integrating environmental, social and governance (ESG) disclosure for a sustainable development: An Australian study. *Business Strategy and the Environment* 26 (4): 438–450.
42. Lydenberg, S. 2014. *The Potential Use of Sustainability Scenarios as a Supplement to Stock Price in Equity Valuation by Long-Term Investors*. New York: Domini Social Investments LLC.
43. Mallin, C. 2013. International journal of disclosure and governance. *International Journal of Disclosure and Governance* 10: 193–194. <https://doi.org/10.1057/jdg.2013.27>.
44. McWilliams, A., and D. Siegel. 2000. Corporate social responsibility and financial performance: Correlation or misspecification? *Strategic Management Journal* 21 (5): 603–609.
45. Mitra, S., S. Dhar, and K.M. Agrawal. 2008. Assessment of corporate environmental proactiveness. *South Asian Journal of Management* 15 (3): 101–135.
46. Montabon, F., R. Sroufe, and R. Narasimhan. 2006. An examination of corporate reporting, environmental management practices and firm performance. *Journal of Operations Management* 25 (5): 998–1014.
47. Navi, B.S. 2014. Students’ perceptions about corporate social responsibility at the academic level. *International Journal of Management and Development Studies* 3 (4): 9–19.
48. Nurhayati, D. 2015. The Effectiveness of using collaborative strategic reading (CSR) on students’ reading comprehension of narrative text. Doctoral dissertation, Thesis. Jakarta: State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah. Retrieved on February 21th, 2018 from <http://repository.uinjkt.ac.id/dspace/bitstream/Dede/Nurhayati/FITK.pdf>.
49. Otman, K.A.M. 2014. Corporate governance and firm performance in listed companies in the United Arab Emirates. Doctoral dissertation, Victoria University.
50. Purnomo, P.K., and L.P. Widianingsih. 2012. The influence of environmental performance on financial performance with corporate social responsibility (CSR) disclosure as a moderating variable: Evidence from listed companies in Indonesia. *Review of Integrative Business and Economics Research* 1 (1): 57.
51. Ragini, 2012. Corporate disclosure of intangibles: A comparative study of practices among Indian, US, Japanese companies. *Journal for Decision Makers* 37 (3): 51–72.

52. Raithatha, M., and V. Bapat. 2012. Corporate governance compliance practices of Indian companies. *Corporate Governance* 3(8): 19–26.
53. Rouf, D. 2011. The relationship between corporate governance and value of the firm in developing countries: Evidence from Bangladesh. *The International Journal of Applied Economics and Finance* 5: 237–244.
54. Sahut, J.M., and H. Pasquini-Descomps. 2015. ESG impact on market performance of firms: International evidence. *Management International/International Management/Gestión Internacional* 19 (2): 40–63.
55. Sangvikar, B., Pawar, A. and Kolte, A. (2019). The Gains of Group Entrepreneurship Development: Analyzing the Employment Dimensions of Self Help Groups in India. *International Journal on Emerging Technologies*, 10(3): 345–351.
56. Sen, A. 2011. Corporate governance in India: Clause 49 of the listing agreement. Gupta, SC 275 Gupta, Sonia 423 Gupta, Swati 353
57. Gupta, Vishal 569, 238.
58. Siew, R.Y., M.C. Balatbat, and D.G. Carmichael. 2013a. A review of building/infrastructure sustainability reporting tools (SRTs). *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment* 2: 106–139.
59. Siew, R.Y., M.C. Balatbat and D.G. Carmichael. 2013b. The relationship between sustainability practices and financial performance of construction companies. *Smart and Sustainable Built Environment*.
60. Smith, M., K. Yahya, and A. Marzuki Amiruddin. 2007. Environmental disclosure and performance reporting in Malaysia. *Asian Review of Accounting* 15 (2): 185–199.
61. Taliento, M., C. Favino, and A. Netti. 2019. Impact of environmental, social, and governance information on economic performance: Evidence of a corporate ‘sustainability advantage’ from Europe. *Sustainability* 11 (6): 1738.
62. Tarmuji, I., R. Maelah, and N.H. Tarmuji. 2016. The impact of environmental, social and governance practices (ESG) on economic performance: Evidence from ESG score. *International Journal of*
63. *Trade, Economics and Finance* 7 (3): 67–74.
64. Tripathi, V., and V. Bhandari. 2014. Socially responsible investing— An emerging concept in investment management. *FIIIB Business Review* 3 (4): 16–30.
65. Tseng, M.L., P.A. Tan, S.Y. Jeng, C.W.R. Lin, Y.T. Negash, and S.N.A.C. Darsono. 2019. Sustainable investment: Interrelated among corporate governance, economic performance and market risks using investor preference approach. *Sustainability* 11 (7): 2108.
66. Umlas, E. 2008. The global expansion of SRI: Facing challenges, meeting potential. *Development and Change* 39 (6): 1019–1036.
67. Khule, P., Gite, S. & Vasagadekar, P. (2026). Green Finance as a Pathway to Sustainable Development: Concept, Instruments, Challenges, and Prospects for Sustainability in India.. *International Journal of Creative and Open Research in Engineering and Management*, <i>02</i>(6). <https://doi.org/10.55041/ijcope.v2i6.065>
68. Uwuigbe, O.R. 2011. Corporate governance and financial performance of banks: A study of listed banks in Nigeria. Doctoral dissertation, Covenant University.
69. Waddock, S.A., and S.B. Graves. 1997. The corporate social performance– financial performance link. *Strategic Management Journal* 18 (4): 303–319.
70. Yao, S., J. Wang, and L. Song. 2011. Determinants of social responsibility disclosure by Chinese firms. The University of Nottingham- China Policy Institute. Discussion paper, 72, 1–30.