Journal of Contemporary Issues in Business and Government Vol. 27, No. 06, 2021
https://cibg.org.au/
P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

COMPANY PERFORMANCE AS RELATED TO CORPORATE GOVERNANCE DISCLAIMER INDEX

Varsha Rustagi*, Yashika
Assistant professor, Deen Dayal Rustagi College of Management and Technology, Gurugram, rustagi.varsha@gmail.com

Abstract
There is a need to find a comprehensive answer to the corporate governance changes that are now underway in India, one that tends to the country-explicit troubles in an Indian setting. In sync with overall patterns, India's administration has carried out measures to expand corporate, social, and ecological exposures. The research compares the corporate governance practices of Indian corporations in FY 2012-2013 and FY 2015-2016 to examine whether the changes were successful (FY 2012-2013 as Period 1) and if they were ineffective (FY 2015-2016 as Period 2). (FY 2015-2016 as Period 2). The corporate governance performance (CGP) index was created in accordance with the 49 noclauseof the posting concurrence with the Securities Exchange Board of Indiato quantify the internal control score of Indian companies.

Other performance indicators include Profitability,Return on Equity and Return on Invested Capital in addition to Tobin's Q and the Market to Book Value Ratio. For our economic study, we use the Year-wise Normal Least Squares Regression model, the Pooled OLS model, and the Panel Data Model. The connection among CGDI and firm outcome measures has gotten stronger over time, according to the results of the year-by-year OLS regression analysis. According to the results of the research, CGDI has a favorable influence on business results evaluation on the both business and bookkeeping indicators.

Financial success and the integrated framework of overall corporate financial responsibility were only strongly connected in period 1 of the research, according to the findings. Due to corporate governance improvements in period 2, financial ties across Indian markets do not vary much.

Keywords: Firm Performance, Corporate Governance Disclosure Index,Tobin's Q, Fixed Effect Model, Random Effect Model, Feasible Generalized Least Square.

Introduction
Corporate governance concepts, as well as efficiency, innovation, and quality management, are critical to an organization's financial success. Corporate governance standards are helping companies in developed economies improve their financial performance and internal efficiency (Tadesse, 2004). Corporate governance structures are being weakened by transparency and disclosure practices. The significance of compelling corporate administration for an association's

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

drawn out wellbeing and maintainability has been featured by a new spate of major corporate outrages and the worldwide monetary emergency (Ehikioya, 2009).Businesses are successfully and efficiently regulated and managed via corporate governance. Its core may be summarized as fairness, transparency, and disclosures for the protection of stakeholder groups' interests (Arora and Bodhanwala, 2018).

Corporate governance arrangements may increase firm performance by allowing for better decision-making (Shivani et al. 2017). "Corporate governance" is described by Maier (2005) as "the connection between an organization's board of directors and its management, as well as its shareholders and stakeholders." Corporate administration involves thinking about the interests of a different scope of partners, remembering the networks for which they work, just as guaranteeing that the organization and its top managerial staff are considered responsible" (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Developement, in the year 1999). Administration started for the purpose of protecting the interests of investors, however it is presently considered to be basic for different partners and social orders (Jizi, Salama, Dixon, Startling, in the year 2014).

In regard to shareholders and other stakeholders, directors and auditors play a critical role in corporate governance. Good corporate governance benefits shareholders by increasing business confidence and generating a higher return on investment. Furthermore, corporate governance ensures that the company is responsible to society and the environment, as well as to its employees, customers, suppliers, and community.Corporate administration obligations incorporate board responsibility, yet in addition social and natural issues.

Notwithstanding, in light of the fact that it is a particularly troublesome idea to incorporate, past investigations have commonly utilized single corporate administration models that incorporate board size or possession structure (e.g., Morck et al., 1988; Yermack, 1996). 1988, Yermack 1997), or a bunch of discretionary assembled composite administration revelation lists (e.g., Gompers et and. 2003; Bebchuk et al. 2009; Karpoff et al. in 2016).

Despite widespread agreement on the importance of governance, the findings of the vast majority of studies are inconstant, going to raise severe concerns about whether the leadership frameworks used throughout the body of research are actually 'valid' surrogate assessments for the complex idea something which they attempt to quantify.Larcker et al., on the other hand, suggest that the measurement error introduced by utilizing a single governance mechanism "would almost certainly result in incongruent regression findings."

For a number of reasons, the executive gets compensated. Core et al. (1999 2003), Amzaleg et al. (2014), Murphy (1999),Sapp (2008) andNewton (2015), are only a few of the researchers that have looked into the reasons. The literature, on the other hand, contains a slew of flaws. Very first foremost, despite the significance of corporate governance principles as well as the peak of good corporate governance practices that were tried and failed around the universe (Aguilera and CuervoCazurrra in 2004), the writings accessible that has already been published, such as Amzaleg et al. (2014), Ozkan (2011), and Conyon and Murphy (2000)has largely focused on the

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

idea wherein variable compensation can be affected by performance of the company or Msp, regardless of the fact that it is clear that executive

The second reason is that it is critical to study corporate governance in financial decision from both an academic and practical aspect, and as a result, it is expected to influence business operations results (Larcker and co., 2007; Foss and Stea, 2014). Foss and Stea (2014; Foss and Stea (2007; Foss and Stea, 2014). Many investigations have inspected the effect of different corporate administration systems on administrative conduct and friends results.

Literature Review

Corporate governance reforms are critical for India's efforts to achieve an open and transparent economic governance structure (Sanan and Yadav). 2011; Sanan and Yadav). The Indian economy was liberalized and privatized as a result of the 1991 economic crisis. Finance was required by Indian businesses in order to expand and grow. India's corporate governance reforms were necessitated by the need for foreign investment. Since then, SEBI has made ensuring good governance in capital markets a top priority.

This should be visible in SEBI's incessant corrections of rules, rules, and guidelines to guarantee oversight and responsibility (Sehgal and Mulraj 2008). SEBI passed the proviso 49 regulation in 1999, in view of a moral code created by the Confederation of Indian Industry (CII), a free body that talks with the public authority on arrangement matters. To guarantee more prominent consistence, it is refreshed consistently.

India has executed changes pointed toward working on ecological, social, and corporate straightforwardness. In 2011, the Government of India's Ministry of Corporate Affairs delivered "Public Voluntary Guidelines on Social, Economic, and Environmental Responsibilities of Business" (Ministry of Corporate Affairs 2011). To improve the nature of their exposures, the principles require recorded organizations to create a Business Responsibility Report (BRR) (SEBI Circular, 2012).

The Companies Act of 2013 displaces the Companies Act of 1956, and it further develops corporate administration system, improves on guidelines, and ensures the freedoms of minority investors (Prasanna 2013). India was the primary country to make corporate social obligation (CSR) use a legitimate prerequisite. As far as viable execution of Corporate Governance norms, the Indian framework is relied upon to fill in to act as an illustration for different nations everywhere.

Regardless of the execution of changes, they analysts of Portugal, Monteiro, and Guzman (2010) observed that the quantity of exposures has filled in contrast with past changes, yet that the quantity of revelations stays low. Ioannou and Serafeim (2017) inspect the impacts of exposure changes in China, Denmark, Malaysia, and South Africa, recommending that improved manageability related divulgences because of the changes might be associated with more noteworthy corporate worth. Different European nations, just as Japan, have started to give specific consideration to board part checking, moral adherence, and outside confirmations as a result of changes in exposure guidelines, as indicated by Kolk (2008).

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

The Goel Asia Journal of Sustainable and Social Responsibility is an Asian journal committed to social and environmental responsibility (2018). A phrase in the disclosure standards states "comply and explain," which is an interesting aspect. It means that businesses must either obey the regulations or explain why they are not complying with the legal standards. Furthermore, there are no repercussions for non-compliance. It enables employers whether to obey the guidelines or justify their actions by citing a reason. Before the modifications, some firms may well have been implementing the most better corporate governance processes.

Following China's introduction of disclosure rules, Chen, Hung, and Wang (2018) indicate a reduction in industrial waste and Sulfur Dioxide (SO2) emissions; nonetheless, businesses that have adopted CSR disclosures have seen a profit decline. In order to improve corporate disclosures, India has started to make improvements in the areas of company law, community involvement, and the environment. Corporate governance reforms, on the other hand, are much more difficult to put in place than they are to develop. Local constraints and stringent regulatory requirements (Afsharipour 2009), as well as a complete lack of competent independent non-executive directors (Malik and Nehra 2014) and inadequate external surveillance systems, as well as inadequate and multiple regulatory norms, all serve as roadblocks to effective reform implementation and enforcement (Rajharia and Sharma 2014).

This warrants an investigation of the real impact of the transparency and corporate governance changes implemented by Indian firms. As a consequence of these improvements, others may have began to adopt similar approaches. There is no reason to expect that these steps will result in enhanced compliance and reporting, based on this logic. This is why it's so important to think about how these developments will affect Indian firms and governments.

The corporate governance practices of thirty BSE listed businesses in India were studied by Gupta, Nair, and Gogula (2003). The number of board members, the industry's size, and the group's foreign newly listed status are the principal variables that affect governance practices disclosures throughout BSE listed businesses, according to OLS regression. Sen (2011) used a 67-factor index to rate the performance of governance practices disclosures in fifty annual reports of publicly listed businesses in compliance with article 49 of the listing agreement. There is a significant variation in the number and quality of corporate governance disclosures provided by publicly listed firms, according to the research. The size of the business has a big influence on the disclosures. Larger organizations have greater levels of transparency as compared to smaller businesses.

The Governance Index (GOV) was created by Klapper and Love (2004) using 374 enterprises from 14 developing economies. Because the association between firm efficiency and governance indicators is large and favorable, they observed that organizations with superior corporate governance have greater market value and function more efficiently. Durnev and Kim (2005) looked examined data on corporate governance from 859 significant companies in 27 countries and came to the same result. They discovered that a company's transparency and governance rules are positively related to its investment, external financing, and development potential. For 515 Korean corporations, Black, Kim and Jang (2006) developed a corporate governance index

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

(KCGI) that comprises 38 variables that may be utilized and grouped into four sub-indices: Shareholders rights, Board Composition, Board Structure, Procedure, and Transparency. According to OLS and the Instrumental Variable for 2000, an overall index of corporate governance is a major and likely incidental component that determines the value of the market regardless of the kind of market variables utilized.

Research Methodology

Hypothesis

Ho1: There isn't any critical improvement in the corporate administration of Indian organizations following execution of the changes.

The HO2 is that there is no critical variety in corporate administration across various ventures in India.

HO3 The aftereffects of the review show that there is no critical impact of changes to corporate administration on the monetary exhibition of Indian firms in both time spans considered.

Methodology

The review's example incorporates the main 100 income producing ventures in The Economic Times 500 (ET500) (2016 version). Because of the way that exposure and productivity standards are distinctive in these areas in India, 28 associations in the monetary and banking industry were overlooked from the extent of this exploration. Also, four firms were prohibited from the concentrate because of an absence of information for the time-frame under audit. Six key ventures were utilized to order the organizations that were picked. The sectoral cosmetics of the organizations examined is displayed in Table 1.

The significant wellspring of data is the organizations' distributed Annual Reports, just as Corporate Responsibilities Reports and Sustainability Reports. The reports are gathered or downloaded from the particular organization's site. The reports have been entirely analyzed to finish the substance examination for the aspects being scrutinized (Quick 2008; Sandhu and Kapoor, 2010; Gautam and Singh, 2010). To produce scores for each aspect, the data remembered for the reports with respect to that aspect was accumulated. The reports were examined to some degree two times to check that no things were missed when assembling the required information, and to affirm the data's dependability and rightness.

Rather than using parallel appraisals of 0 and 1, you might utilize a size of 1 to 10. This exploration gives credit to the report's construction, how much data uncovered, and the quantity of good administration measures utilized by any organization (Cheung and associates, 2010). The score for various aspects goes from zero to three. The monetary information utilized in this review was generally gotten from information accessible in the Prowess data set of the Center for Monitoring Indian Economy (CMIE).

The heft of examination have zeroed in on specific parts of corporate administration to survey the results of monetary execution, for example, board size (Black 2002), autonomous chiefs (Kaur and Mishra, 2010, Annalisa, P. and Yosef (2011)), and board meetings (Misra and

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

Vishnani 2012). Subramanian and Reddy (2012), just as Liao (2010), Mittal, Sinha, and Singh (2008), have composed on the code of conduct.

In view of the latest adjustments in India's corporate administration guidelines, the exploration applies an extensive corporate administration execution marker for assessing corporate administration in Indian undertakings. The list depends on changes to condition 49 of the Company Act of 2013, just as other required suggestions delivered by India's Ministry of Corporate Affairs.

S No	Industry Group	Number of Companies	Percentage
1	AUTOMOBILE	6	13.52
2	CEMENT & CEMENT PRODUCTS	3	11.23
3	CONSTRUCTION	1	6.13
4	CONSUMER GOODS	5	8.12
5	ENERGY	8	17.51
6	INDUSTRIAL MANUFACTURING	3	1.87
7	IT	7	15.87
8	METALS	9	15.92
9	PHARMA	5	11.23
10	TELECOM	2	2.21
	TOTAL	49	

Table 1 : sectoral cosmetics of the organizations examined

Discussion

Are reforms helping enhance the corporate governance of Indian businesses?

All of the organizations in this study have excellent governance practices in place and are aware of their responsibilities to a variety of stakeholders. The listing agreement's inclusion of corporate governance rules in clause 49 has aided in the improvement of the listed company's internal procedures and raised the quality of governance (Sharma and Singh, 2009; Goel& Mclver, 2015). Only two of the 16 corporate governance score categories haven't improved considerably. Indian businesses must be aware of these characteristics, particularly the no of board independence of governors and the number of medals and other acknowledgements received during the year. The proportion of independent non-executive members as a percentage of the overall directors has dropped over time, according to the study (Kaur and Misra 2010). It's possible that this is due to a scarcity of proficient directorships in India (Malik and Nehra 2014 Rajharia and Sharma 2014a, and b). In addition, two key advancements in corporate governance standards have been observed, namely the inclusion of women on boards, as mandated by new regulations, and the formation of diverse boards to defend shareholder interests.

These improvements aim to improve the effectiveness of boards by concentrating on controlling and assessing the company's direction (Dharmapala and Khanna 2013, 2013; Dua, 2015). As a result, it's clear that the number of director's committee meetings has increased. Many businesses

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

have started conducting separate meetings for corporate governance. As a result, independent directors have increased their participation in various committees, making boards more accountable and responsible to their stakeholders (Shivani and others. 2017, 2017; Khan, Muttakin and Siddiqui 2013,). The majority of organizations clearly deal with both staff and customer concerns. It's odd that some of the largest production companies aren't disclosing their problems as required by law (Chatterjee 2011,).

How do different sectors function in the aftermath of governance reforms?

In P1, the oil, power, and refinery industry showed constant commitment to all stakeholders. The bulk of businesses in this sector are public-sector entities that are compelled to adhere to stricter norms and regulations. The IT and communication sectors, which are dominated by private firms, performed well in P1. The bulk of Indian IT businesses use outsourcing methods for business operations to operate abroad. As a result, it is critical that they follow international corporate environmental, sustainable management, and social responsibility standards.This definite information assists organizations with getting global agreements and increment pay. Notwithstanding, Palaniappan and Rao (2015) contend that IT firms need to further develop their corporate administration. In P2, corporate administration evaluations worked on essentially no matter how you look at it.

The Pharmaceutical and Chemical industry, in particular, has witnessed a tremendous growth and now ranks first in the overall score table. For both time periods, the Transportation and Auto sector sits at the bottom of the list. Although the industry has made significant progress in terms of how it manages employee and shareholder responsibility, it must remain cognizant of environmental standards and take further steps to promote the good of society. Furthermore, in both time periods investigated, the Metal, Engineering, and Infrastructure sector is the most accountable to customers and suppliers; nonetheless, they must demand on CSR reporting (Shamim, Kumar, Soni 2014). A small increase in the overall score for corporate governance may be noted in the varied industry.

Conclusion

As per the discoveries of this review, Indian organizations have gained critical headway in corporate administration because of late changes. By and large, the changes were fruitful in accomplishing the essential objective of making sheets more responsible to all members. The expansion of somewhere around one female chief to the directorate is a huge advance forward for Indian organizations. To further develop the sexual orientation balance in high administration, controllers could build ladies' interest on sheets of chiefs. Indian companies should choose a more prominent number of free chiefs, since the job of autonomous chiefs is basic to the achievement of change execution. CSR's mandatory 2% net profit contribution has not yet been completely realized. When corporations are able to define the major social responsibility areas, as I want to see happen in the near future, this Indian model might bring about miracles in society's growth. This suggests that charitable activities might result in better

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

social investment returns. Corporate responsibility reports are now required to be published, which has increased the transparency of social and economic accountability.

To raise environmental awareness and accountability, regulators should make the publication of carbon footprints a mandate. Implementing adequate corporate governance incentives across multiple industries might encourage businesses to follow the rules and contribute to the environment and society. Investors have started to recognize excellent governance firms, and this might be used to attract international investors, therefore every industry has attempted to strengthen their corporate governance. To raise the bar for performance, governments should focus on specific issues in the sector. Despite these improvements, India's corporate governance framework has made significant progress. However, no substantial impact of the changes on business financial performance was discovered in this research.

When corporate governance changes are executed with conviction, market attitudes will improve and reinforce the link between corporate management and firm performance in India, just as they have in advanced nations. In light of the encroachment of corruption and bureaucracy in India, the issue of compliance and the implementation of governance reforms must be addressed. Market regulators must be strengthened, and they must be given the authority to pursue companies that commit fraud.

Noncompliance with the necessary requirements must also be punishable by serious penalties. As a result, the full implementation of India's governance reforms would need considering reforms in broader settings, such as legal and political systems. Furthermore, Indian businesses must be aware of the benefits of implementing effective governance strategies, as well as the initiatives that will help them improve their financial performance. There are certain limitations to the research. These yearly reports are reviewed many times to ensure that the information presented is accurate and consistent, as well as to assign a rating score; nonetheless, the rating scale's inherent subjectivity is a problem.

Furthermore, financial data and corporate governance were assessed over a two-year period and are only applicable to the top 100 organizations. A future study could look at the data over a longer period of time and analyze the relationship in a way that can be used to create a trend analysis for the entire ET500 companies. Because global investors are willing to pay a premium for firms that invest in sustainable practices that benefit all parties involved, local investors may take a similar approach and put more emphasis on companies with solid governance systems. corporate accountability

References

1. Abatecola G, Caputo A, Mari M, Poggesi S (2012) Relations among corporate governance, codes of conduct, and theprofitability of public utilities: an empirical study of companies on the Italian stock exchange. Int J Manag 29(2):611–626
2. Afsharipour A (2009) Corporate governance convergence: lessons from the Indian experience. Nw J Int'l L & Bus 29:335

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

3. Aggarwal P (2013) Impact of sustainability performance of company on its financial performance: a study of listed Indiancompanies
4. Annalisa P, Yosef S (2011) Corporate governance and earnings Management in Family-Controlled Companies. J Acc Audit Financ 26:199–227. https://doi.org/10.1177/0148558X11401212
5. Arif K, Syed N (2015) Impact of corporate governance on performance of a firm: a comparison between commercial banksand financial services companies of Pakistan. European Journal of Business and Management 7(10):54–60
6. Arnold MC, Bassen A, Frank R (2012) Integrating sustainability reports into financial statements: an experimental study
7. Arora A, Bodhanwala S (2018) Relationship between corporate governance index and firm performance: Indian evidence.Glob Bus Rev 19(3):675–689
8. Ashraf M, Bashir A, Asghar N (2017) Impact of corporate governance on firms' financial performance: textile sector ofPakistan. International Journal of Business and Management Invention 6(5):13–19
9. Aupperle KE, Carroll AB, Hatfield JD (1985) An empirical examination of the relationship between corporate socialresponsibility and profitability. AcadManag J 28(2):446–463
10. Bae KH, Goyal VK (2010) Equity market liberalization and corporate governance. J Corp Finan 16(5):609–621
11. Barter, N. (2011). Stakeholder theory: pictures, the environment and sustainable development {u2013} do we have agood enough picture in our heads or do we need something different? Asia Pacific Centre for SustainableEnterprise
12. Bauer R, Frijns B, Otten R, Tourani-Rad A (2008) The impact of corporate governance on corporate performance: evidencefrom Japan. Pac Basin Financ J 16(3):236–251
13. Bauer R, Guenster N, Otten R (2004) Governance in Europe: the effecton stock returns, firm valueand performance. J AssetManag 5(2):91–104
14. Bayoud NS, Kavanagh M, Slaughter G (2012) Corporate social responsibility disclosure and corporate reputation in developingcountries: the case of Libya. Journal of Business and Policy Research 7(1):131–160 ISSN 1838-3742
15. Beiner S, Drobetz W, Schmid MM, Zimmermann H (2006) An integrated framework of corporate governance and firmvaluation. EurFinancManag 12(2):249–283
16. Bhagat S, Bolton B (2008) Corporate governance and firm performance. J Corp Finan 14(3):257–273
17. Bhardwaj MN, Rao CDBR (2014) Corporate governance practices in India – a case study. Asia Pacific Journal of Research, I(12), 43-54.
18. Bhasin M (2012) 'Voluntary'Corporate governance disclosures made in the annual reports: an empirical study. InternationalJournal of Management & Innovation 4(1)
19. Black BS (2002) The non-correlation between board Independence and long-term firm performance. Journal of CorporationLaw 27:231–274

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

20. Black BS, Khanna VS (2007) Can corporate governance reforms increase firm market values? Event study evidence from India.JEmpir Leg Stud 4(4):749–796
21. Botosan CA (2006) Disclosure and the cost of capital: what do we know? Account Bus Res 36(sup1):31–40
22. Brammer S, Brooks C, Pavelin S (2009) The stock performance of America's 100 best corporate citizens. Q Rev Econ Finance49(3):1065–1080
23. Brown LD, Caylor ML (2006) Corporate governance and firm valuation. J Account Public Policy 25(4):409–434
24. Burke L, Logsdon JM, Mitchell W, Reiner M, Vogel D (1986) Corporate community involvement in the San Francisco Bay Area.CalifManag Rev XXVIII(3):122–141
25. Chatterjee D (2011) A content analysis study on corporate governance reporting by Indian companies. Corp Reput Rev 14(3):234–246
26. Chen YC, Hung M, Wang Y (2018) The effect of mandatory CSR disclosure on firm profitability and social externalities:evidence from China. J Account Econ 65(1):169–190
27. Cheung Y-L, Stouraitis A, Tan W (2010) Does the quality of corporate governance affect firm valuation and risk? Evidencefrom a corporate governance scorecard in Hong Kong. International Review of Finance 10:403–432. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2443.2010.01106.x
28. Clarkson MBA (1995) A stakeholder framework for analyzing and evaluating corporate social performance. AcadManag Rev20(1):92–117
29. CORTEZ MAA, CUDIA CP (2011) Sustainability and firm performance: a case study of Japanese electronics companies.Ritsumeikan international affairs 10:321–339
30. Cyriac S (2013) Corporate sustainability reporting practices: a comparative study of practices by Indian and Europeancompanies. The Macrotheme Review 2(6):38–46
31. Dharmapala D, Khanna V (2013) Corporate governance, enforcement, and firm value: evidence from India. J Law Econ Org29(5):1056–1084
32. Dua P, Dua S (2015) A review article on corporate governance reforms in India. International Journal of Research 2(2):806–835
33. Durnev A, Kim EH (2005) To steal or not to steal: firm attributes, legal environment, and valuation. J Financ 60:1461–1493
34. Ehikioya BI (2009) Corporate governance structure and firm performance in developing economies: evidence from Nigeria.Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society 9(3):231–243
35. Freeman RE, Evan WM (1990) Corporate governance: a stakeholder interpretation. J Behav Econ 19(4):337–359
36. Gautam R, Singh A (2010) Critical environmental indicators used to assess environmental performance of business. Glob BusManag Res 2(2):224–236
37. Goel K, McIver R (2015) INDIA'S corporate governance reforms and listed CORPORATIONS'CAPITAL structures. Delhi BusinessReview 16(2)

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

38. Gompers P, Ishi JL, Metrick A (2003) Corporate governance and equity prices. Q J Econ 118(1):107–155
39. Griffin, J.J. & Mahon, J,F. (1997). The corporate social performance and corporate financial performance debate: Twenty fiveyears of incomparable research. Business and Society. 36(1). 5–31
40. Ioannou I, Serafeim G (2017) The consequences of mandatory corporate sustainability reporting
41. Jizi MI, Salama A, Dixon R, Stratling R (2014) Corporate governance and corporate social responsibility disclosure: evidencefrom the US banking sector. J Bus Ethics 125(4):601–615
42. Johnson S, Boone P, Breach A, Friedman E (2000) Corporate governance in the Asian financial crisis. J Financ Econ 58(1–2):141–186
43. Kansal M, Joshi M, Babu S, Sharma S (2018) Reporting of corporate social responsibility in central public sector enterprises: astudy of post mandatory regime in India. J Bus Ethics 151(3):813–831
44. Kansal M, Singh S (2012) Measurement of corporate social performance: an Indian perspective. Social responsibility journal8(4):527–546
45. Kaur G, Mishra R (2010) Corporate Governance Failure in India: A Study of Academicians Perception. IUP Journal of CorporateGovernance, IX: (1): 99-112
46. Khan A, Muttakin MB, Siddiqui J (2013) Corporate governance and corporate social responsibility disclosures: evidence froman emerging economy. J Bus Ethics 114(2):207–223
47. Kiel GC, Nicholson GJ (2003) Board composition and corporate performance: how the Australian experience informscontrasting theories of corporate governance. Corp Gov 11(3):189–205
48. Klapper LF, Love I (2004) Corporate governance, investor protection, and performance in emerging markets. J Corp Finan10(5):703–728
49. Kohli N, Saha GC (2008) Corporate governance and valuations: evidence from selected indian companies. Int J DisclGov 5(3):236–251. https://doi.org/10.1057/jdg.2008.10
50. Kolk A (2008) Sustainability, accountability and corporate governance: exploring multinationals' reporting practices. BusStrateg Environ 17(1):1–15
51. Kolk A, Pinkse J (2010) The integration of corporate governance in corporate social responsibility disclosures. Corp SocResponsib Environ Manag 17(1):15–26
52. Kumar J (2004) Does corporate governance influence firm value? Evidence from Indian firms. The Journal of EntrepreneurialFinance& Business Ventures 9(2):61–91
53. Liao WC (2010) The relationship between ethics training and employee satisfaction: a mediator of corporate responsibilitypractices. The Journal of Human Resource and Adult Learning 6(1):9
54. Love I, Klapper LF (2002) Corporate governance, investor protection, and performance in emerging markets. Journal ofCorporate Finance 10(5):703–728

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

55. Maier S (2005) How global is good governance? Ethical Investment Research Services, London
56. Malik S, Nehra VS (2014) Corporate governance and firms performance: review of research in the light of recent reforms inIndia. Pacific Business review International 6(7):77–84
57. Mansur H, Tangl A (2018) The Effect of Corporate Governance on the Financial Performance of Listed Companies in Amman
58. Stock Exchange (Jordan). Journal of Advanced Management Science Vol, 6(2), 97–102.Ministry of corporate affairs (MCA), India (2011).http://www.mca.gov.in/Ministry/latestnews/National_Voluntary_Guidelines_2011_12jul2011.pdf
59. Misra D, Vishnani S (2012) Impact of corporate governance regulation on market risk. Vikalpa 37(2):19–32
60. Mittal RK, Sinha N, Singh A (2008) An analysis of linkage between economic value added and corporate social responsibility.ManagDecis 46(9):1437–1443. https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740810912037
61. Mohanty P (2003) Institutional investors and corporate governance in India
62. Monda B, Giorgino M (2013) Corporate governance and shareholder value in listed firms: an empirical analysis in fivecountries (France, Japan, Italy, UK, USA). Corporate Ownership & Control 10(3):36–50
63. Monteiro DS, Guzmán SMAB (2010) Determinants of environmental disclosure in the annual reports of large companiesoperating in Portugal. Corporate Social Responsibility and Environmental Journal 17(4):185–204
64. Mulyadi MS, Anwar Y (2012) Impact of corporate social responsibility toward firm value and profitability. The Business Review,Cambridge 19(2):316–322
65. Narayanaswamy R, Raghunandan K, Rama DV (2012) Corporate governance in the Indian context. Account Horiz 26(3):583–599
66. Okoye LU, Evbuomwan GO, Achugamonu BU, Araghan I (2016) Impact of corporate governance on the profitability of theNigerian banking sector. ESUT Journal of Accountancy 7(1):281–292
67. Palaniappan G, Rao S (2015) Relationship between corporate governance practices and firms performance of Indian context.International Research Journal of Engineering and Technology 3(3):1–5
68. Pande, S., & Kaushik, K. V. (2012). Study on the state of corporate governance in India– evolution, issues and challenges for thefuture. Indian Institute of Corporate Affairs
69. Patibandla M (2006) Equity pattern, corporate governance and performance: a study of India's corporate sector. J Econ BehavOrgan 59(1):29–44
70. Prasanna PK (2013) Impact of corporate governance regulations on Indian stock market volatility and efficiency. Int J DisclGov 10(1):1–12

P-ISSN: 2204-1990; E-ISSN: 1323-6903
DOI: 10.47750/cibg.2021.27.06.128

71. Quick R (2008) Voluntary sustainability reporting practices in Germany: a study on reporting quality. Portuguese Journal ofAccounting and Management 5(1):7–35
72. Rajharia P, Sharma B (2014a) Corporate Governance In India Evolution, Issues And Challenges For The Future. InternationalJournal of Scientific Research and Management 2
73. Rajharia, P., & Sharma, B. (2014b). Legal Aspects of Corporate Governance for IT Companies in India, 2(11), 35–42
74. Rajput N, Batra G, Pathak R (2012) Linking CSR and financial performance: an empirical validation. ProblPerspectManag10(2):42–49
75. Reed D (2002) Corporate governance reforms in developing countries. J Bus Ethics 37(3):223–247
76. Roodposhti FR, Chashmi SN (2010) The effect of board composition and ownership concentration on earnings management:evidence from Iran. World Academy of Science. EngTechnol 66:165–171
77. Saher, Z., Pal, S., &Pinheiro, T. (2015). Regulations and firm Financing : impact of clause 49 in India * regulations and firmFinancing : impact of clause 49 in India, (October).
78. Sanan N, Yadav S (2011) Corporate governance reforms and financial disclosures: a case of Indian companies. IUP Journal ofCorporate Governance 10(2)
79. Sanda AU, Mikailu AS, Garba T (2005) Corporate governance mechanisms and firm financial performance in Nigeria
80. Sandhu HS, Kapoor S (2010) Corporate social responsibility initiatives: an analysis of voluntary corporate disclosure. SouthAsian J Manag 17(2):47